

St. Catherine University

SOPHIA

Masters of Arts in Education Action Research
Papers

Education

5-2017

The Effect of Student-Led Conferencing at School and at Home on Goal-Setting, Goal-Fulfillment, Effort, Achievement, Intrinsic Motivation, and Satisfaction for Montessori Lower Elementary 3rd Year Students.

Timothy David Blake Schwartz
St. Catherine University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://sophia.stkate.edu/maed>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), and the [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blake Schwartz, Timothy David. (2017). The Effect of Student-Led Conferencing at School and at Home on Goal-Setting, Goal-Fulfillment, Effort, Achievement, Intrinsic Motivation, and Satisfaction for Montessori Lower Elementary 3rd Year Students.. Retrieved from Sophia, the St. Catherine University repository website: <https://sophia.stkate.edu/maed/224>

This Action Research Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Education at SOPHIA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters of Arts in Education Action Research Papers by an authorized administrator of SOPHIA. For more information, please contact amshaw@stkate.edu.

The Effect of Student-Led Conferencing at School and at Home on
Goal-Setting, Goal-Fulfillment, Effort, Achievement, Intrinsic Motivation,
and Satisfaction for Montessori Lower Elementary 3rd Year Students.

Submitted on May 20, 2017

In fulfillment of final requirements for the MAED degree

Timothy David Blake Schwartz

St. Catherine University

St. Paul, Minnesota

Advisor _____

Date _____

Abstract

This study was designed to determine the effect of weekly student-led conferences (both at-home and at-school) on goal setting, goal fulfillment, effort, achievement, intrinsic motivation, and satisfaction. One teacher, eight Montessori third-year lower elementary students, and eight parents participated in the study for six weeks. Baseline data on goal setting and fulfillment was collected and analyzed. Guiding questions designed to encourage and support the students formed the content of the conferences. Pre- and post-intervention surveys were administered. The results showed that while the intervention did not help the students set and fulfill greater quantities of goals, it did have a positive effect on the prioritizing of academic and project-based goals. Communication and relationships between parties also increased, resulting in greater adult awareness of student success and challenge, as well as more supportive adult behavior. Continued research could involve a modified home and school conference format for all lower elementary students.

Keywords: Montessori, student-led conferencing, goal setting, intrinsic motivation, autonomy, self-efficacy, work cycle

Each morning my Montessori lower elementary students enter the classroom full of excitement and anticipation. Surrounded by the pleasant hum of greetings and anecdotes, they put away belongings, wash hands, and take out weekly work records. The weekly work record is a tool that is designed to help Montessori students organize, plan, and prioritize the many lessons, assignments, activities, and projects that make up their week. Although there are similar goals for all of my students, each member of the classroom makes a unique plan, and shares that plan with me or my co-teacher in a brief conference. Over the course of the week, my students record their completed works, or assignments and activities, often with my initials to show sufficient quality and content. In this way, the work record, together with the goal setting conference, serves as a medium for helping the students develop organizational skills, confidence, and independence, three key aspects of Montessori elementary philosophy.

As a record of all that students do at school, the weekly work record also helps me keep track of their progress. Some students obviously gravitate to certain areas of the classroom while avoiding others. Some struggle with the quality and accuracy of their work. The work record can help me find and evaluate these challenges, and aid me in providing feedback for my students during our conferences. Once I am aware of my students' individual needs, I can provide them with options and interventions to help them overcome obstacles, and develop self-confidence, determination, and perseverance. This leads to fulfillment, joy, and intrinsic motivation.

This year, many of my third year students have struggled to develop these traits. They are anxious and nervous. They doubt the quality of their endeavors and show less interest in the lessons and works than in previous years. They seem to depend on me and my co-teacher to judge their work, to tell them when to start and when they have finished. They seem to think it is our decision whether the work is good enough or needs to be redone. Goal-planning is uninspired

and lethargic. When reporting home about school, the students tell their parents little, and the parents share concerns over the quality of their children's experience. Even with reminders, the students do not consistently take work records home, so the parents are left without the artifact that will help them decipher their child's week.

What would happen if I developed a better type of conferencing with my students? What would happen if I prioritized positive, encouraging, supportive communication over judgmental, punitive communication? What would happen if I met with the parents to also teach them to do the same? Can student-led conferencing at school and at home positively affect goal setting, goal fulfillment, effort, achievement, intrinsic motivation, and satisfaction? These questions formed the seed of my action research. The abundant literature germinated that seed.

Research conducted on intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1971; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002), self-determination (Deci, Eghari, Patrick, & Leone, 1994; Ryan & Deci, 2000), and conferencing (Coleman & McNeese, 2009; Gottfried, Marcoulides, Gottfried, & Oliver, 2009; Mudrey, Scholes, & Lewis, 2006; Loomans, 2014) pointed to a distinct reciprocal relationship between positive, supportive, encouraging adult involvement and intrinsic motivation in students, including autonomy, effort, achievement, self-efficacy, and satisfaction (Murray, 2011). Bandura (1994) found evidence that parent and teacher practices can promote intrinsic motivation, autonomy (self-determination), and self-efficacy in education. Montessori found similarities in children who were capable of concentration, enjoyment, discipline, and self-direction. She coined the term "normalization" to describe such children, who were capable of being independent and successful in a prepared environment (Lillard, 2005; Montessori, 1989, 1994, 1995).

This action research was conducted in a Montessori lower elementary first through third grade classroom in suburban Washington, DC. The subjects were eight third year lower elementary students, aged eight to nine. For a period of six weeks, I met with each student on Friday to review the previous week's work record, discuss successes and challenges, and consider the upcoming week. Each student's parent or parents also actively participated in the study, conducting the same, structured, weekly, home-based student-led conference the evening prior.

Review of Literature

Ryan & Deci (2000) wrote, "motivation concerns energy, direction, persistence and equifinality--all aspects of activation and intention" (p. 69). When people need to do something, they get it done. Children are no different. They need to have the energy, purpose, determination, and stamina required to accomplish the tasks set for them as well as those they set for themselves. But, where does this energy come from? In what direction does motivation push students, and how is it connected to persistence? Will the same result be achieved whether students do things for themselves or for others? If results are more genuine, long-lasting, and impressionistic when they are achieved intrinsically, should it be the goal of education and parenting to facilitate intrinsically-motivated learning? As educators and parents, can we respond to our students' and children's efforts, successes, and failures in ways that foster that intrinsic motivation?

Numerous studies have explored the nature of motivation (Deci, 1971; Bandura, 1994; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Pintrich, 2003; Seifert, 2004). The abundance of research into the relationship between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation was examined thoroughly by

Deci, Koestner, & Ryan (1999). Positive personal qualities such as autonomy, self-efficacy, and self-determination have been connected to personal and academic growth in children (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Seifert, 2004; Lillard, 2005; Ervin, Wash, & Mecca, 2010; Gohr, 2014; Freeman, 2016; Loomans, 2014). Parental and teacher influence has been shown to affect intrinsic motivation, through positive interactions, conferencing, and goal setting. (Deci, 1971; Gottfried, Marcoulides, Philips, & Lindsay, 2006; Gottfried, & Oliver, 2009; Coleman & McNeese, 2009). Schools and classrooms can be designed that help foster intrinsic motivation by providing opportunities for independence, self-determination, and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994; Montessori, 1989, 1994, 1995; Pintrich, 2003; Lillard, 2005; Mudrey, Scholes, & Lewis, 2006). Montessori education, in particular, provides an idealized environment in which students can discover their own motivation and success (Montessori, 1989, 1994, 1995; Lillard, 2005; Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005).

Intrinsic Motivation

According to researchers Ryan & Deci,

Perhaps no single phenomenon reflects the positive potential of human nature as much as intrinsic motivation, the inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one's capacities, to explore, and to learn. (2000, p. 70)

Although the term “intrinsic motivation” has earlier roots in academic and education literature, it was Deci (1971) who first popularized the concept. In studies comparing the introduction and then removal of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards involving psychology students, Deci (1971) found that motivation decreased when an extrinsic reward such as money was removed, while removing an intrinsic reward, such as verbal encouragement, did not negatively affect the behavior of the subjects. Murray (2011) connected Montessori education with current motivation

theories from Ryan & Deci (2000), Seifert (2004), and Pintrich (2003). Murray (2011) discussed how four key aspects of motivation: autonomy, interest, competence, and relatedness; manifest in the Montessori classroom. Rathunde noted how Montessori (and Flow Theory) focuses on creating a learning atmosphere that promotes and supports “an intrinsically motivated state of deep concentration” (2015, p. 16).

There is a good amount of research concerning the connection between intrinsic motivation and academic interest, achievement, and excellence. Deci, Eghari, Patrick, & Leone (1994) observed that internalization could take one of two forms. Through introjection, internal regulation was still dependent on external approval or expectation. When people experienced integration, they found self-direction through the process of transforming external regulations into internal regulations and then integrating those regulations into themselves (1994, p. 120). Phillips & Lindsay, in a study investigating the role of motivation on advanced achievement for 14 and 15 year-olds, observed the positive influence “of teaching and learning provision, of support and of social and emotional factors on the students’ achievement” (2006, p. 57). Academic realization, goal fulfillment, and alleviation of challenges were also noted outcomes (Phillips & Lindsay, 2006, p. 57). Coleman and McNeese in a quantitative study concerning “the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement” (2009, p. 459) of over 9,000 fifth-grade students found a direct correlation between academic achievement and student motivation (2009, p. 467). Coleman & McNeese (2009, p. 468) also cited Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2002), whose study showed a beneficial link specifically between mastery goals (motivation to learn) and academic achievement. Linnenbrink and Pintrich noted, “that instructional efforts and the designs of classrooms and schools can make a difference in motivating students for academic achievement” (2002, p. 314). Intentional school

and classroom design connects back to Montessori's assertion that the prepared environment contributes directly to student satisfaction and normalization (Montessori, 1989, 1994, 1995). Bandura (1994) wrote extensively about self-efficacy, the process through which people determine how they feel, think, motivate themselves and behave (p. 1). Coleman and McNeese defined self-efficacy as "a student's concept of their ability to complete a learning experience" (2009, p. 461). Wigfield, Guthrie, Tonks, and Perencevich (2004) noted that "Competence and efficacy beliefs refer to an individual's assessments of their ability to accomplish a task or activity" (p. 301). Mastery experiences, shared successes in social environments, engaging external support, and physical and emotional self-awareness all contribute to the level of self-efficacy people exhibit (Bandura, 1994, pp. 2-3).

Maria Montessori (1995) discussed self-direction and student engagement as *normalization*. Through careful observation of young children in the prepared environment, Montessori determined that normalization is present when children want to work, to concentrate, and to develop discipline and sociability (Montessori, 1995, p. 202). "The children in our schools have proved to us that their real wish is to be always at work--a thing never before suspected, just as no one had ever before noticed the child's power of choosing his work spontaneously" (Montessori, 1995, p. 202). Montessori discovered that when children are presented with a learning environment carefully prepared to meet their developmental needs, they will find meaning, purpose, and satisfaction in that environment. As the child reaches normalization, undesired traits, such as "caprice, disorder, timidity, sloth, and extra-social" (Montessori, 1995, p. 204), diminish while desired traits, such as concentration, work, discipline, and sociability, increase. Montessori further noted that "the loss of all these superficial defects is not brought about by an adult, but by the child himself" (Montessori, 1995, p. 204). Children,

Montessori determined, can be the architects of their own success. This is intrinsic motivation in its essence.

There have also been numerous studies evaluating the connections between intrinsic motivation and academic success in Montessori education. Ervin, Walsh, & Mecca (2010) found a distinct correlation between self-direction and intrinsic motivation in Montessori. In a three-year study comparing Montessori and non-Montessori students progressing from kindergarten through second grade, the researchers determined that Montessori students show higher levels of self-regulation and academic performance (Ervin, Walsh, & Mecca, 2010). These findings were connected to more effective work habits and higher levels of intrinsic motivation (Ervin, Walsh, & Mecca, 2010). Amundson (2015) noted that an increased focus on fostering intrinsic motivation and satisfaction regarding reading for lower elementary students was not only successful along those lines, but led to increases in comprehension skills as well. Lillard (2005) points to many connections between intrinsic motivation and academic success in Montessori. Structured choice, within a prepared environment, along with a trained guide, all help to lead the student toward success and growth. Freeman (2016) conducted an action research project that examined the connection between independence and student success. Students were encouraged to use work journals to plan their follow-up work. The study showed that students who are given autonomy in designing and choosing their own work show an increase in confidence, work completion, and resource utilization.

Two studies (Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005; Ervin, Walsh, & Mecca, 2010) compared Montessori & non-Montessori students. In Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi (2005) approximately 140 Montessori middle school students were compared to 160 non-Montessori middle school students against five key criteria points. The Montessori schools involved had:

An explicit philosophy of intrinsic motivation, . . . provided students with significant portions of unstructured time, . . . did not utilize mandatory grading or standardized testing for comparative purposes and student placements, . . . allowed students to play a significant role in daily decisions that affected the school, and discouraged whole class, lecture formats and encouraged students to work in smaller groups. (Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 348)

The research showed that “Montessori students reported more flow, higher affect, potency, and intrinsic motivation while doing schoolwork” (Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 357). The researchers noted how Montessori schools are task-oriented, allowing students to develop goals based on interest rather than just ability (Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, pp. 345-346). This task-oriented model allows students to develop more intrinsic motivation (Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 358), while performance-oriented goals tend to have more short-term effects. In another study comparing Montessori and non-Montessori students, Ervin, Wash, & Mecca (2010) concluded that there is a difference in self-regulation skills between Montessori and non-Montessori students. These skills directly correlate to academic success (Ervin, Walsh, & Mecca, 2010, p. 29). These research studies suggested that independence, freedom, improvisation, a hands-on curriculum, and formative experiences away from the classroom all work to foster intrinsic motivation and self-determination for the student.

Autonomy & Independence

Ryan & Deci (2000) noted that humans, including children, have “three innate psychological needs--competence, autonomy, and relatedness--which when satisfied yield enhanced self-motivation and mental health” (p. 68). These needs “appear to be essential for facilitating optimal functioning of the natural propensities for growth and integration, as well as

for constructive social development and personal well-being” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 68). Montessori (1994, 1995) wrote extensively about independence. Independence, she observed, is the foundation for self-construction. Independence cannot be given to children by adults; children must develop their own independence, and in so doing they find liberty as well (Montessori, 1994, p. 64). This process leads to many other qualities, such as carefulness, thoughtfulness, intelligence, imagination, self-reflection, compassion, and caring (Montessori, 1994, pp. 11-13). When given the opportunity to develop independence and autonomy, children also get the opportunity to discover themselves (Montessori, 1995). Lillard (2005) discussed the role of independence in Montessori extensively, noting that Montessori “saw it as one of education’s goals” (p. 302). The repetition of independent endeavors, Lillard noted, “may be even more important to a sense of mastery than achieving the immediate goal of each routine” (Lillard, 2005, p. 302). By encouraging independence, Montessori championed the chance for anyone to master anything, and thereby discover independence and self-belief.

Teacher & Parent Involvement

Numerous studies support the assertion that positive parental and teacher support directly influence intrinsic motivation, self-determination, autonomy, and academic excellence. Deci’s (1971) landmark study laid the foundations for decades of research into intrinsic motivation and intrinsically-motivated intervention. In a quantitative study that involved interviewing more than 250 German students about their experiences with parental interactions, Häbig found that “parental attitudes characterized by esteem and support towards their children correspond with positive evaluations of the concrete cooperation” (2015, p. 155). Gottfried, et al. (2009) studied children and parents to determine the positive relationship between encouragement and motivation. Coleman and McNeese noted that “an involved parent can have an immensely

positive impact on their child's learning and overall school experience" (2009, p. 460). However, the researchers found an inverse relationship between parental involvement and academic motivation and success (Coleman & McNeese, 2009). The researchers attributed this relationship to the ages of the participants, who were in an age bracket commonly associated with independence and resistance to adult involvement. The researchers cited Manzo (2008), who noted that, "Remedying low motivation is most easily accomplished in the elementary years, while it is quite difficult in the middle school years" (p. 22). The interviewees in Phillips & Lindsay's study also acknowledged the positive influence of supportive home environments on motivation and success (2006, p. 65). Coleman and McNeese noted that self-efficacy "refers to a person's desire to relate to those around them" (2009, p. 461). Wigfield, Guthrie, Tonks, and Perencevich identified the "feedback and encouragement that they receive from others" as a major influence on children's efficacy beliefs (2004, p. 301). Bandura (1994) discussed the power of others to affect an individual's feelings of self-efficacy. People who are supported and encouraged by others "are likely to mobilize greater effort and sustain it than if they harbor self-doubts and dwell on personal deficiencies when problems arise" (p. 2).

Parents are not the only adults who can influence self-efficacy in children. Kraft & Dougherty (2012) conducted a quantitative field experiment in which sixth and ninth grade students were chosen to receive prescribed daily phone calls or text messages from summer program teachers (2012, p. 1). The results showed that sixth and ninth grade students who received direct feedback from teachers on a daily basis completed more homework, participated in class more, and stayed on task longer (Kraft & Dougherty, 2012, p. 1). Interestingly, students in the control group, who did not receive extra feedback, actually showed lower completion rates, on-task behavior, and participation (Kraft & Dougherty, 2012, p. 19). Not only did

communication influence positive outcomes; the absence of communication correlates to negative outcomes. The researchers followed up on the initial study with a qualitative assessment of teachers and learners. Interviews revealed, “stronger teacher-student relationships, expanded parental involvement, and increased student motivation” for intervention recipients (Kraft & Dougherty, 2012, p. 24). Mudrey, Scholes, & Lewis (2006), in a study of fourth-grade Catholic students engaged in student-led conferences, found that students felt more successful when they set their own goals.

There is a good amount of anecdotal and research-based evidence on the role of the Montessori teacher in fostering intrinsic motivation through positive interactions. Gohr (2014) and Fitch (2013) conducted action research projects which focused on teacher behavior towards students as well as conferencing and goal setting. Such interventions as “acknowledging feelings, giving intrinsic rationales, using a peace table, conducting class meetings, and practicing teacher mindfulness” led to significant improvements in self-control and intrinsic motivation (Gohr, 2014, p. 1). Although Ervin, Wash, & Mecca (2010) found little association “between levels of teacher self-efficacy rating and student self-regulation and academic performance in Montessori and non-Montessori settings” (p. 30), the researchers also determined that “Montessori teachers have been slightly more effective in helping parents employ positive approaches to discipline than non-Montessori teachers” (Ervin, Wash, & Mecca, 2010, p. 30). Furthermore, the researchers noted that, “The homes from which non-Montessori children come practice less modeling, explaining, and telling” (Ervin, Wash, & Mecca, 2010, p. 30). Loomans (2014) found yet more correlation between parent involvement and goal setting and goal fulfillment among Montessori Elementary 4th year and 5th year students. Parents who “provide accountability,

support in time management and support in workload management” (Loomans, 2014, p. 1) can help their children find success in school.

Lillard (2005) wrote about conferencing and goal setting in Montessori, noting that most children meet weekly with teachers, while others meet more frequently (pp. 149-150). The teacher’s role is not necessarily to judge the work, but rather to help the children judge it for themselves, to find inspiration or enjoyment, and success (Lillard, 2005, p. 150). Montessori (1989) wrote about the teacher’s role in assisting children to find their own learning.

We do not need to choose what we shall teach, but should place all before him for the satisfaction of his mental appetite. He must have absolute freedom of choice, and then he requires nothing but repeated experiences which will become increasingly marked by interest and serious attention, during his acquisition of some desired knowledge. (p. 5)

All of these studies and writings point to a distinct correlation between supportive, encouraging, and engaging adult behaviors and intrinsic motivation, self-determination, self-efficacy, and academic excellence. The more children are studied, the more it becomes apparent; let children do things for themselves, and engage them along the way, and they will be both happy and successful.

Methodology

Implementing this research study on student-led conferencing involved multiple data collection tools as well as the cooperation of both student participants and their parents. The study was conducted over a six-week period from January through March of 2017. For tracking purposes, and for purposes of anonymity, the eight student participants were assigned letter

signifiers. The classroom also included 16 other students, aged six to eight, as well as one co-teacher, who did not participate in the study.

Baseline data was collected over a six-week period prior to implementation. The student's independent work records (see Appendix A) were assessed for the number of goals set, the number of goals fulfilled, and the percentage of goals fulfilled on work record & work journal data analysis (see Appendix B) sheets. During this time, students were permitted to set their own academic goals in whatever way they wished, with or without teacher input. They were invited to utilize such tools as a classroom assignment board and/or their work journals to help them in choosing goals. During this time, students were also permitted to mark their own work records for goal completion.

Prior to implementation of the student-led conferencing sessions, both at school and at home, parent participants attended an information session. This session introduced the parent participants to the student-led conferencing guiding questions and student-led conferencing observation sheet (see Appendix C). This tool includes 23 pre-determined questions designed to influence an attitude of reflective self-evaluation in the students. The questions covered such areas as the work record and goals, work choices, lessons and follow-up work, feelings, and the other conference (held either at home or at school). Parents were instructed to set aside time for the at-home conferences on Thursday evenings. The at-home conference was expected to take approximately 15 to 30 minutes. Parents were notified that each student's individual at-school conference with the teacher would involve the same data collection tool and take place the next day for approximately the same amount of time. At the conclusion of the information session, parent participants were asked to complete an anonymous parent information gathering tool (see

Appendix D). The data from this tool assessed the total level of awareness and knowledge concerning their children's recent school work and school experience.

Prior to the first student-led conferences, students were asked to complete an anonymous student self-assessment and attitude scale (see appendix E). The total data from this tool assessed the students' attitude toward school, work time, and themselves. The students also met with the teacher as a group to discuss getting work checked by the teachers for accuracy and completeness, as well as quality and content. Students were reminded that teachers can show a work has been completed to expectations by initialing the appropriate space on the weekly work record (see Appendix A) as well as by initialing the work itself, whether in a work journal or on a separate piece of paper or other medium.

Implementation of the action research intervention commenced with the sending home of the student's current weekly work record as well as the next week's work record (see Appendix A) and the student-led conferencing guiding questions and observation sheet (see Appendix C). Each parent participant met with his or her child and took detailed notes on the answers to the guiding questions. These were returned the following day along with both weekly work records. The teacher then conducted another conference, taking notes on a separate student-led conferencing guiding questions and observation sheet. The current weekly work record was assessed for the number of goals set, the number of goals fulfilled, and the percentage of goals fulfilled. This data was then added to the work record and work journal data analysis tool (see Appendix B). The student-led conferencing observation sheet was assessed for positivity as well as level of detail. Negative or pessimistic answers were given a score of 0, while positive or optimistic answers were given a score of 1. This code allowed the researcher to track student satisfaction. Regarding details, one word answers, such as "yeah" or "good," or single expression

answers, such as “pretty good” or “I guess,” were given a score of 0, while elaborate answers were given a score of 1. In this way, answers that included more information and insight than requested or expected could be tallied, helping the researcher to track the development of self-efficacy and effort.

Following the at-school conference, the students were asked to set their goals for the upcoming week on their new work records. They were again given the freedom to choose their goals utilizing whatever input they desired, including an assignment board, their work journals, and teacher suggestions. Over the course of the following week, students proceeded through each daily work cycle as normal, receiving lessons, choosing individual or group work spaces, completing and showing work to the teacher, and spending time with their classmates and friends. One data collection tool, the teacher observation tally sheet (see Appendix F), was abandoned after one week. The researcher had planned to take a few minutes every half hour during the work cycle to observe student behavior and work habits. Due to many interfering scheduling factors as well as the grossly subjective nature of the tool, this plan proved impractical and misleading. The student-led conferencing procedure continued each Thursday evening at home and each Friday at school as planned. Exceptions were made for students who missed school on Thursday or Friday or were too busy on Thursday after school to participate in the home conference. In these instances, students were given time over the weekend to conduct the home conference, with the associated school conference taking place with the teacher early Monday morning.

At the conclusion of the six-week implementation, students were again presented with the student self-assessment and attitude scale (see Appendix E). The total data from this tool was then cross analyzed with the associated baseline data to determine any changes. The parent

participants were again presented with the parent information gathering tool (see Appendix D). The total data from this tool was cross analyzed with the associated baseline data to determine any changes.

Analysis of Data

Upon conclusion of the research I was able to analyze the data collected throughout the study. These data consisted of a parent information gathering tool (Appendix D), student self-evaluation and attitude scale (Appendix E), weekly observation sheets from both parent participants and myself (Appendix C), and work record data analysis sheets (Appendix B). For reasons of subjectivity and inconsistency with timing the teacher observation tally sheet (Appendix F) was abandoned.

The first sets of data were acquired through a study of student work records. For six weeks prior to implementation, each student participant's weekly work record was analyzed for the number of goals set, goals fulfilled, and for the percentage of goals fulfilled. These baseline results were recorded on work record data analysis sheets (see Appendix B). The data is reflected in Table 1. The mean goals set for the baseline period was 11.98. The mean for goals fulfilled was 8.16. The mean percentage of goals fulfilled was 69.04 %. The same data was recorded and analyzed during the action research project implementation. The mean goals set for this period rose slightly to 12.43. The mean goals fulfilled remained at 8.16. This resulted in a mean goals fulfilled percentage of 63.21 during the study, which was slightly below the baseline statistic. A variety of reasons could be found for this drop, including scheduling conflicts, absences, and special projects or events. These statistics suggested that the intervention did not affect goal setting or goal fulfillment.

Table 1.
Work Record Data Analysis

	Mean # Goals Set	Mean # Goals Fulfilled	Mean Goals Fulfilled %
Baseline	11.98	8.16	69.04
Intervention	12.43	8.16	63.21
Change	+0.45	0	-5.83%

Note: Baseline data was recorded for six weeks prior to implementation.

Just prior to implementation of the student-led conferencing intervention, the eight parent participants attended an introductory presentation where they were given the student-led conferencing guiding questions and observation sheets (see Appendix C). These questions were presented on a weekly basis, both at-home by the associated parent participant and at-school by the researcher. The student responses were recorded on the observation sheet. The responses varied widely across each observation sheet. This created some challenges in data analysis. However, after some consideration, patterns were found. Each observation sheet was subsequently coded for positive answers and for detailed answers. Positive answers consisted of language that expressed affinity, happiness, or optimism. Detailed answers consisted of expressive language, elaboration, and additional information not expected for the corresponding question. These patterns were the closest thing to statistical indicators of intrinsic motivation found during the study. A student who expresses enjoyment, curiosity, and satisfaction, or who prioritizes certain works over others, is intrinsically motivated. The scores from both the at-home and at-school conferences were combined to determine the weekly totals for each code. Means and ranges were then calculated. The results are reflected in Table 2.

Table 2.
Student-Led Conference Observation Sheets

Student	Mean Positive	Range Positive	Mean Details	Range Details
A	10.4	7	9.2	5
B	17.75	7	10.75	10
C	16.83	10	9.67	6
D	15.8	8	9.6	3
E	10.5	3	11.5	8
F	13.17	13	13.5	13
G	13	7	12.17	10
H	20.83	10	11.33	10

Note: A week's conferences were considered incomplete if the student was unable to conduct one or both conferences. Due to absences, students A and D completed five weeks of conferences and students B and E completed four weeks.

For the most part, the statistics for positivity and details offered little insight into the effectiveness of the action research intervention. The richness of the tool only came to light when the individual comments were observed. Each student's home and school observation sheet shed light on the student's current frame of mind concerning the just finished and upcoming school weeks. On multiple occasions, notes from the home conference suggested the student was struggling with an academic, social, or emotional issue. These notes allowed the researcher to offer support to the student, eliciting details which could then be used to offer advice or feedback.

The researcher was amazed at one situation, where a student who had complained about frustrations stemming from a younger classmate's behavior, chose to partner and guide said classmate. When asked about this choice, the student remarked that his parent had told him to try

an approach other than just complaining. In another instance, early in the implementation, a student commented that she disliked having so many assignments for follow-up work from lessons. She commented that she often felt overwhelmed during her goal setting for the upcoming week and would subsequently shut down. The researcher worked with her to prioritize one assignment per day in her goal setting for the upcoming week, leaving aside the other assignments to be planned after the firsts were completed. This flexibility reassured the student; she worked successfully from then on, accomplishing more than she had for a number of weeks.

Following the introductory presentation, each parent participant completed the pre-intervention parent information gathering tool (see Appendix D). The tool consisted of fourteen questions pertaining to their child's school experience as well as the information shared about school at home. Ten questions were answered on a scale from one to five, with one signifying "not at all" and five signifying "very much." Four other questions, numbers nine through twelve, asked for specific information about four core areas of the curriculum: cultural, mathematics, writing, and literature. These questions were presented open-ended, with the participants free to answer as they wished. Upon conclusion of the action research project the parents completed the same information gathering tool. The results are detailed in Table 3.

Parent responses to the parent information gathering tool indicated that although their children told them about fun or favorite work, their children rarely mentioned goals or the work cycle. The pre-intervention data showed that the parents considered their children to enjoy school, with a mean of 4.625 and a mode of five. Additionally, five of eight participants responded to the question about whether their child tells them about fun or favorite works with a rating of four or five. In contrast, the data for the questions concerning goals and the work cycle showed less engagement at home. The mode for each question was three, which can be translated

as “some of the time.” The means were 3.375, 3.125, and 3.125 respectively. Question 13, which asked how much parents know about what their child is doing at school, also had a mode of three and a mean of 3.25.

Table 3.
Parent Information Gathering Tool

Question	Mean		Mode	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
2. Does your child enjoy school?	4.625	4.5	5	5
3. Does your child tell you about his or her day?	3.825	4	3,4	5
4. Does your child tell you about worktime?	3.375	3.875	3	4,5
5. Does your child tell you about specific works or lessons?	3.125	3.75	3	4
6. Does your child tell you about his or her goals?	3.125	3.875	3	5
7. Does your child tell you about fun or favorite works?	3.75	4.125	4	4
8. Does your child tell you about challenging or unpleasant work?	3.5	3.5	3,5	2,3,4,5
13. How much do you feel you know about what your child has been doing at school lately?	3.25	3.875	4	4,5

Note: Questions 1, 9-12, and 14 were participant response or multiple choice.

Post-intervention results showed almost no decreases, with only the mean average to the question concerning enjoyment dropping from 4.625 to 4.5. All other results, for both mean and mode, either stayed the same or increased. Significantly, questions four, five, six, and seven, which ask about work time and lessons, all showed mean increases of at least three-eighths of a

point. Additionally, the mode for questions four, five, and six, rose by at least one point. Though not the primary aim of the study, this was a desired result. Finding ways for students to inform their parents about school, lessons, goals, and the work cycle has often been challenging. There is significance in this result suggesting that the instituting weekly at-home conferences positively affects parent information gathering and awareness.

Regarding results for the open-ended, curriculum-specific questions, there was also interesting results. Pre-intervention, three parents showed awareness of their child's recent bird research report while four remarked that their child had been practicing math operations. On the post-intervention tool, the cultural awareness rose to four, and the math awareness rose to seven of eight. This was a significant increase. This type of cultural and math work happens regularly, but there is no scheduled "class" in regards to them. Individual work varies from day to day; describing these works in detail to parents is often challenging for the students. The fact that almost every parent participant commented on recent math operation work shows that the conferencing format gives students a beneficial setting for sharing these details.

In contrast, the students engage in weekly, scheduled writer's workshop and literature discussion sessions. Pre-intervention, four parents noted in detail that their child enjoys writer's workshop, while seven of eight participants noted that their child enjoys literature discussion, with six adding details about this class. Post-intervention, six of eight participants commented that they had heard nothing regarding writer's workshop or journal, while half the participants remarked that they had heard nothing about literature discussion. It is possible that this drop relates to the increase in details given about individual goals and the work cycle. Perhaps as students discuss individual work more, they are less likely to discuss group lessons and classes.

Finally, question fourteen asked in which ways parents get their information about school. Pre-intervention, all eight participants acknowledged that they get information from their child, while six said they get information from the teacher as well as the class newsletter. Post-intervention results remained statistically close, with seven parents saying they receive information from their child, six from the class newsletter, and five from the teacher. These results showed that the most consistent information comes from the student and the teachers. This data also suggests that it is essential to help the students and parents communicate consistently and effectively.

Student participants completed both a pre-intervention and a post-intervention attitude scale and self-assessment (see Appendix E). This tool was designed to evaluate the students' feelings towards school, the work cycle, and goals as well as their feelings of self-efficacy and self-belief. The results are detailed in Table 4 and Table 5 below.

The first half of the tool concerned the attitude scale. Students were asked to rate their feelings toward school and work from one to five, with one signifying "not at all" and five signifying "very much." The pre- and post-intervention results can be seen in Table 3 below. The results showed that the students mostly like school and care if their work is correct. In contrast, the results showed that the students neither enjoy having goals, nor do they care if their teacher or parents see their work.

Questions ten and eleven asked the students to select their favorite areas of the classroom and parts of the day. Pre-intervention, five participants each identified language/reading and mathematics/geometry as favorite areas of the classroom, while seven students identified lunch/recess as favorite parts of the day. Post-intervention, those statistics remained basically the same. Interestingly, the number of students who selected the cultural/geography area of the

classroom as a favorite rose from two to six, while the number of students who selected enrichments as their favorite part of the day rose from one to five. This increase could be explored through further research. It should be noted that during the implementation of the action research intervention, the students had more recently been focusing time and energy in these two aspects of the curriculum.

Table 4.
Student Attitude Scale

Question	Mean		Mode	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1. Do you like school?	4	4.125	4,5	5
2. Do you look forward to work time?	3.86	3.75	4	5
3. Do you like your work record?	3.86	3.25	4	4
4. Do you enjoy having goals?	2.625	2.625	3	1
5. Do you care when you finish your goals?	3.75	3.75	5	4
6. Do you care if the teacher sees your work?	2.67	2.375	2,4	3
7. Do you care if your work is correct?	4.375	4.5	5	5
8. Do you care if you have to fix your work?	3.635	3.375	4	3,4,5
9. Do you care if your parent sees your work?	2.625	2.5	3	3

Note: Pre-intervention, only seven students answered questions two and three, and only 6 students answered question six.

The second half of the tool concerned the student self-assessment. These questions gauged whether the students believed they had the work habits to succeed. These questions also asked the students about being believed in by their teachers, friends, parents, and themselves. Again, there was little variation between the pre- and post-intervention results for this portion of the tool. The pre-intervention results for questions twelve through 20 were remarkably

consistent, with means ranging from 3.5 to 3.875 and modes of either three or four for all questions. The mean range widened somewhat post-intervention, with results between 3.25 and four. This “sometimes” self-assessment suggests both a lack of concern as well as a lack of self-awareness. In terms of belief, it was interesting that the results for questions 21 (teachers) and 23 (parents) were considerably higher than the results for questions 22 (friends) and 24 (yourself). Pre-intervention, the means for whether the students felt believed in by their teachers and parents were 4.625 and the modes were five. Post-intervention, the means were 4.5 and 4.625 respectively, and the modes remained at five. In contrast, pre-intervention the respective means for whether the students felt believed in by their friends and themselves were 3.75 and 4.125, while the modes were four and five. Post-intervention, the respective means were 3.625 and four, and the modes were both four.

There was no significant statistical change in the results of the student attitude scale and self-assessment pre- and post-intervention. This suggests that the intervention did not have an immediate impact on the students’ attitude toward school, the work cycle, goal setting, and goal fulfillment. It also suggests that the students did not experience significant increases in self-awareness and self-belief. However, it must be noted that the participant pool was exceptionally small. There is significance in these results when viewed in tandem with the results of the parent information gathering tool, which showed more marked changes. It may be the case that adults adapt more quickly, while students take time. It is also significant that the students showed such a distinct difference in how they view the opinions of the adults they work with differently than those of themselves and other children. This suggests that adults are in a unique position to be supportive and encouraging, while also offering guidance.

Table 5.
Student Self-Assessment

Question	Mean		Mode	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
12. Are you successful in school?	3.75	3.75	4	4
13. Do you complete your daily and weekly goals?	3.5	3.25	3,4	3
14. Do you challenge yourself?	3.86	3.625	4	4
15. Do you work hard?	3.86	4	4	4
16. Do you try new things?	3.875	3.875	3,4	4
17. Do you ask for lessons with more challenging materials?	3.75	3.25	3	3
18. Do you ask for help when needed?	3.875	3.5	4	3
19. Do you persevere?	3.75	3.5	4	3,4
20. Do you help others	3.75	3.75	4	4
21. Do your teachers believe in you?	4.625	4.5	5	5
22. Do your friends believe in you?	3.75	3.625	4	4
23. Do your parents believe in you?	4.625	4.625	5	5
24. Do you believe in yourself?	4.125	4	5	4

Note: Only seven students answered questions fourteen and fifteen respectively during the pre-intervention session.

Action Plan

There is a great deal still to learn in regards to weekly student-led conferencing, both at-home and at-school. To gain more valid statistical and clinical significance, the pool of participants should be widened to include Montessori lower elementary students of all ages, rather than just third-year students. Implementation across multiple classrooms could also lead to a more valid pool of data and experience. Furthermore, this six-week research study should constitute just the beginning of the student-led conferencing intervention implementation. It is my intention to establish and maintain a routine of student-led conferencing, both at-home and at-school, throughout the entire school year. The process should be streamlined, and written communication between parents and teachers refined. This will lead to more parent awareness, as well as increasingly supportive behavior towards the students.

Including all the students in my class will greatly benefit the younger students. It has been my experience that first year lower elementary Montessori students have less academic stress. They are focused much more on adapting to the routine and structure of the elementary environment. If I can succeed in making weekly student-led conferencing another part of the whole elementary structure, they will adjust to it more easily and successfully. By the time they are third year students, conferencing will be second nature. Additionally, including my school's other two lower elementary classrooms would create consistency across the program, while also offering a broader pool of participants.

At the core of this study is the desire to connect the weekly work cycle, as well as work goals, to a consistent, ongoing conversation between students, and their parents and teachers. The weekly at-home conference, between students and parents, utilizes the work record artifact as a medium of information and sharing. This scenario increases the importance of the work

record, inspiring the student to be more deliberate in completing assignments and getting follow-up works or assignments checked by the teacher. Because there is personal accountability at home, students will possibly work harder to fulfill their goals and responsibilities.

The conference setting also allows the parents to gather as much information as possible, and to offer support and encouragement to their child. The student relates successes and challenges, and the parents can write comments for the student and the teacher on the work record, which is returned to school the following morning. In many cases, these comments can suggest areas of the classroom where the student should work more, or acts as a platform for the communication of concerns shared during the conference.

To this end, the observation sheets need not be used now that the conference setting has been established. The parent comments section of the work record offers enough space for weekly feedback. The conversation between child and adult is more important, so a refined set of guiding questions could be designed and given to parents early in the school year, possibly at back-to-school night. The questions should be broader, while also allowing more open-ended responses. Too many of the guiding questions administered during this research study were easily answered with a “yes” or “no.” While some of these questions, such as those pertaining to choosing successful work spaces and limiting partner works, did have a positive impact on student behavior, an open-ended question such as, “What will you do to help yourself work more successfully,” would better encourage student self-efficacy while also fostering intrinsic motivation.

For at-school conferences, it is just as important to meet with each individual student on a weekly basis. The time spent each week in discussion with each third-year student was both fascinating and insightful. They shared personal challenges, and I felt very positive about the

feedback I offered. I plan on continuing this routine, but, again, the conference format must change. There is not enough time to spend 15-30 minutes with each student. There should be fewer questions and the questions should be more carefully refined to cover as much breadth as possible. This action research project showed me that each student needs personal time with the teacher on a regular basis. It is not my job to do their work for them, nor is it my job to solve every problem. By giving them a safe, consistent, and supportive setting I can help them develop beneficial work habits as well as the determination to approach their own problems and persevere.

References

- Amundson, A. (2015). Increasing intrinsic motivation and reading comprehension in children. *Masters of Arts in Education Action Research Papers*. Paper 107. Retrieved from <http://sophia.stkate.edu/maed/107>
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In Ramachaudran, V. S. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 4, 71-81. New York: Academic Press.
- Coleman, B. & McNeese, M. N. (2009). From home to school: The relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *The International Journal of Learning*, 16(7), 459-470
- Deci, E. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18(1), 105-115
- Deci, E., Eghrari, H., Patrick, B., & Leone, D. (1994). Facilitating internalization: The self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 62(1), 119-142
- Ervin, B., Wash, P., & Mecca, M. (Summer 2010) A 3-year study of self-regulation in Montessori and non-Montessori classrooms. *Montessori Life*, 22(2), 22-31
- Fitch, V. (2013). Further fostering intrinsic motivation in the Montessori elementary classroom. *Eric.ed.gov*. Retrieved September 17, 2016, from <http://eric.ed.gov/?q=Further+Fostering+Intrinsic+Motivation+in+the+Montessori+Elementary+Classroom&id=ED540068>.
- Freeman, G. (2016). Preparing the environment for independent learning: Supporting autonomy in the Montessori classroom. *University of Wisconsin River Falls*. River Falls, WI.

- Gohr, G. (2014). The influence of autonomy-supporting teacher strategies on intrinsic motivation in relation to pro-social behaviors in a Montessori primary classroom. *University of Wisconsin River Falls*. River Falls, WI.
- Gottfried, A. E., Marcoulides, G., Gottfried, A. W., & Oliver, P. (2009). A latent curve model of parental motivational practices and developmental decline in math and science academic intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(3), 729-739
- Häbig, J. (2015). Cooperation between parents and schools from a student perspective. *Studia paedagogica, 20* (4), 155-165
- Kraft, M. & Dougherty, S. (October 2012). The effect of teacher-family communication on student engagement: Evidence from a randomized field experiment. *Harvard Graduate School of Education*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lillard, A. S. (2005). *Montessori: The science behind the genius*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Linnenbrink, E. & Pintrich, P. (2002). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. *School Psychology Review, 31*(3), 313-327
- Loomans, M. (2014). Parent involvement that supports children academically and promotes the development of independence. *University of Wisconsin River Falls*. River Falls, WI.
- Manzo, K. (2008). Motivating students in the middle years. *Education Week, 27*(28), 21-24
- Montessori, M. (1994). *From childhood to adolescence*. Oxford, England: Clio Press.
- Montessori, M. (1989). *To educate the human potential*. Oxford, England: Clio Press.
- Montessori, M. (1995). *The absorbent mind*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Murray, A. (Spring 2011). Montessori elementary philosophy. *Montessori Life, 23*(1), 22-33

- Mudrey, R., Scholes, K., & Lewis, C. (Winter 2006). Students' perceptions of student-led conferences. *Academic Exchange*, 2006, 60-64
- Phillips, N. & Lindsay, G. (June 2006). Motivation in gifted students. *High Ability Studies*, 17(1), 57-73
- Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 667-686
- Rathunde, K. (February 2015). Creating a context for flow: The importance of personal insight and experience. *North American Montessori Teacher's Association Workshop: Adolescent Creativity, Collaboration, and Discovery*. Atlanta, GA.
- Rathunde, K. & Csikszentmihalyi. (May 2005). Middle school students' motivation and quality of experience: A comparison of Montessori and traditional school environments. *American Journal of Education*, 111(3), 341-371
- Ryan, R. & Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78
- Seifert, T. L. (2004). Understanding student motivation. *Educational Research*, 46(2), 137-149
- Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J., Tonks, S., & Perencevich, K. (2004). Children's motivation for reading: Domain specificity and instructional influences. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(6), 299-310

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Appendix A
Weekly Work Record

	M	T	W	Th	F
LANGUAGE					
Reading Comprehension					
Handwriting/Composition					
Grammar and Sentence Analysis					
Montessori Materials					
Word Study/Spelling					
Montessori Materials					
Other Language Work					
Spanish					
MATH					
Operations					
Montessori Materials					
Math Facts					
Montessori Materials					
Practical Math					
Math Insights					
Problem Solving/Mixed Practice					
Geometry/Roman Numerals					
Time/Money/Fractions					
Geometry					
Other Math Work					

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

	M	T	W	Th	F
CULTURAL					
Geography / Social Studies					
Geography					
Biome Studies					
History/Timeline Studies					
Science					
Zoology/Biology					
Botany					
Physical Science					
OTHER					
Morning Journal					
Buddy Work					
Volunteering in Primary					
Movement Break					
Peace Shelf					
Amount of Work Time	3 hrs	2 hrs	3 hrs	0	1 hr
LESSONS					
Parent Comments					

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Appendix B
Work Record & Work Journal Data Analysis

Student: A B C D E F G H

Baseline Data			
Week # / Date	# of Goals Set	# of Goals Fulfilled	% of Goals Fulfilled
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
	Avg. # Goals Set _____	Avg. # Goals Fulfilled _____	Avg. % of Goals Fulfilled _____
Intervention Implementation Data			
Week # / Date	# of Goals Set	# of Goals Fulfilled	% of Goals Fulfilled
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
	Avg. # Goals Set _____	Avg. # Goals Fulfilled _____	Avg. % of Goals Fulfilled _____
Change in Avg. # of Goals Set = _____			
Change in Avg. # of Goals Fulfilled = _____			
Change in Avg. % of Goals Fulfilled = _____			

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Appendix C

Student-Led Conferencing Guiding Questions and Observation Sheet

The "Guiding Questions" are intended to be as objective as possible, so that the student can feel understood, supported, and encouraged with as little extrinsic motivation as possible. They are numbered to allow for detailed note taking, where student answers can be recorded and codified.

Instructions: Ask these necessary questions throughout the conference to help the student assess herself or himself. Make notes of anything interesting or important on the corresponding observation sheet. Many questions are yes/no. Record any other pertinent information in concise detail.

Parent conferences will be Thursday nights. Teacher conferences will be Friday mornings. Conferences are expected to take about 30 minutes at home (which includes sharing work samples) and 15 minutes at school (which does not necessarily include sharing work samples).

Work Records & Goals:

1. What goals did you set/fulfill this week?
2. What book are you currently reading for pleasure? Does it pass the five finger test (Is it at the appropriate level for you)?
3. What books are you reading for Literature Discussion? What is your literature job this week?
4. What personal projects have you been working on or planning?
5. What are you excited to learn about?

Work Choices:

6. Are you feeling challenged?
7. Are you choosing work spaces that allow you to be successful?
8. Are you doing most of your work independently?
9. Are you varying the partner(s) you choose to work with each day?

Lessons & Follow-Ups:

10. What lessons did you have this week?
11. Are you getting work signed off? If yes, are you getting it signed off as you go or saving it for a full check-in later in the week?
12. Does the work you have turned in meet the expectations for that assignment? Is it neat and legible and in cursive?
13. If it does not meet expectations, are you working further?
14. If follow-up work was not completed this week, how will you plan your coming week to ensure that it is completed?

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Feelings:

15. How have the last couple weeks been?
16. Are there things that are difficult with which you need help? Have you asked for help?
17. How are things going socially?
18. Is there anything you want to let me know?

Student-Led Conferencing with parent/teacher:

19. Have you thought about your conference with your teacher tomorrow? **Or** How was your conference with your parent last night?
20. Will you be (Were you) able to share your successes and challenges?
21. What feedback do you expect to receive from your teacher? **Or** What feedback did you receive from your parent?
22. How do you hope to (How did) you feel after your conference?

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Student-Led Conferencing Observation Sheet

Date: _____

Student: A B C D E F G H

Question # Notes

1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
11.	
12.	
13.	
14.	
15.	
16.	
17.	
18.	
19.	
20.	
21.	
22.	
23.	

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Appendix D

Parent information Gathering Tool

What is your child doing at school?

Completion of these questions is voluntary and confidential. Please be honest. Honesty is key in helping us create the best classroom for your child. There is no penalty for negative answers. It is okay to mark questions to which you do not have an answer with "n/a."

1. **Study Acknowledgement** *Check all that apply.*

- I would like to continue, and I am comfortable allowing my responses to be included confidentially in the study.
- I would like to continue, but prefer not to have my responses included in the study.

2. **Does your child enjoy school?** *Mark only one box.*

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |

3. **Does your child tell you about his/her day?** *Mark only one box.*

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |

4. **Does your child tell you about work time?** *Mark only one box.*

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |

5. **Does your child tell you about specific works or lessons?** *Mark only one box.*

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |

6. **Does your child tell you about his or her goals?** *Mark only one box.*

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

7. **Does your child tell you about fun or favorite works?** *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

8. **Does your child tell you about challenging or unpleasant work?** *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

9. **What has your child told you about our science and culture areas lately?**

10. **What has your child told you he/she has been learning in math lately?**

11. **Has your child mentioned any recent writer's workshop or morning board work activities? If so, can you remember any specifics?**

12. **Has your child told you anything about recent or current Literature Discussion books?**

13. **How much do you feel you know about what your child has been doing at school lately?**
Mark only one box.

Nothing Very Little Some Very Much Everything

14. **Where do you get your information about what your child has been doing at school?**
Mark all that apply.

- Your child
- The teacher
- Other staff, parents, or students
- The weekly class newsletter
- The weekly school newsletter

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Appendix E

How do you feel about school and yourself?

Please remember to be honest. Honesty is key in helping us develop the best classroom for you. There is no penalty for negative answers.

1. **Do you like school?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

2. **Do you look forward to work time?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

3. **Do you like your work record?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

4. **Do you enjoy having goals?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

5. **Do you care when you finish your goals?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

6. **Do you care if the teacher sees your work?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

7. **Do you care if your work is correct?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

8. Do you care if you have to fix your work? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

9. Do you care if your parent sees your work? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

10. What are your favorite areas of the classroom? *Mark all that apply.*

- Biology/Science
- Cultural/Geography
- Language/Reading
- Math/Geometry
- Peace/Practical Life

11. What are your favorite parts of the day? *Mark all that apply.*

- Journal/Morning Board Work
- Circle/Morning Whole Class Lesson
- Work Time
- Lunch/Recess
- Enrichments/Afternoon Groups

12. Are you successful in school? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

14. Do you challenge yourself? *Mark only one box.*

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

15. Do you work hard? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

16. Do you try new things? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

13. Do you complete your daily and weekly goals? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

17. Do you ask for lessons with more challenging materials? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

18. Do you ask for help when needed? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

19. Do you persevere? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

20. Do you help others? *Mark only one box.*

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

22. **Do your friends believe in you?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

23. **Do your parents believe in you?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

21. **Do your teachers believe in you?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

24. **Do you believe in yourself?** *Mark only one box.*

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

STUDENT-LED CONFERENCING

Appendix F (abandoned)
Teacher Observation Tally Sheet

Date _____

Time _____ /8 Students Observed

Desired Behaviors

Undesired Behaviors

Working quietly _____ Socializing _____
Working purposefully _____ Distracted _____
Choosing "challenging" work _____ Choosing "easy" work _____
Working independently _____ Working with others _____
Goals checked _____ Goals not checked _____

Time _____

_____ /8 Students Observed

Desired Behaviors

Undesired Behaviors

Working quietly _____ Socializing _____
Working purposefully _____ Distracted _____
Choosing "challenging" work _____ Choosing "easy" work _____
Working independently _____ Working with others _____
Goals checked _____ Goals not checked _____

Time _____

_____ /8 Students Observed

Desired Behaviors

Undesired Behaviors

Working quietly _____ Socializing _____
Working purposefully _____ Distracted _____
Choosing "challenging" work _____ Choosing "easy" work _____
Working independently _____ Working with others _____
Goals checked _____ Goals not checked _____

Time _____

_____ /8 Students Observed

Desired Behaviors

Undesired Behaviors

Working quietly _____ Socializing _____
Working purposefully _____ Distracted _____
Choosing "challenging" work _____ Choosing "easy" work _____
Working independently _____ Working with others _____
Goals checked _____ Goals not checked _____