

Responsive Classroom Evaluation Project  
District of Columbia Public Schools

June, 1995

---

---

Final Evaluation Report

# The Responsive Classroom Approach: Its Effectiveness And Acceptability

Prepared for The Center for Systemic Educational Change  
District of Columbia Public Schools  
Washington, D.C.

---

---

**Stephen N. Elliott, PhD**  
**Project Director**

## Table of Contents

Background . . . . .	1
Overview of Study . . . . .	2
Sample . . . . .	2
Evaluation Instruments . . . . .	4
Data Collection Procedures. . . . .	7
Analyses of Quantitative and Qualitative Data. . . . .	9
Results and Discussion . . . . .	9
Rating Scale Phase . . . . .	9
Survey Phase . . . . .	21
Teachers' Reactions . . . . .	21
Parents' Reactions . . . . .	23
Students' Reactions . . . . .	27
Principals' Reactions . . . . .	28
Conclusions . . . . .	33
Summary . . . . .	35
References . . . . .	37
Acknowledgement . . . . .	38
About the Project Director . . . . .	39
Appendix A: Responsive Classroom Usage Checklist . . . . .	40
Appendix B: Responsive Classroom Questionnaires. . . . .	43
Appendix C: Teacher Reactions to the RC Questionnaire . . . . .	48
Appendix D: Student Reactions to the RC Questionnaire . . . . .	54
Appendix E: Principal Reactions to the RC Questionnaire . . . . .	57

## List of Tables

Table 1A.	Descriptive Summary of Participating Students . . . . .	3
Table 1B.	Racial/Ethnic Make-up of the District of Columbia Public Schools and Selected Subsamples . . . . .	5
Table 2.	Summary of Data Collection Procedures . . . . .	8
Table 3.	Teacher's Use of <i>The Responsive Classroom</i> (RC) Components During Spring 1994 . . . . .	10
Table 4A.	SSRS Data Summary for Entire Sample of Students in Classes With and Without <i>The Responsive Classroom</i> Approach . . . . .	12
Table 4B.	Means and Standard Deviations for Spring SSRS Ratings for Original RC Evaluation Sample and Two Representative Subsamples . . . . .	14
Table 5.	SSRS Data Summary for Students at Three Grade Levels . . . . .	15
Table 6.	Mean Changes in Ratings for Students in RC and NRC Classrooms Across Three Educational Levels. . . . .	16
Table 7.	Percentage of Students Evidencing Noticeable Changes In Social and Academic Behaviors . . . . .	19
Table 8.	Correlations Among Ratings of Social Skills, Problem Behaviors, and Academic Competence. . . . .	20
Table 9.	Comparison of Parents from Five Racial Groups' Ratings of <i>The Responsive Classroom</i> . . . . .	24
Table 10.	Comparison of Ratings of <i>The Responsive Classroom</i> by Parents with Varying Annual Income Levels. . . . .	25
Table 11.	Distribution of Principals' Responses to Items About Staff and the School Year . . . . .	30
Table 12.	Principals' and Teachers' Reactions to the Changes that <i>The Responsive Classroom</i> Approach Would Require to Implement . . .	32

## ***Background***

On May 24, 1993, a forum with educational stakeholders was held at the "factors influencing school transformation and social Sumner School to examine curriculum as a mediating factor" in the Washington, D.C. Public Schools. Much of the discussion at this meeting focused on *The Responsive Classroom*® (RC) approach to instruction and classroom management. *The Responsive Classroom* approach was developed by educators at the Northeast Foundation for Children and since 1991 has been implemented in several schools in the District of in the Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grades. This instructional approach also was initiated in 1993 with a subset of teachers in 4th through 6th grade classrooms. *The Responsive Classroom* approach is built around six components classrooms that integrate teaching, learning, and caring in the daily functioning of a classroom. The six featured components of *The Responsive Classroom* approach are: classroom organization, morning meetings, rules and logical consequences, choice time, guided discovery, and communication with parents (Wood, 1994).

Many of the teachers who participated in the forum at Sumner School provided positive, personal testimonies about the effects of *The Responsive Classroom* on them as teachers and on their students. Previous evaluations of *The Responsive Classroom* approach have documented its effectiveness in promoting the development of prosocial behavior and academic functioning (Elliott, 1992). However, no empirical database focusing on students in D.C. schools existed to cross validate the teachers' perceptions about *The Responsive Classroom* approach. Thus, one of the major outcomes of the forum was the need to create an evaluative database concerning the effects of *The Responsive Classroom* approach. Such a database could provide objective insights into the effects of the approach on students through the eyes of parents, teachers, and students themselves. In addition, comparisons to students not exposed to the RC approach were needed for making decisions about the scope of future programmatic efforts concerning this instructional approach.

In the early Fall of 1993, it was decided that a comprehensive evaluation study of the acceptability and the effectiveness of *The Responsive Classroom* approach should be done. This evaluation project was designed to answer six questions:

1. Do students exposed to *The Responsive Classroom* approach exhibit higher levels of social skills and academic functioning than peers with limited exposure to the approach?
2. If *The Responsive Classroom* approach is effective, how can the school system get others to buy into the approach?
3. What is the acceptance level of *The Responsive Classroom* approach by parents, and does the level of acceptance vary depending on socioeconomic or ethnic/racial group status?
4. What is the level of implementation of *The Responsive Classroom* approach across the system?
5. What is the level of parent involvement in schools implementing the social curriculum?
6. What are critical structural and environmental elements that need to be in place for successful implementation of *The Responsive Classroom*?

## **Overview of Study**

This report summarizes information from a two-phase evaluation study about the social behavior and academic functioning of students participating in classrooms where part or all of *The Responsive Classroom* approach was being used during the period October 1 1993 to May 1 1994. The first phase or Rating Scale Phase of the study focused on quantitative evidence concerning teachers' use of *The Responsive Classroom* approach and changes in students' behavior which occurred over the six-month period. The second phase or Survey Phase of the study integrated a substantial body of qualitative evidence from parents, principals, teachers, and students concerning their reactions to *The Responsive Classroom* approach.

**Sample.** Originally, 480 students were randomly selected or nominated by their teachers to participate in the study. Of these students, 212 (44%) volunteered and were given parental consent to participate. Thus, the final sample was comprised of 212 students from grades PreK through 6<sup>th</sup> in 26 schools who were assessed on two occasions (See **Table 1A**). Of the 212 students, 30 were from the PreK level, 108 were from the K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade level, and 74 were from the 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade level. This sample can be further characterized as 52.8% female, 47.2% male, 41.2% Caucasian, 43.1 % African American, 10.4% Hispanic, and 3.8% other ethnic groups. To facilitate the interpretation of the effects of *The Responsive Classroom* approach, 126 students (RC group) sampled in grades Pre-Kindergarten through sixth were in classrooms in demonstration schools where six components of the RC approach were used,

**Table 1A****Descriptive Summary of Participating Students**

		<b>Responsive Classroom</b>		<b>Non-Responsive Classroom</b>	
		Time 1	Time 2	Time 1	Time 2
PreK	Male	13	10	6	5
	Female	11	7	8	8
K	Male	7	6	3	5
	Female	9	10	2	4
1st	Male	7	9	7	6
	Female	13	16	6	6
2nd	Male	11	12	3	2
	Female	8	12	4	4
3rd	Male	3	3	3	6
	Female	2	2	3	5
4th	Male	0	0	3	3
	Female	0	4	7	9
5th	Male	3	7	5	4
	Female	2	3	5	3
6th	Male	11	10	5	8
	Female	11	14	6	8
<b>Totals</b>		111	126	76	86

while 86 students (NRC or non-Responsive Classroom group) were in classrooms where only the Morning Meeting component was used. All students participated voluntarily and with the consent of a parent or guardian. The sample is representative with regard to gender and grade, but under representative of the African American population and over representative of the Caucasian population of the district. This somewhat disproportional racial sampling, however, is characteristic of several of the early childhood demonstration schools. **Table 1B** documents the actual racial/ethnic make-up of the District of Columbia Schools (from School Census Report, 1993) and also provides comparative racial/ethnic percentages for the Demonstration Center Schools and the RC Evaluation volunteer subsample of students.

To address potential concerns that the original sample (N = 212) of students was racially unrepresentative of the district's students, two subsamples of students were created from the original sample by using a computer-generated, stratified random sampling procedure. The first subsample was selected to proportionally match the racial profile of the Demonstration Centers (i.e., 65.8% African American, 9.6% Hispanic, and 24.6% Caucasian) and was comprised of 150 of the original 212 student participants. The second subsample was selected to proportionally match the racial profile of the entire District (i.e., 88.52 % African American, 6.12% Hispanic, and 4.02% Caucasian) and was comprised of 111 of the original 212 student participants. Several of the major analyses to be discussed were run on each of the three samples to determine if race of student had a significant effect on social skill ratings.

In addition to the student sample, 9 principals, 45 teachers, and 171 parents actively participated in the study by completing child-focused rating scales and program-focused questionnaires. The sample of parents represented children in either the RC group or NRC group, and reported annual incomes ranging from less than \$15,000 to more than \$75,000.

**Evaluation Instruments.** Three instruments primarily were used to evaluate students' social behavior and reactions to *The Responsive Classroom* approach: the Social Skills Rating System, the RC Usage Checklist, and the RC Questionnaires. Two additional instruments were completed only by students in 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> grades to gain insights into their self-concept and perceptions of social support.

Table 1B

**Racial/Ethnic Make-up of the District of Columbia Public Schools and Selected Subsamples**

	<b>District Population (1993)</b> <b>N = 80,678</b>	<b>Demonstration Center Schools Population (1993)</b> <b>N = 2,589</b>	<b>RC Evaluation Sample (1994)</b> <b>N = 212</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.32%	--	6.0%
<b>African American</b>	88.52%	65.8%	45.0%
<b>Hispanic</b>	6.12%	9.6%	9.0%
<b>American Indian</b>	.02%	--	--
<b>Caucasian</b>	4.02%	24.6%	40%

The Social Skills Rating System or SSRS (Gresham & Elliott, 1990) was used to assess students' social behavior. The SSRS is a multirater (teacher, parent, and student), nationally normed behavior rating scale that assesses the frequency of children's social skills. The SSRS- Teacher and SSRS-Parent versions also provide assessment data on problem behaviors, while the SSRS- Teacher provides ratings of students' academic competence. This rating measure of academic competence is designed to provide only a general characterization of a student's reading and mathematical functioning and motivation to work on classroom assignments. It is not a direct measure of students' achievement. The SSRS-Student form requires at least a third-grade reading level and allows students to complete a self-assessment of their social skills. The SSRS provides scale scores for total Social Skills, total Problem Behaviors, and Academic Competence. Scores for each of these total scales have been transformed to standard scores to make them easily comparable; they have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Higher scores (e.g., > 100) are desirable on the Social Skills and Academic Competence Scales, whereas lower scores (e.g., < 100) are desirable on the Problem Behaviors Scale. Both the Social Skills and Problem Behavior Scales are broken down into subscales that provide a more detailed characterization of social behaviors. The Social Skills subscales are Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, Empathy, and Self-Control. Each of these subscales has 10 items, so raw scores (ranging from 0 to 20) are directly comparable and transformation of subscale scores to standard scores is unnecessary. The Problem Behaviors Scale is comprised of three brief subscales: Externalizing Problems, Internalizing Problems, and Hyperactivity. Each of these subscales has 6 items and thus raw scores (ranging from 0 to 12) are directly comparable and are used to summarize ratings. The Preschool version of the SSRS does not have an Academic Competence scale or a Hyperactive subscale.

The Responsive Classroom Usage Checklist or RC Checklist (Elliott, 1993) was designed as a teacher self-report form for documenting daily use of the various classroom components of the RC approach (i.e., Morning Meeting, Role Playing, Problem Solving Class Meeting, Time-Out, Choice Time, and Guided Discovery) over a two-week period. This checklist yields a percentage of usage score for each of six RC components. A copy of this checklist is exhibited in Appendix A.

The Responsive Classroom Questionnaires or RC Questionnaires (Elliott, 1994) were designed to document teachers', parents', principals', and students' (4<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> grades) reactions to *The Responsive*

*Classroom* approach to instruction and to gain insights into changes needed to facilitate the use of the RC approach in the D.C. Public Schools. Each of the questionnaires has some items that require ratings as well as some open-ended questions concerning the most and least desirable aspects of the RC approach. There are a core of common items across all four versions of the questionnaires. Copies of each of the RC Questionnaires are included in Appendix B.

Additional instruments of importance to the evaluation of the 4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> grade subsample included the Student Self-Concept Scale or SSCS (Gresham, Elliott, & Evans-Fernandez, 1993) and the Student Social Support Scale (Nolten, 1994).

**Data Collection Procedures**. A standard Preintervention-Postintervention design with a 6-month interlude was used as the primary framework for collecting and analyzing the evaluation data. Specifically, after selecting the sample of participating students in October, teachers, parents, and students (4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> graders only) completed the SSRS. The older students also completed the SSCS and SSSS rating forms. During the months of February, March, and April, randomly selected subsets of approximately 15 teachers from the AC group and NAC group completed the RC Usage Checklist, providing evidence about the implementation integrity of the RC approach. Once again in late April and May, teachers, parents, and students (4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> graders only) completed the SSRS; the older students also completed the SSCS and SSSS for the second time. Finally, in May and early June, teachers, parents, principals, and students (4th-6th graders only) completed RC Questionnaires. **Table 2** provides a visual summary of the data collection instruments, timelines, and participants who completed the evaluation instruments.

Before presenting data, it is appropriate to mention two issues that influence the interpretation of rating scale data. First, the behavior change data in this evaluation study is based entirely on observers' ratings. Ratings have been shown to correlate highly with direct observations, but are not as sensitive to small changes in behavior. Generally, when reliable changes in ratings occur, they are indicative of relatively large changes in actual behavior. Therefore, ratings often underestimate the actual degree or amount of change in students' behavior. The implication for the present study is that the behavior change data for the RC and NRC students alike is probably a conservative estimate (i.e., underestimate) of their actual change.

**Table 2****Summary of Data Collection Procedures**

<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>FALL 1993 (Oct. - Dec.)</b>	<b>WINTER 1994 (Jan. - March)</b>	<b>SPRING 1994 (April - June)</b>
<b>Teachers</b>	SSRS	RCUC	SSRS RCQ
<b>Parents</b>	SSRS	----	SSRS RCQ
<b>Students*</b>	SSRS SSCS SSSS	----	SSRS SSCS SSSS RCQ
<b>Principals</b>	----	----	RCQ

\* 4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> grade students only.

Note. SSRS = Social Skills Ratings System; RCUC = Responsive Classroom Usage Checklist; RCQ = Responsive Classroom Questionnaire; SSCS = Student Self-Concept Scale; and SSSS = Student Social Support Scale.

A second issue is that only six months of time elapsed between assessments of students. This is relatively a very short period of time to test for changes. When significant changes over short time spans are detected, they usually suggest the influence of a relatively strong intervention.

**Analyses of Quantitative and Qualitative Data.** The major independent variables examined in this evaluation study were Educational Level (3 levels: PreK, K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade, and 4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> grade) and Instructional Approach (2 levels: Responsive Classroom, Non-Responsive Classroom). The primary analytic techniques used to examine and compare the quantitative data were multivariate analyses of covariance and Pearson correlations. Specifically, quantitative data was collected and analyzed concerning (a) the prevalence and changes in fundamental social skills and problem behaviors across samples of children exposed to differing levels of the RC approach, (b) the relationship between students' social skills and the occurrence of problem behaviors, (c) the relationship between students' social skills and their perceived academic competence, and (d) the influence of *The Responsive Classroom* approach on teachers' sense of instructional effectiveness and personal satisfaction. Qualitative data was collected regarding parents' teachers', students', and principals' perceptions of *The Responsive Classroom* approach and students' social behavior. This qualitative data was analyzed descriptively.

## ***Results and Discussion***

The major results of this summative evaluation of *The Responsive Classroom* approach are displayed in 12 data tables. Each of these tables is described and major findings highlighted in the remainder of this report. Results from the Rating Scale Phase of the study are examined first, followed by the results of the Survey Phase.

### **Rating Scale Phase**

The major concern of this phase of the evaluation study was the effect of *The Responsive Classroom* instructional components on the social and academic behaviors of students in demonstration schools in the District of Columbia. Before conclusions about the effects of an instructional intervention can be made, it must be demonstrated that the intervention was used with high integrity. That is, the intervention components were all used frequently as intended. **Table 3** provides the mean percentage of days teachers reported using one or more components of *The Responsive Classroom* approach. Given that approximately 100 days of school occurred between Time 1 data collection and Time 2, it is easy to

**Table 3****Teacher's Use of The Responsive Classroom (RC)****Components During Spring 1994**

<b>Classroom Components</b>	<b>Responsive PreK-2rd grades (N = 24)</b>	<b>Responsive 4th - 6th grades (N = 16)</b>	<b>Non-Responsive PreK - 3rd grades (N = 3)</b>	<b>Non-Responsive 4th - 6th grades (N = 6)</b>
Morning Meeting	98.9%	88.8%	43.3%	60%
Role Playing	48.3%	22.5%	0%	10%
Problem Solving Class Meetings	48.8%	25.0%	0%	83%
Time-Out	72.0%	65.0%	13.3%	5.0%
Choice Time	95.8%	45.6%	0%	6.7%
Guided Discovery	41.3%	28.9%	0%	8.3%
<b>MEANS</b>	X = 67.5%	X = 45.9%	X = 28.3%	X = 16.4%

translate the percentage of days into an estimated number of days each component of the RC was used. Several trends can be interpreted from the usage data in Table 3. First, teachers in the RC group implemented components of the approach significantly more frequently than teachers in the NRC group; on average teachers in the RC group used the entire approach 56.7% of the possible days, while teachers in the NRC group used the approach (primarily the Morning Meeting) an average of 22.4% of the possible days. Second, as expected the Morning Meeting was the most frequently used component of the approach by teachers in both the RC group and NRC group. Third, teachers in the RC group at the early elementary level (PreK – 3<sup>rd</sup> grade) used portions of the approach significantly more frequently than their teaching colleagues in the RC group at the upper elementary level (3<sup>rd</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> grades) and their teaching colleagues in the entire NRC group. In summary, it is clear students in the RC group with reasonable attendance records were exposed to significant portions of *The Responsive Classroom* approach and their level of exposure was more than double that of peers in the NRC group. Thus, the evaluation can be considered a fair test of the differential impact of the RC approach on students' behavior.

**Table 4A** is the first table documenting the mean (average) SSRS ratings at Time 1 and Time 2 by teachers, parents, and students for the students from the two instructional conditions (i.e., RC vs. NRC). Readers should examine this table by (a) comparing scores from a single category of rater for students within a given instructional condition from Fall 1993 to Spring 1994, (b) comparing scores across instructional conditions within a given category of rater, and then (c) comparing across raters within an instructional condition. The data are prevalent within each condition. The following trends in (a) teachers', parents', and students' ratings of social skills are in the mid-Average range normatively, (b) teachers from both instructional conditions reported only slight changes in the overall average frequency of social skills, problem behaviors, and academic functioning from Fall to Spring, (c) parents of students in both instructional conditions reported, on average, only slight changes in the frequency of social skills and slight decreases in the frequency of problem behaviors from Fall to Spring, and (d) SSRS ratings by students from both instructional conditions also indicated only slight increases in social skills. Focusing on the mean SSRS ratings for students indicates that teachers and parents of students in both the RC and NRC instructional conditions perceived small changes in behavior in almost all cases in the desired

Table 4A

**SSRS Data Summary for Entire Sample of Students in Classes****With and Without The Responsive Classroom Approach**

	Responsive Classroom		Non-Responsive Classroom	
	Fall 1993	Spring 1994	Fall 1993	Spring 1994
<b>TEACHER</b>				
Total SS	104 (15)	108 (15)	100 (20)	102 (16)
C	15 (4)	16 (4)	15 (5)	15 (5)
A	14 (4)	15 (4)	14 (5)	14 (4)
SC	14 (4)	16 (4)	14 (4)	14 (4)
Total PB	98 (15)	98 (16)	98 (24)	102 (18)
Ex	2 (3)	2 (3)	3 (3)	3 (3)
I	2 (3)	3 (3)	3 (2)	2 (3)
H	3 (3)	3 (3)	4 (3)	4 (3)
Total AC	99 (11)	101 (12)	99 (13)	101 (12)
<b>PARENT</b>				
Total SS	98 (17)	104 (18)	98 (14)	98 (21)
C	12 (3)	12 (13)	12 (3)	12 (3)
A	16 (3)	16 (3)	15 (3)	15 (3)
SC	13 (3)	14 (3)	12 (3)	13 (4)
R	13 (3)	14 (3)	13 (3)	13 (3)
Total PB	97 (15)	96 (16)	99 (13)	97 (14)
Ex	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (2)
I	3 (2)	3 (2)	3 (2)	4 (2)
H	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (3)	4 (2)
<b>STUDENT</b>				
Total SS	110 (15)	111 (14)	103 (17)	107 (15)
C	16 (2)	16 (3)	15 (3)	14 (3)
A	14 (2)	14 (3)	14 (3)	14 (2)
SC	13 (4)	13 (3)	11 (4)	13 (3)
E	16 (4)	16 (3)	15 (3)	15 (3)

**Note.** The total scores for Social Skills (SS), Problem Behaviors (PB), and Academic Competence (AC) scales are in standard score form ( $X = 100$ ,  $SD = 15$ ), whereas the subscales for these scales are in raw score form. These subscores have a  $X = 10$ ,  $SD = 3$ , C = Cooperation, A = Assertion, SC = Self Control, Ex = Externalizing, I = Internalizing, and H = Hyperactive, E = Empathy, R = Responsibility. Standard deviations are in parentheses.

directions (i.e., increases in social skills and general academic competence, and decreases in problem behaviors) Mean rating scores, although the single most representative score for a group, do not adequately characterize changes that individuals may undergo.

A further breakdown and characterization of the SSRS rating data for students in both instructional conditions is provided in Tables 4B, 5, 6, and 7. Specifically, **Table 4B** provides a summary of Time 2 or Spring SSRS total scale ratings for the RC and NRC groups from the Original sample of students and the two racially representative subsamples of the Demonstration Center schools and the entire District. Examination of this table indicates that only parents' ratings of Problem Behaviors resulted in statistically different mean scores between the Original sample and the racially representative subsample of the District. Thus, the data in Table 4B does not support a hypothesis that racially different samples from the students in the district would often produce different results with regard to social skills ratings. **Table 5** provides a summary of the mean scale ratings for RC and NRC groups of students from three educational levels in the Fall and Spring. This table most vividly reveals that at each of the three educational levels RC teachers observed significant improvements (i.e. > 5 points) in social skills for the group, while over the same time period, NRC teachers reported moderate to significant decreases in rated social skills of their group of students! The ratings of parents and students themselves in the NRC group also reinforces the teachers' observations with regard to social skills. With regard to problem behaviors and academic competence, all raters generally indicated little change, positive or negative, for students in either the RC or NRC groups. **Table 6** provides actual mean change scores for all students who had scores at both Time 1 and Time 2. The magnitude and direction of these change scores is consistent with the group data presented in **Table 5** and serves to reinforce the observation that the RC approach did influence the development of prosocial skills in children.

It should be noted that previous research on the stability of SSRS with untreated (i.e., no instructional or behavioral interventions in place) samples of students has indicated only minimal changes ( $\pm 3$  points) over periods of 1 to 2 months (Gresham & Elliott, 1990). Thus, changes of the type of magnitude observed with this data cannot be accounted for by error or unreliable measurements along. It is reasonable to conclude that exposure to

**Table 4B****Means and Standard Deviations for Spring SSRS Ratings for Original****RC Evaluation Sample and Two Representative Subsamples**

	<b>Original (N = 212)</b>		<b>Demonstration Centers (N = 150)</b>		<b>District (N = 111)</b>	
	RC	NRC	RC	NRC	RC	NRC
<b>SSRS-Teacher</b>						
Social Skills	108.1 (14.9)	102.3 (16.5)	107.2 (14.4)	101.8 (17.7)	104.5 (14.5)	99.7 (16.5)
Problem Behaviors	98.3 (15.8)	101.6 (17.7)	99.6 (15.6)	104.1 (17.9)	102.1 (16.5)	107.1 (18.6)
Academic Competence	100.3 (12.3)	101.3 (12.2)	98.1 (12.5)	100.9 (12.6)	96.1 (12.7)	98.9 (11.7)
<b>SSRS-Parent</b>						
Social Skills	104.1 (18.3)	98.4 (20.5)	106.4 (13.5)	99.8 (21.3)	104.8 (14.9)	96.2 (19.4)
Problem Behaviors	96.5 (16.4)	97.3 (14.1)	96.8 (17.7)	97.9 (12.9)	100.5 (13.0)	98.8 (14.4)
<b>SSRS-Student</b>						
Social Skills	110.8 (13.9)	106.8 (14.5)	106.2 (15.6)	107.4 (13.9)	105.2 (16.0)	105.3 (13.6)

**Note 1.** All versions of the SSRS have a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15. The scales SEM is 4. Higher scores for Social Skills and Academic Competence subscales are interpreted as positive, while lower scores on the Problem Behavior Subscales are positive.

**Note 2.** The subsamples labeled Demonstration Centers and District were generated using as SPSS stratified random selection program to create **racially representative subsamples** from the original voluntary sample of 212 students.

Table 5

**SSRS Data Summary for Students at Three Grade Levels**

	Responsive Classroom		Non Responsive Classroom	
	Fall 1993	Spring 1994	Fall 1993	Spring 1994
<b>PreK</b>				
<b>Teacher</b>				
Social Skills	105.2 (16)	112.0 (14)	--	--
Prob. Behavior	100.1 (12)	100.1 (17)	--	--
<b>Parent</b>				
Social Skills	95.5 (14)	106.3 (15)	92.6 (15)	107.0 (20)
Prob. Behavior	87.9 ( 5)	94.0 (22)	97.0 (14)	87.4 (23)
<b>K – 3<sup>RD</sup> GRADES</b>				
<b>Teacher</b>				
Social Skills	104.9 (14)	110.3 (15)	94.9 (20)	90.2 (15)
Prob. Behavior	97.0 (13)	97.5 (14)	95.5 (28)	102.8 (19)
Academic	99.1 (10)	100.4 (12)	99.4 (14)	101.1 (12)
<b>Parent</b>				
Social Skills	98.8 (16)	105.6 (14)	98.3 (14)	97.9 (19)
Prob. Behavior	98.8 (11)	98.5 (12)	99.7 (12)	100.0 (12)
<b>4<sup>TH</sup> – 6<sup>TH</sup> GRADES</b>				
<b>Teacher</b>				
Social Skills	99.5 (16)	104.0 (15)	107.2 (19)	100.5 (15)
Prob. Behavior	99.2 (19)	98.9 (18)	102.2 (17)	101.6 (19)
Academic	99.7 (13)	100.1 (13)	99.1 (13)	101.6 (12)
<b>Parent</b>				
Social Skills	99.7 (20)	99.7 (26)	98.9 (15)	96.9 (23)
Prob. Behavior	96.3 (21)	93.5 (20)	97.4 (13)	96.9 (13)
<b>Student</b>				
Social Skills	110.3 (15)	110.8 (14)	109.5 (15)	106.9 (15)

**Note.** The SSRS has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 for each of its major subscales. Standard deviations are indicated in parentheses for each of the subsamples above.

**Table 6**

**Mean Changes in Ratings for Students in RC and  
NRC Classrooms Across Three Educational Levels**

	<b>PreK</b>	<b>K – 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> Grade</b>
<b>Responsive Classrooms</b>			
Teacher			
Social Skills	+ 8.0	+ 5.8	+ 8.0
Prob. Behaviors	- .1	+ 1.3	- .6
Academic Comp	--	+ .1	+ 1.3
Parent			
Social Skills	+ 11.7	+ 5.3	+ 6.4
Prob. Behaviors	+ 14.6	+ .7	+ 1.4
Student			
Social Skills	--	--	+ .5
<b>Non-Responsive Classrooms</b>			
Teacher			
Social Skills	--	- 4.5	- 2.5
Prob. Behaviors	--	+ 7.3	- 3.0
Academic Comp.	--	+ .8	+ 2.1
Parent			
Social Skills	--	- .8	- 2.2
Prob. Behaviors	--	- .9	- 3.8
Student			
Social Skills	--	--	- 2.5

**Note.** Positive changes or improvements in ratings from fall to spring are indicated with a +. Negative changes in ratings as indicated with a -. An ideal pattern is positive changes in Social Skills and Academic Competencies and negative changes in Problem Behaviors.

*The Responsive Classroom* instructional approach does influence elementary students' social behavior in measurable and practically meaningful ways.

From a statistical perspective, a series of analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to test the magnitude of change in Social Skills, Problem Behavior, and Academic Competence scores for students at the K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade and 4<sup>th</sup> - 6<sup>th</sup> grade levels. The independent variables in these analyses were sex, race, and instructional approach. In the ANCOVA, the SSRS scores from the Fall were treated as covariates of the Spring scores, thus allowing for a test of differences between students' ratings in the RC and NRC groups without the error problems typically encountered with change scores. Statistical analyses of the PreK students' ratings were not possible given the limited number of comparison students. Students at the other two levels were only included in the analyses if they had a complete set of ratings; this requirement reduced the sample by nearly 10% at each educational level. The results of the ANCOVA for the teachers' ratings of students at the K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade level indicated there were significant effects for the main effects of instructional approach (Multivariate  $F = 2.67$ ,  $p < .015$ ) and for sex (Multivariate  $F = 3.84$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Follow-up univariate analyses indicated ratings of students' Cooperation and Assertion behavior accounted for most of the significance difference between the RC group and the NRC group. In addition, ratings of girls on Cooperation were significantly higher than boys in both instructional approaches. None of the other ANCOVAs for teachers', parents', or students' ratings were found to be statistically significant.

In summary, the effects of *The Responsive Classroom* approach on the social behavior of students was statistically tested and the major trend observed in the mean data was determined to be significant at a level very unlikely to occur by chance alone. Thus, the differential results between the RC and NRC groups of students at the K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade level is very likely due to the difference in instructional activities included in *The Responsive Classroom* approach. The effects were most evident in teachers' ratings of students' cooperation and assertion behaviors, two behaviors emphasized in social interactions which commonly occur during Morning Meeting, Choice Time, and Guided Discovery!

For many readers, statistical analyses do not provide the most meaningful way to communicate evaluation results. A more practical metric of the impact of an instructional intervention often are data on the percentage of individuals who had (a) noticeable increases in ratings, (b) noticeable decreases in

ratings, and (c) essentially no change in ratings. With this in mind, Table 7 was created. **Table 7** effectively provides information on the distribution of individuals with change scores on the SSRS of + 5 points or more, - 5 points or more, or between  $\pm 5$  points. As displayed in this table, teachers', parents', and students' ratings result in categorizing over 51 % of the children in the RC group as making "Noticeable Increases" in social skills. Comparable results for students in the NRC group are more variable with teachers categorizing only 38% as evidencing "Noticeable Increases" in social skills, whereas parents and students categorized 53% and 46%, respectively. Perhaps as important as increases in social skills, teachers and parents in the RC instructional condition rated nearly 40% of their students as exhibiting "Noticeable Decreases" in problem behaviors. Teachers and parents in the NRC instructional condition characterized 29% or fewer of their students as decreasing problem behaviors. The distributions of students with changes in their general academic competencies were very similar for both the RC and NRC groups.

**Table 8** provides evidence about the relationship between the students' Social Skills, Problem Behaviors, and Academic Competence scores. Recall that a coefficient of correlation [ $r$ ] is a single number ranging between + 1.00 and -1.00. Correlations indicate to what extent two things are related or to what extent variations in one behavior or rating occur with variations in another behavior or rating. Correlations ranging between .00 and  $\pm .29$  are considered low, correlations ranging between  $\pm .30$  and  $\pm .59$  are considered moderate, and correlations ranging between  $\pm .60$  and  $\pm 1.00$  are considered high. Table 8 provides Pearson correlations among the three SSRS total scale scores (i.e., Social Skills and Problem Behaviors, Social Skills and Academic Competence, and Problem Behaviors and Academic Competence) of students as rated by teachers, parents, and students themselves. Based on past research, the expectation was for moderate to high positive correlations between teachers' ratings of Social Skills and Academic Competence and high negative correlations between their ratings of Social Skills and Problem Behaviors. The  $r$  values in the upper third of the table are equal to or larger than the same correlations for the SSRS's national standardization sample. As evidenced by these  $r$  values, the expected relationships between teachers' SSRS ratings were observed when all students in the sample were examined. Thus, it is clear from this correlational data that continued efforts to improve students' social skills also can have indirect impact on general academic functioning and problem behaviors.

Table 7

**Percentage of Students Evidencing Noticeable Changes****In Social and Academic Behaviors**

	<b>Noticeable Decrease in Ratings</b>	<b>Essentially No Change in Ratings</b>	<b>Noticeable Increase in Ratings</b>
<b>RESPONSIVE CLASSROOMS</b>			
<b>Teacher</b>			
Social Skills	23.6	22.0	54.4
Prob. Behaviors	40.2	36.4	23.4
Academic Comp.	13.6	51.2	35.2
<b>Parent</b>			
Social Skills	21.0	27.1	51.9
Prob. Behaviors	38.0	39.2	22.8
<b>Student</b>			
Social Skills	30.4	17.4	52.2
<b>NON-RESPONSIVE CLASSROOMS</b>			
<b>Teacher</b>			
Social Skills	24.1	38.2	37.7
Prob. Behaviors	29.3	51.7	22.4
Academic Comp.	12.7	54.0	33.3
<b>Parent</b>			
Social Skills	24.6	22.8	52.6
Prob. Behaviors	22.4	42.9	34.7
<b>Student</b>			
Social Skills	21.1	33.3	45.6

**Note.** A Change of + 5 or more points defined a noticeable and reliable increase in ratings, whereas a change of – 5 or more points define a noticeable and reliable decrease in ratings. Change scores less than  $\pm 5$  are characterized as essentially no change.

Table 8

**Correlations Among Ratings of Social Skills, Problem****Behaviors, and Academic Competence**

	RESPONSIVE CLASSROOM			NON-RESPONSIVE CLASSROOM		
	Social Skills	Problem Behaviors	Academic Comp.	Social Skills	Problem Behaviors	Academic Comp.
<b>TEACHER</b>						
Social Skills	1.0	- .69***	.50***	1.0	- .63***	.55***
Problem Behaviors		1.0	- .50***		1.0	- .29*
Academic Comp.			1.0			1.0
<b>PARENT</b>						
Social Skills	1.0	- .21	.10	1.0	- .53***	.26*
Problem Behaviors		1.0	- .24*		1.0	- .30*
<b>STUDENT</b>						
Social Skills	1.0	- .46*	.14	1.0	- .40*	.02

**Note.** Based on the SSRS standardization data, you expect for teacher ratings that the correlations between Social Skills and Problem Behaviors would be -.75 and between Social Skills and Academic Competence +.68. The correlation between Problem Behaviors and Academic Competence should be approximately -.50.

\* p < .05  
 \*\* p < .01  
 \*\*\* p < .001

A final subset of correlational evidence from the Rating Scale Phase of the study concerned the relationships among students' self-rated social skills and their self-concept and perceptions of social support. Specifically in a sample of 26 4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> graders from the RC group, the students with the highest rated social skills consistently had positive self-concepts ( $r = + .75$ ) and perceived others as socially supportive of them ( $r = + .67$ ). Conversely, students with the lowest rated social skills had relatively low self-concepts and perceived others as socially unsupportive. This correlational data must be interpreted cautiously given the small sample. However, if this pattern is found to be reliable, it has very positive ramifications for the continued use of *The Responsive Classroom* approach.

### **Survey Phase**

This phase of the study was conducted concurrently with the collection of the rating scale data in April and May. Teachers, parents, students, and principals completed questionnaires designed to assess their perceptions of student's social behavior, the use of *The Responsive Classroom* approach to instruction, and the types of changes needed to implement instructional approaches like *The Responsive Classroom*. A summary of the reactions of each of the four groups of respondents follows.

#### **Teachers' Reactions**

Forty-five teachers, 35 from the RC group and 10 from the NRC group, completed the same 28-item questionnaire, thus allowing for direct comparisons of their reactions. The first section of six items was entitled "About My Class This Year." With the exception of two items, the RC teachers' reactions were essentially the same as the reactions of the NRC teachers. On item #3, which read "My students' interpersonal or social skills overall this school year \_\_\_\_\_," the RC teachers overwhelmingly endorsed the response "Improved Significantly," whereas the majority of the NRC teachers endorsed the response "Improved Slightly." These global responses are very consistent with the actual SSRS summary data of which the teachers were unaware. On item #6, which read "Parental involvement in my class this year could be characterized as " the RC teachers consistently selected the terms "High" or "Very High" to complete the item, whereas the NRC teachers most frequently chose "Moderate" to characterize parent involvement in their classes.

The second section of the teacher questionnaire was titled "Reactions to The Responsive Classroom," which was comprised of five items requiring ratings and five open-ended items. On item #8,

which asked "The best way to characterize my reaction to *The Responsive Classroom* would be \_\_\_\_\_," the RC teachers overwhelmingly endorsed "Strongly Like it," as did the NAC teachers. On item #9, which read "I believe the effectiveness of this approach for improving my students' social behavior would be \_\_\_\_\_," 70% of the RC teachers thought it would be "Very Effective," whereas the majority of the NRC teachers thought it would be "Effective." On item #10, which stated "My interest in using *The Responsive Classroom* approach can best be characterized as \_\_\_\_\_," 60% of the RC teachers selected "Very High" and the remaining 40% selected "High" as the best way to complete the item. Teachers in the NRC group most frequently selected "Moderate" as the term to describe their interest in *The Responsive Classroom* approach. With regard to the perceived difficulty of implementing the RC approach (i.e., item #10), the RC teachers' selections varied widely with 30% endorsing "Very Difficult" and 23% endorsing "Very Easy." Interestingly, the NRC teachers' reactions to the difficulty of implementing the approach were more optimistic, with 60% selecting "Very Easy" as a descriptor and only 20% choosing "Very Difficult."

Teachers' responses to the open-ended items cannot be summarized concisely. Therefore, in addition to highlighting a couple of the most frequent responses of teachers in the text of this report, the entire list of teachers' responses to items #12 - #16 are included as Appendix C. When asked what aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* they liked most, RC teachers consistently mentioned "Morning Meeting." A couple of teachers indicated "Every aspect of the RC seems to work for me. It is difficult to say the one I like most or least. Another respondent said, "Children are valued, their ideas are all viewed as contributions, it [the RC approach] creates an atmosphere of confidence both in the self and in one's ability to share ideas and feelings." Many NRC teachers indicated they could not respond given their limited knowledge and use of the RC approach. Several teachers in the NRC group, however, offered Morning Meeting as the aspect they liked best.

With regard to the aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* approach they liked least, the most frequent response was "Nothing" or a blank space. A few individuals suggested that completing continuous progress reports and reporting to parents were the least liked aspects. Again, the teachers in the NRC most frequently left the item blank or indicated they did not know as indicated by a "?".

When asked the aspect of the RC approach that students liked most, teachers in the RC group most frequently indicated "Choice Time" or "Morning Meeting." The majority of teachers in the NRC group

did not respond to the question, however, those who did most frequently indicated "Morning Meeting" was the most liked aspect by students. When asked the aspect of the approach that students liked least, "Rules and Logical Consequences" or a blank space were the most frequently offered responses from the teachers in the RC group. No response or a blank space was the most frequent response of the NRC teachers to this same question

When teachers were asked, "What type(s) of support is (are) needed to implement *The Responsive Classroom* approach?" those in the RC group offered a range of reactions including: "As much hands on material as possible, for students and teachers, along with up-to-date research on the use of *The Responsive Classroom*" and "Opportunities for teachers to observe RC in classrooms of teachers with significant experience." Teachers in the NRC group also offered a range of detailed responses to this question about support. Time, colleague support and collaboration, and materials for training were three of the most prevalent aspects of the NRC teachers' responses.

The teachers' responses to the 12 items in the section of the questionnaire titled "About me and the RC Approach in my Classroom" will be reviewed concurrently with those from principals in a later section of this report. Based on the responses to the first two sections of the questionnaire, however, it is clear that *The Responsive Classroom* is an acceptable, if not highly acceptable, approach to instruction in the eyes of teachers who have first-hand experience with the approach, as well as those who have very limited knowledge of the approach

### **Parents' Reactions**

One hundred and seventy-one parents of students responded to the 12-item questionnaire; 94 of the parents had children in a classroom where *The Responsive Classroom* approach was in use, while 75 of the parents had children in a classroom where only the Morning Meeting component of the approach was used. This sample of parents was quite diverse with regard to income level and racial/ethnic group identity. These two variables, however, did not account for any significant differences in parental ratings or reactions to *The Responsive Classroom* approach. Evidence to support this conclusion is presented in Tables 9 and 10. Specifically, **Table 9** provides comparisons of the mean ratings of the RC approach for each of 12 items by parents from five racial groups (i.e., Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian, and Others). **Table 10** provides comparisons of mean ratings of items by parents from six income levels.

Table 9

**Comparison of Parents from Five Racial Groups' Ratings****Of The Responsive Classroom**

Item	RESPONSIVE CLASSROOM					NON-RESPONSIVE CLASSROOM				
	Parents' Race					Parents' Race				
	C	AA	H	A	O	C	AA	H	A	O
1	3.9	3.6	3.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.8	2.8	3.5
2	3.5	3.4	3.8	4.5	4.0	3.6	3.0	3.5	3.3	3.3
3	2.4	2.5	2.4	3.0	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.7	2.0	2.3
4	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.0	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.3	3.8
5	4.3	4.4	4.6	5.0	5.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.8
6	2.8	2.7	2.6	3.0	2.0	2.9	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.8
7	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.0	1.8	2.5
8	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.0	4.0	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.0	2.5
9	2.6	2.4	1.8	3.0	1.0	2.2	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.0
10	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.7
11	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	4.0	3.4	3.0	3.5	2.8	3.3
12	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.0	4.0	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.3
N =	(28)	(22)	(6)	(4)	(4)	(51)	(28)	(5)	(2)	(1)

**Note.** C = Caucasian, AA = African American, H = Hispanic, A = Asian, O = Others. Given the small sample of Asian and Others, the results for these groups should be interpreted very cautiously.

Table 10

**Comparison of Ratings of The Responsive Classroom by Parents****With Varying Annual Income Levels**

	RESPONSIVE CLASSROOM						NON-RESPONSIVE CLASSROOM					
	Parents' Income Level						Parents' Income Level					
Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
#1	3.3	3.4	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.8
#2	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.7	3.5	3.3
#3	2.5	2.5	2.6	1.8	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.1
#4	3.6	3.6	4.1	3.4	4.2	3.9	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.1	3.5	3.8
#5	4.4	4.1	4.7	4.1	4.4	4.5	3.9	4.5	4.5	4.4	3.8	3.9
#6	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.8	3.0	2.3	2.4	2.8	2.6	2.8	3.1
#7	2.4	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.8	2.4
#8	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.0	3.2
#9	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.5	2.2
#10	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.7
#11	3.6	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.7	3.0	3.3	3.4
#12	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.8	3.1	3.3	3.4
<b>N =</b>	22	10	6	7	4	17	8	11	13	9	12	33

**Note.** Higher ratings are more favorable. Annual Income Range: 1 = Less than \$15,000; 2 = \$15,000 to \$30,000; 3 = \$30,000 to \$45,000; 4 = \$45,000 to \$60,000; 5 = \$60,000 to \$75,000; and 6 = More than \$75,000.

In the section titled "About My Child," the average ratings of parents with children in the RC group were virtually identical to those of parents in the NRC group on four of the first five items. Specifically, both groups of parents most frequently (a) characterized their child's interpersonal or social skills with peers as "Very Good," (b) described their child's ability to solve problems or disagreements as "Good" to "Very Good," (c) described their child's interpersonal or social skills this school year as between "Improved Slightly" and "Improved Significantly," and (d) summarized their child's achievement in school this year as "Good" to "Very Good." When asked to characterize their "Child's reaction to school this year" parents with a child in a classroom where the RC approach was in full use most frequently selected the descriptor "Very Positive," whereas parents with a child in a classroom using only the Morning Meeting selected the term "Slightly Positive. "

The second major section of the Parent Questionnaire concerned "Parental Involvement and Satisfaction." In general, the average responses from parents with children in either an RC or a NRC class were highly similar and positive for items #6 and #7. Parents with children in an RC class, however, reacted significantly more positively than parents with children in a NRC class to item #8, which stated "My satisfaction with my child's schooling can best be characterized as \_\_\_\_." The mean ratings for these two groups of parents were 3.5 (Slightly to Very High) and 3.1 (Slightly High), respectively.

When asked to characterize their perceptions of *The Responsive Classroom* approach in the last section of the questionnaire, both groups of parents responded similarly indicating for item #10 that they "Strongly Liked it" and for item #11 they believed the approach was "Effective" in improving their child's social behavior. In concluding the questionnaire, both groups of parents indicated, on average, they were "Highly" or "Very Highly" interested in having their child's teacher use *The Responsive Classroom* approach!

In summary, the questionnaire data from a large and diverse sample of parents provides strong support for the acceptability and perceived effectiveness of *The Responsive Classroom* approach. These perceptions of the RC approach were shared nearly as strongly by parents who did not have children in a classroom where the RC approach was fully operational as it was by parents with children in RC classes!

### Students' Reactions

Fifty-nine students from 4<sup>th</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grades responded to the 9-item student questionnaire about the RC approach; 23 of the students were in classes where only the Morning Meeting was used, while the remaining 36 students were in RC classes. Students from both classrooms using the different instructional approaches responded very similarly to the first five items on the questionnaire. Specifically, they indicated on average that (a) "Getting along with classmates was talked about in class very often," (b) "Spending time in class to practice social skills and ways to solve problems with others is important," (c) "Morning Meetings are usually useful," (d) "Chances to make personal choices about learning and working in the classroom are important," and (e) "Classroom rules and consequences for not following rules in my classroom are clear."

When asked to indicate "The best way to describe how feel about *The Responsive Classroom*" the students in the RC group consistently characterized their feelings as "Very Good" or "Good," whereas the students in the Morning Meeting only classes consistently selected "O.K." to characterize their feelings about the RC approach. On the final rating item, students were asked to complete the following statement: "This year my skills for getting along with others \_\_\_\_." Within both groups students' responses varied significantly, although across the groups the average response was very similar. In the RC group, 13 students indicated "Did Not Change Much," 18 students selected "Improved," and 6 students selected "Improved A Lot." By comparison in the NRC group, 1 student selected "Got Worse," 5 students indicated "Did Not Change Much," 12 said "Improved," and 5 indicated "Improved A Lot."

The students were given two open-ended questions. The first question asked them to identify "The thing I **liked most** about the Morning Meetings is \_\_\_\_." The entire list of the students' responses is documented in Appendix F. However, for purposes of a summary, three responses were frequently given as aspects liked most. These were: "Sharing," "Greetings," and "Activities." The second question asked "The thing **liked least** about Morning Meetings is \_\_\_\_." Students gave a wide range of responses many of which indicated they "Didn't like the meetings to end" rather than pick out a negative aspect of the meetings themselves. Several students also indicated they didn't like it when "Children don't listen" or when "People try to insult, put down and irritate people."

In summary, the reactions of the 4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> grade students indicates that the Morning Meeting is liked very much and appears to offer them an effective means for improving social interaction skills. Students who have experienced the entire Responsive Classroom approach felt even more positive about their personal outcomes and the instructional process!

### **Principals' Reactions**

Nine principals from schools where *The Responsive Classroom* was fully operational in several classrooms responded to the 28-item principals' questionnaire focusing on staff, students, and the implementation of The RC approach. The principals' responses to the introductory items about "My Staff & School This Year" are documented in Table 11. This table illustrates that the principals' responses to the five items are quite variable, and thus not easily summarized with a mean rating or common term. The only item with fairly high consensus was item #1 where five principals indicated that their staffs' interest in improving students' interpersonal or social skills was "Very High."

The principals' evidenced much more consensus on the items concerning *The Responsive Classroom*. Specifically, eight of the nine principals responded with "Strongly Like It" when asked "The best way to characterize my reaction to *The Responsive Classroom* approach would be \_\_\_\_." Similarly when asked about the effectiveness of the RC approach, six principals indicated it was "Very Effective" and the three remaining principals characterized it as "Effective." When asked about teachers involvement with the RC approach, virtually all the principals reported they were "Very Highly" interested in having teachers in their schools use the approach. With regard to implementation of the approach, five of the principals thought most teachers would find it "Easy" to implement. However, two thought it would be "Difficult" and another two were "Unsure" how easy it would be to implement.

The principals' responses to open-ended questions about the RC approach are all documented in Appendix E. Their responses to items concerning aspects of the approach "liked most" and "like least" were quite diverse in content and are not easy to represent with one or two sample responses per item. There were no surprises in their list of responses, simply a wide range of different opinions. When asked "What type of support is needed to implement *The Responsive Classroom*?" the principals collectively answered with the following list: staff training, peer coaching and sharing, administrative and parental support, and consistent reinforcement [from administration]. When asked "What will it take to get teachers

and parents to buy into approaches like *The Responsive Classroom?*" seven of the principals responded with the following suggestions: more information about the approach for parents and teachers, time, education and training [of staff], and incentives [for staff]. Two of the principals offered no response to this last question.

**Table 11**  
**Distribution of Principals' Responses to**  
**Items About Staff and the School Year**

---

**About My Staff & School This Year** (Circle one answer for each question.)

**1. My staffs' interest in improving students' interpersonal or social skills is**

Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>

**2. My staffs' ability to teach students how to solve problems with other people is**

Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Exceptional
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

**3. Parental involvement on average in my school could be characterized as**

Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

**4. Students' social behavior this year compared to the past two years was**

Worse	Slightly Worse	The Same	Slightly Improved	Much Improved
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>

**5. Parents' interest in school-based social skills programs for their children is**

Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

---

**Note.** The boldface numbers corresponding to the anchor terms for each item are frequencies of responses from the principals.

The last section of the principals' questionnaire was the same set of 12 questions about change that teachers were confronted with in their questionnaire. Both groups of respondents were asked to read a question (see Table 12) and to indicate whether it was 0 = Irrelevant, 1 = Not True of Me, 2 = Somewhat True of Me, or 3 = Very True of Me. The mean response per item for the 9 principals, 35 RC teachers, and 10 NRC teachers are compared in **Table 12**. Items #17, #20, #23, and #28 are considered critical indicators of motivation or willingness to change. High average scores ( $\geq 2.0$ ) on these four items thus would be expected if the respondents are eager to increase the use of the RC approach. An examination of the data table indicates the principals endorsed all four of the items strongly, while the teachers with previous experience with the approach endorsed three of the four items strongly. The teachers with limited or no experience with the RC approach strongly endorsed the item "I would like more information about the purpose of this approach," but also indicated they were quite concerned about limited resources (item #21) and finding the time to implement the approach (items #25 and #27).

In summary, it seems fair to conclude that the sample of principals questioned about the RC approach were very positive about it and seemed ready to facilitate broader use of the approach throughout the system. Traditional concerns with the implementation of innovations such as time, resources, and staffs' or colleagues' attitudes were not evaluated as significant deterrents to the continued or expanded use of *The Responsive Classroom*. As an educational innovation, this instructional approach enjoys a very positive valence for principals and teachers who have experience with it.

Table 12

**Principals' and Teachers' Reactions to the Changes Required to Implement The Responsive Classroom Approach**

Item #	Principals' Ratings	RC Teachers' Ratings	Non-RC Teachers Ratings
17. I would like to know more about the purpose of this approach.	2.0	1.7	2.5
18. I am concerned about criticism of my work with the approach.	.8	.8	1.4
19. I wonder how use of this approach will affect my relationship with my teaching colleagues.	1.2	.8	1.0
20. I would like to develop working relationships with other administrators to facilitate the use of the RC approach.	2.4	2.2	1.3
21. I am concerned about facilitating use of this approach in view of limited resources.	1.7	1.3	1.8
22. I spend little time thinking about this approach.	1.5	1.1	1.3
23. I would like to help others in the use of this approach.	2.1	2.5	1.6
24. I see a potential conflict between facilitating this approach and overloading staff.	1.3	1.2	1.3
25. I am concerned that communication and problem-solving with this approach takes too much time.	1.5	1.4	1.8
26. I have alternative approaches in mind that would better serve the needs of our students.	1.2	1.3	1.0
27. I am concerned about finding time needed for this approach	1.2	1.5	1.6
28. I would like to inform others about the progress of this approach.	2.0	2.4	1.1

**Note.** The above ratings are based on the following scale: 0 = Irrelevant, 1 = Not True of Me, 2 = Somewhat True of Me, 3 = Very True of Me. The sample completing ratings was comprised of 9 principals, 10 teachers in Non-RC classrooms, the 35 teachers in RC classrooms. Items 17, 20, 23, and 28 are considered the best indicators of "motivation to change." High ratings (2 or greater) on these items are positive indicators.

## **Conclusions**

The information summarized in this report featured behavior rating data for students from 26 schools and questionnaire data from nearly 300 individual stakeholders in the District of Columbia Public Schools. This data was collected and analyzed to help provide answers to questions about (a) the nature of relationships among social behaviors and changes in social behavior for a diverse sample of students and (b) to gain insights into the effectiveness of *The Responsive Classroom* approach as implemented in PreK through 6<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms. A multirater or multisource evaluation approach was used to gather student data from teachers, parents, and students at two points, approximately six months apart during the 1993-1994 school year. The body of this report has provided a rather detailed account of results starting with general findings about the entire sample's average social behavior ratings and ending with specific accounts of teachers', parents', students', and principals' reactions to various aspects of *The Responsive Classroom* approach. At this point, it is appropriate to revisit the major questions motivating this evaluation and to offer databased answers to them.

### **Question #1: Do students exposed to *The Responsive Classroom* approach exhibit higher levels of social skills and academic functioning than peers with limited exposure to the approach?**

Students exposed to the RC approach over a significant time period generally were perceived to exhibit higher levels of social skills in their classroom than students with limited or no exposure to the approach. Cooperation and assertion behaviors of students, in particular, were influenced by *The Responsive Classroom*. In addition to increasing the level of prosocial behavior, students exposed to the entire RC approach were observed to exhibit significantly less problem behavior than their peers with limited exposure to the approach. These findings held up across racially diverse subsamples of students from the district.

Teachers reporting on changes in academic functioning noted little change in either group of students during the time period of this investigation. The examination of the correlational data, however, reiterates there is a strongly perceived relationship between the social skills of students and their academic competence as rated by teachers. The perceived changes in academic competence simply seem to lag behind the changes in social functioning, and, of course, are influenced by many other

factors as well. The social functioning of a class remains to be an important prerequisite or corequisite to successful academic performances of children!

**Question #2: If *The Responsive Classroom* approach is effective, how can the school system get others to buy into the approach?**

*The Responsive Classroom* is perceived to be effective by a wide range of educational stakeholders surveyed. Actual behavior change data with students at the K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade level reinforces this perception. Given the effectiveness status of *The Responsive Classroom*, teachers and principals anonymously and consistently indicated that three actions are necessary for the wide-scale adoption of the approach: (1) provide more communication with parents, teachers, and administrators about the approach, (2) provide more training opportunities for teachers, and (3) increase administrative support for training and use of the approach. In sum, the educational stakeholders surveyed seemed to be confidently saying, "We have an acceptable and effective method, *The Responsive Classroom* approach, for improving students' social behavior and we recognize what has to be done to get others to use it. We need to communicate, we need to train, we need to support each other!"

**Question #3: What is the acceptance level of *The Responsive Classroom* approach by parents, and does the level of acceptance vary depending on socioeconomic or ethnic/racial group status?**

Parents, regardless of socioeconomic level or racial/ethnic group membership, overwhelmingly rated the RC approach as "acceptable" or "highly acceptable." Whether they had a child in an RC classroom or not, they consistently indicated they would like their child's teacher to use the approach. In sum, parents perceived *The Responsive Classroom* as an acceptable and effective method for improving their children's social behavior, and this perception is not class or culture bound!

**Question #4: What is the level of implementation of *The Responsive Classroom* approach across the system?**

Variable. That is, teachers trained in all six components of the RC approach consistently reported using the foundational component, Morning Meeting, significantly more frequently than their colleagues who have only been trained to use the Morning Meeting. In general, it is safe to assume that the Morning

Meeting component of the approach is being used at least 2 times a week, and in many cases 4 times, in PreK through 6<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms throughout the district.

Some of the RC components are appropriately used only occasionally. For example, Problem Solving Class Meetings are unlikely to be needed more than once a week or two. Role Playing also would not be needed on a daily basis. The rate of use for components such as Morning Meeting, Choice Time, Guided Discovery should be relatively much higher. The data indicate in the classrooms where teachers have been trained to use the entire approach, Morning Meeting and Choice Time are used at high levels.

**Question #5: What is the level of parent involvement in schools implementing *The Responsive Classroom*?**

Parental interest in *The Responsive Classroom* and involvement in school was on average slightly higher in schools where the approach was being implemented most fully, according to teachers, principals, and parents themselves. Although the relative involvement of parents with children in classes where the comprehensive version of the RC approach was operating was higher, the involvement was generally variable across parents and the absolute level of involvement was characterized as "moderate."

**Question #6: What are critical structural and environmental elements that need to be in place for successful implementation of *The Responsive Classroom*?**

Teachers and principals alike identified several elements that they believe are needed to successfully implement *The Responsive Classroom* in more classrooms. The most frequently identified elements by both parties were teacher training or staff development and time—time to learn from others and time to implement what has been learned. In addition to these central elements, both parties indicated that administrative support—moral and material—was needed by teachers. Finally, parent support ranging from simple acknowledgements for teachers' work to actively reinforcing their children's prosocial skills taught at school was identified as an important component.

**Summary**

The study was conducted as designed, integrating multiple forms of data from multiple informants. The general conclusions of the study have reinforced and amplified testimonies of several teachers who spoke during the educational forum at Sumner School in May of 1993. *The Responsive Classroom* approach that is operating in the District of Columbia schools is a very acceptable and

moderately effective method for enhancing the social behavior of young children. With more time—time for teachers to learn and use the approach, and especially for students to be exposed to it—it is highly likely that the benefits of the approach will be even more evident behaviorally and attitudinally.

## **References**

- Elliott, S.N (1992). Caring to learn: A report on the positive impact of a social curriculum. Greenfield, MA: Northeast Foundation for Children.
- Elliott, S.N. (1993). Responsive Classroom Checklist. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Elliott, S.N. 1994). Responsive Classroom Questionnaires. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin
- Gresham, F.M., & Elliott, S.N. (1990). Social Skills Rating System. Circle Pines, American Guidance Service.
- Gresham, F.M., Elliott, S.N., & Evans-Fernandez, S. (1993). Student Self-Concept Scale. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Nolten, P. (1994). Student Social Support Scale. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin
- Wood, C. (1994). Responsive teaching: Creating partnerships for systemic change. Young Children, 50, 21-28.

## ***Acknowledgements***

Completion of this evaluation project was a cooperative effort. I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Mary Duru and Myrtle Lewis, coordinators in the Center for Systemic Educational Change, who helped by coordinating meetings, facilitating communications among many teachers, and providing feedback on various evaluation tools. I am especially thankful for the energetic assistance that Diane Tromans-Berg provided by coordinating data collection efforts. I also wish to acknowledge the capable assistance of Christine Malecki, who input and analyzed most of the quantitative data. Finally, I have appreciated the leadership and visionary efforts of Maurice Sykes and Zollie Stevenson on behalf of the D. C. Public Schools, and Robert "Chip" Wood on behalf of the Northeast Foundation for Children. All these individuals care about the effects of schooling on teachers and children, and are serious about evaluating these effects. Thanks for caring!

## ***About the Project Director***

Stephen N. Elliott is a professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Steve is a faculty member in the School Psychology Program (APA approved) and a Research Associate in the Wisconsin Center for Educational Research where he co-directs federal grants on school-based consultation and large-scale performance assessments.

Steve has been a productive scholar authoring over 75 journal articles and 12 books. Most of Steve's research has focused on the assessment and treatment of children's social behavior problems. This empirical work has lead directly to the publication of a nationally standardized behavior rating scale, the Social Skills Rating System, and a coordinated treatment manual, the Social Skills Intervention Guide.

Steve can be reached by phone at (608) 262-8841 or by mail at 1025 W. Johnson St., Department of Educational Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706.

***Appendix A***

Responsive Classroom Usage Checklist

---

## ***Responsive Classroom Evaluation Project***

---

***District of Columbia Public School  
1993-94***

---

Dear Teacher,

Responsive Classroom (RC) methods are being used in some classrooms in the District of Columbia Public Schools. As part of an ongoing evaluation of the impact of these instructional methods, information is needed on which of the RC components are being used and how often they are used. Even if you are participating as a member of the comparison group, we need your input.

As a participating teacher in the RC Evaluation project, we would appreciate honest feedback about your use of some of the components of the program. For this evaluation, we only are interested in the components that relate directly to working with children in the classroom. The components of **Assessment and Reporting to Parents** and **Classroom Organization** are **NOT** evaluated with this usage chart. The component of **Rules & Logical Consequences** is divided into three subcomponents (Role Playing, Time Out, and Problem Solving Classroom Meeting) to allow for a more detailed analysis of classroom activities.

During the next week, please complete the usage chart on the accompanying sheet and return it in the enclosed envelope. The information you are asked to report will remain anonymous. We need only the grade level you teach.

If you have questions about this form, please call Mary Duru or Myrtle Lewis at 724-4099. Thank you very much for your time and input into this important project.

Sincerely,

Stephen N. Elliott, PhD  
Project Director

---

***Presidential Bldg. Room 805, Route 1  
415 12<sup>th</sup> St., N.W., Washington, D.C.  
(202) 724-4099***



## ***Appendix B***

### Responsive Classroom Questionnaires

## PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

### Responsive Classroom Evaluation Project

May, 1994

Dear Principal,

Your perceptions and opinions about *The Responsive Classroom* (RC) are requested. Some principals in the District of Columbia Schools are in schools where some teachers are using this approach, while other principals are in schools where very few or no teachers are using *The Responsive Classroom* approach. Regardless of your exposure to *The Responsive Classroom* approach, your thoughts about this approach are important to the ongoing evaluation of this approach to classroom instruction and management.

This survey will take about 15 minutes to complete and will be used as part of an evaluation of efforts to improve the social behavior of young students in your school district. Your honest responses to a series of questions would be valued. Your responses will remain confidential (your name is not requested), and the information will be summarized along with approximately 25 other principals, 50 teachers, and 150 parents.

To help us summarize and more fully understand the responses from all principals, we would appreciate having the following background information about you:

#### **Background Information**

Sex: \_\_\_ Female \_\_\_ Male

Have you taken *The Responsive Classroom* course? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No

Do you have teachers in your school who have taken *The Responsive Classroom* course? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No

### **Instructions for Completing the Survey**

On the next three pages of this survey, you are asked to respond to questions about your students' social behavior, implementation of *The Responsive Classroom* approach, and finally about yourself. **There are no right or wrong answers.** We want to know what you think.

Once you have completed this survey, **please return it in the enclosed preaddressed envelope** via district mail to Diane Tromans, Presidential Bldg., Room 805, Route 1, 415 12<sup>th</sup> St., N.W., Washington, D.C. Please respond by **May 25, 1994**.

**About My Staff & School This Year** (Circle one answer for each question.)

1. My staff's interest in improving students' interpersonal or social skills is

Very Low                  Low                  Moderate                  High                  Very High

2. My staff's ability to teach students how to solve problems with other people is

Very Poor                  Poor                  Good                  Very Good                  Exceptional

3. Parental involvement on average in my school could be characterized as

Very Low                  Low                  Moderate                  High                  Very High

4. Students' social behavior this year compared to the past two years was

Worse                  Slightly Worse                  The Same                  Slightly Improved                  Much Improved

5. Parents' interest in school-based social skills programs for their children is

Very Low                  Low                  Moderate                  High                  Very High

**Reactions to *The Responsive Classroom***

*The Responsive Classroom* approach is being used by some teachers in the District of Columbia Public Schools. This approach is designed "to build a classroom into a learning community where high social and academic goals are attained." *The Responsive Classroom* involves:

**Classroom Organization** which provides for active interest areas for students, space for student-created displays of work, and an appropriate mix of whole class, group, and individual instruction.

**Morning Meeting** which provides children daily opportunities to practice greetings, conversation, sharing, and problem solving.

**Rules and Logical Consequences** which are generated, modeled, and role-played with classmates and facilitate order and discipline in the classroom.

**Choice Time** for all children each day which provides students opportunities to take control of their own learning in some meaningful way, both individually and cooperatively.

**Guided Discovery** which is a deliberate method of instruction for introducing students to new curriculum content, learning materials, and ways of behaving.

**Assessment and Reporting to Parents** which is an evolving process of mutual communication and understanding.

6. Before receiving this survey, had you heard anything about *The Responsive Classroom*?

(check)  No     Maybe     Yes

7. Based on my understanding of *The Responsive Classroom* approach, the best way to characterize my reaction to it would be (circle one answer)

*Strongly Dislike it*                      *Slightly Dislike it*                      *Slightly Like It*                      *Strongly Like It*

8. Based on my understanding of *The Responsive Classroom*, I believe the effectiveness of this approach for improving my students' social behavior would be (circle one answer)

*Not Effective*                      *A Little Effective*                      *Effective*                      *Very Effective*

9. My interest in having teachers in my school use *The Responsive Classroom* approach can best be characterized as (circle one answer)

*Very Low*                      *Low*                      *Moderate*                      *High*                      *Very High*

10. Most teachers would find implementing *The Responsive Classroom* (circle one answer)

*Very Easy*                      *Easy*                      *Difficult*                      *Very Difficult*                      *I'm Unsure*

11. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like most is

---

---

12. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like least is

---

---

13. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students would like most is

---

---

14. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students would like least is

---

---

15. What type(s) of support is (are) needed to implement *The Responsive Classroom*?

---

---

16. What will it take to get teachers and parents to buy into approaches like *The Responsive Classroom*?

---

---

## **About Me and *The Responsive Classroom* Approach in My School**

*The Responsive Classroom* represents an instructional approach designed to affect students' social behavior and academic functioning. Your reactions to this type of approach affect its use and ultimately its effectiveness. Please respond to each of the next twelve statements by circling the number 0, 1, 2, or 3 to indicate how true each statement is for you.

0	1	2	3
Irrelevant	Not True of Me	Somewhat True of Me	Very True of Me
17. I would like to know more about the purpose of this approach.	0	1	2 3
18. I am concerned about criticism of my work with this approach.	0	1	2 3
19. I wonder how use of this approach will affect my relationship with my teachers.	0	1	2 3
20. I would like to develop working relationships with other administrators to facilitate the use of the RC approach.	0	1	2 3
21. I am concerned about facilitating use of this approach in view of limited resources.	0	1	2 3
22. I spend little time thinking about this approach.	0	1	2 3
23. I would like to help others in the use of this approach.	0	1	2 3
24. I see a potential conflict between facilitating this approach and overloading staff.	0	1	2 3
25. I am concerned that communication and problem-solving with this approach takes too much time.	0	1	2 3
26. I have alternative approaches in mind that would better serve the needs of our students.	0	1	2 3
27. I am concerned about finding time needed for this approach.	0	1	2 3
28. I would like to inform others about the progress of this approach.	0	1	2 3

If you have any additional comments about *The Responsive Classroom* approach, please use the back of this page to share them. Your thoughts are appreciated! Please use the **preaddressed envelope** to return this questionnaire. Thank you!!!

## ***Appendix C***

### Teacher Reactions to the RC Questionnaire

## **Responsive Classroom Teachers' Responses to the Questionnaire**

### **12. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like most is**

- 300. That it teaches children to care enough for each other that they do away with a lot of conflicts.
- 301. Morning Meeting
- 302. Teachers are given skills to implement the philosophy
- 303. Morning meeting
- 304. Rules & Logical Consequences
- 305. Choice Time
- 306. The emphasis on building a community in the classroom, and the strategies for helping children listen and care for each other
- 307. Morning Meeting, Classroom Organization...(all)
- 308. Children are valued—their ideas are all viewed as contributions, it creates an atmosphere of confidence—both in self and in ability to share ideas, feelings.
- 309. M.M., Logical rules and Consequences, Choice
- 310. Morning Meeting
- 311. Is the positive effect it has on the whole class & atmosphere of the class.
- 312. Morning Meeting
- 313. Questions omitted
- 314. Rules and Logical Consequences
- 315. The way it gives children a chance to socialize with peers
- 316. Every aspect about the RC seems to work for me. It is difficult to say the one I like most/least.
- 317. Morning meeting.
- 318. Morning meeting
- 319. Children are encouraged to and can be observed asking questions and explaining their answers.
- 320. The "Classroom Organization" which allows for varied student groupings for instructions.
- 321. The Morning Meeting
- 322. Rules & Logical Consequences

### **13. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like least is**

- 300. Completing the continuous progress reports
- 301. No response given
- 302. More theory behind the philosophy is needed
- 303. Assessment & report to parents
- 304. Morning Meeting
- 305. No response given
- 306. There is nothing negative about the RC approach
- 307. None
- 308. No response given
- 309. Having enough time to complete components
- 310. Morning Meeting Charts for each day
- 311. At first, all the management involved but now I am in control.
- 312. The children did not respond to hand signals for bringing the class to attention.
- 313. Questions omitted
- 314. Parent conferences—since there are no days just for these
- 315. How much time it takes every day
- 316. No response given
- 317. None. The most difficult for me to implement consistently is Guided Discovery.
- 318. Class meetings
- 319. Organizing the many centers.
- 320. "Assessment and Reporting to Parents"
- 321. Choice Time
- 322. Guided Discovery

**14. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students like most is**

- 300. Sharing, Representing and Planning their own day.
- 301. Choice
- 302. Children feel more in control of their lives
- 303. Choice
- 304. Choice
- 305. Choice Time
- 306. Choice!
- 307. Morning Meeting and Choice
- 308. Choice (guided discovery & role playing of rules & logical consequences)
- 309. Morning Meeting
- 310. Morning Meeting
- 311. The bonding in Morning Meeting & Choice time
- 312. Activity during Morning Meeting
- 313. Questions Omitted
- 314. Problem solving ability
- 315. Morning Meeting and choice
- 316. Morning Meeting & class meeting
- 317. Choice Time
- 318. Choice time
- 319. Children are able to voice their opinions.
- 320. Making decisions about the way in which their day is constructed.
- 321. Morning Meeting
- 322. Morning Meeting

**15. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students like least is**

- 300. Meetings that deal with conflicts or improper use of classroom centers.
- 301. Rules & Logical Consequences
- 302. No response given
- 303. No response given
- 304. Assessment and Reporting to Parents
- 305. No response given
- 306. Pre-K students love all aspects of the RC
- 307. Guided Discovery
- 308. Do not know! Probably “time out” although it’s viewed by my class as a time to think so they can join the group again.
- 309. Rules
- 310. None
- 311. The putting away of materials—cleaning up!
- 312. Sharing
- 313. Questions omitted
- 314. No response given
- 315. No response given
- 316. Logical Consequences
- 317. Guided Discovery
- 318. 1<sup>st</sup> 6 weeks of school
- 319. Not enough free choice
- 320. “Rules and Logical Consequences”
- 321. Conflict resolution
- 322. Time Out

**16. What type(s) of support is (are) needed to implement *The Responsive Classroom* approach?**

- 300. Informed Administrators, Parent Educators, time for teacher collaboration, classroom materials and supplies.
- 301. 1. teacher training 2. Equipment & materials 3. Parent conference release time 4. Small classes
- 302. A network of teachers is needed. Time for collaboration with teachers is needed. Consistency in application should take place throughout a school.
- 303. Teachers need the appropriate materials, equipment, administrative support (Principal), & the proper training.
- 304. Materials, Training, Planning Time
- 305. Peer support
- 306. Ongoing support for teachers for at least one school year—from the Early Childhood Coordinators, consulting teachers (those who are knowledgeable and trained in RC), and peer coaching from other teachers in the building. Also. Support of principals is necessary.
- 307. More planning time
- 308. Understanding, supportive administrators. Time to try—observation and coaching by teachers who have evolved & (crucial!) an exposure of the elements directly from NE Foundation for Children. Ruth & discussions with Chip Wood
- 309. Adequate supplies for centers, classroom release time, continuous supporting
- 310. 1. More peer teacher support (through out the year) in the beginning of the school year, middle of the year & end of the school year. 2. More out of school observations.
- 311. Trained, positive attitudes in assistants/aides, materials, feedback, continual training & seminars co-workers.
- 312. More work on Choice and Guided Discovery. More work with daily schedules. (Setting them up).
- 313. Questions Omitted
- 314. Ongoing coaching
- 315. A full time support person at each school
- 316. Positive feedback
- 317. Strategies to use when time out doesn't work; transitioning students without responsive classroom experiences into a responsive classroom.
- 318. Cooperation of everyone in the school, principal support and parent understanding
- 319. Teacher, students, teacher assistants and parents.
- 320. It would be helpful to have additional information concerning: 1) effective portfolio collections; 2) developing positive rules and logical consequences.
- 321. Personnel, Administration needs to be informed
- 322. An aide!!

## **NonResponsive Classroom Teachers' Responses to the RC Questionnaire**

### **12. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like most is**

- 400. Can't respond because I've only done the Morning Meeting
- 401. Morning Meeting
- 402. The emphasis on the development of self esteem in each child.
- 403. Choice time.
- 404. Classroom Organization
- 405. Choice time
- 406. No response given
- 407. Morning Meeting, class discussion of concerns
- 408. Morning Meeting & "Pretzels"
- 409. Emphasis on student interest
- 410. Morning Meeting – A positive way to begin the morning as a group. It sets the atmosphere for working together and solving daily problems together.
- 411. No response given
- 412. No response given
- 413. Communication
- 414. No response given
- 415. Morning Meeting
- 416. The Morning Meeting and establishing rules that facilitate order in the classroom.

### **13. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like least is**

- 400. Unable to respond
- 401. Not sure I've discovered this yet—possibly that others misunderstand it.
- 402. No Kindergarten Aides
- 403. Morning meeting
- 404. Guided Discovery. I say this because I am not very knowledgeable of this method of instruction. I do think, however, that this method would be a very interesting one to implement in my classroom.
- 405. Assessment
- 406. No response given
- 407. ?
- 408. NA – The Morning Meeting is the only thing I've implemented thus far.
- 409. N/A
- 410. No response given
- 411. No response given
- 412. No response given
- 413. Rigid Format
- 414. No response given
- 415. Assessment and Reporting to parents
- 416. I cannot say because I'm just being introduced to it. I do feel I needed more training (see a class and have the course before putting it in action.)

### **14. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students like most is**

- 400. No response given
- 401. Definitely morning meetings and class meeting—a tie!
- 402. Morning Meeting
- 403. Choice time
- 404. Morning Meeting and Choice Time
- 405. Choice Time
- 406. No response given
- 407. Morning Meeting, class discussion of concerns

- 408. "Activity" – (during Morning Meeting)
- 409. Morning meeting displays of student work
- 410. Choice Time – working individually as well as cooperatively.
- 411. No response given
- 412. No response given
- 413. Sharing, and choice time
- 414. No response given
- 415. Morning Meeting
- 416. The Morning Meeting so far. Maybe role playing.

**15. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students like least is**

- 400. No response given
- 401. Not sure—maybe they are expected to respect everyone.
- 402. No response given
- 403. Classroom organization
- 404. Logical Consequences
- 405. Rules and Consequences
- 406. No response given
- 407. No response given
- 408. NA
- 409. n/a
- 410. No response given
- 411. No response given
- 412. No response given
- 413. Rules
- 414. No response given
- 415. Rules and logical consequences
- 416. Have not really done anything other than morning meeting.

**16. What type(s) of support is (are) needed to implement *The Responsive Classroom* approach?**

- 400. No response given
- 401. You need: administrative support, parent buy-in. I'd like new furniture.
- 402. Kindergarten Aides
- 403. Aides and parents
- 404. As much hands on materials as possible, for students and teachers. Up-to-date research on the use of Responsive Classroom. For example pros and cons, the level of success gained by students.
- 405. Exciting materials, books, equipment, etc.
- 406. No response given
- 407. More info before taking the class
- 408. I really don't need more support I just need to do it!
- 409. Training
- 410. Hands-On Materials for choice time, morning meeting activities. Storage (items) for various hands on materials.
- 411. No response given
- 412. Teaching materials i.e.; updated resource materials; manipulatives access to sufficient classroom supplies
- 413. Parental involvement
- 414. No response given
- 415. Opportunities for teachers to observe RC in classrooms of teachers with significant or high experience in RC approach
- 416. The course and visitations to see it in action.

## ***Appendix D***

### Student Reactions to the RC Questionnaire

## **Student Reactions to *The Responsive Classroom***

### **6. The thing I like most about Morning Meetings is:**

500. The thing I like is the games.
501. When people share about things they did and we could comment.
502. That I get to share. Sometimes I can also play activities that I want to play.
503. The activity. The activity gives us a chance to exercise and also have some fun.
504. That you get to learn in a fun way.
505. Activity and greeting
506. Activity and greeting
507. When we have activity
508. The activity we do
509. I talking with my classmates in the Morning Meeting
510. The activity
511. When people share news with the morning meeting group and the way they greet each other.
512. When we greet each other
513. When we greet each other
514. When we greet each other
515. I like the Morning Meeting when we greet each other because we give each other complements.
516. The way we greet each other
517. The new information they provide
518. No response given
519. You share and greet people and play an activity
520. The game
521. The game
522. Sharing because you get to hear what is happening in life.
523. Sharing because it is fun to hear what other people have to say.
524. The class debates-discussion
525. That some people share what they brought
526. When the news and announcements are shared everyone can share a current event
527. Sharing
528. Sharing
529. The part where kids say news
530. Hearing people share events.
531. When Mrs. Rankin says a few words.
532. The math problem she put on the board and the way we greet someone.
533. That we socialize and play games.
534. The activities
535. Sharing

### **7. The thing I like least about Morning meeting is**

500. I don't dislike anything.
501. Some of the greetings take too long.
502. It is real short. And that we should have more activities
503. Having to move the furniture around. Morning Meeting is real fun, and that's the only (small) annoying thing.
504. Is when we have to sit boy girl
505. Sharing
506. When we go back to our sit
507. Sharing
508. When we get to share
509. Have to stand up and read my news topic
510. The greeting

- 511. When children don't listen and when they don't listen to the group as they share news and give important information.
- 512. When people act up while people are greeting each other
- 513. When we write on the chart
- 514. What is happening in the world.
- 515. When we got to share.
- 516. Having to write on the board.
- 517. They take up too much time.
- 518. No response given
- 519. No response given
- 520. The greeting
- 521. Is coming to morning meeting
- 522. Bringing your chair in because you can just sit on the floor.
- 523. N/A
- 524. Having to listen to depressing news that is going on.
- 525. N/A
- 526. N/A
- 527. Yelling
- 528. When she yells!
- 529. I don't know
- 530. Getting the class ready
- 531. When we tell who's absent
- 532. The way she says don't make fun about people clothes when you are greeting someone
- 533. People try to insult, put down and irritate people.
- 534. Sharing
- 535. Activities

## ***Appendix E***

### Principal Reactions to the RC Questionnaire

## **Responses to the Principal Questionnaire**

### **11. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like most is:**

- 01 Cooperative Activities
- 02 Social Curriculum; i.e., all of the parts work together to create a nurturing, and academic instructional program
- 03 Organization
- 04 Morning Meeting, Rules & Logical Consequences & Guided Discovery
- 05 Choice Time
- 06 The ease with which it is infused in existing classroom activities.
- 07 Morning Meeting
- 08 Respect for students—student driven based on Child Growth & Development
- 09 No response

### **12. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* I like least is**

- 01 Guided Discovery
- 02 No response
- 03 No materials
- 04 The lack of agreement between the Work Sampling System and the Continuous Progress Report.
- 05 No response
- 06 The desire of the system to make it the “be all.”
- 07 No response
- 08 Educating parents
- 09 No response

### **13. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students would like the most is**

- 01 Morning Meeting
- 02 No response
- 03 Order, process
- 04 Choice Time
- 05 Choice Time
- 06 No response
- 07 Guided Discovery
- 08 Choice—responsibility
- 09 No response

### **14. The aspect of *The Responsive Classroom* students would like least is**

- 01 Rules & Logical Consequences
- 02 No response
- 03 No response
- 04 “I can’t think of any aspect they would not enjoy.”
- 05 Rules & Logical Consequences
- 06 No response
- 07 No response
- 08 Unknown
- 09 No response

### **15. What type(s) of support is (are) needed to implement *The Responsive Classroom*?**

- 01 Obviously, Parental. Also, central office, when teachers and unions become subversive.
- 02 Peer coaching; and time to collaborate and plan

- 03 Staff training
- 04 Additional support for seasoned teachers for an effective transition;alternatives for teachers who find it difficult to change.
- 05 Instructional support, administrative support, parental support
- 06 Directive to veteran staff to take *The Responsive Classroom* course.
- 07 Consistent reinforcement, evaluation—visitation/peer sharing
- 08 On-site (weekly) support—peer coaching
- 09 No response

**16. What will it take to get teachers and parents to buy into approach like *The Responsive Classroom*?**

- 01 For Central office to give us the real necessary support. See your #'s 1, 16, 19, 24.
- 02 Understanding of its benefits to children, especially in the areas of academic growth & responsibility.
- 03 Training/information
- 04 Many, many, many hours of education & training.
- 05 Parent education, teacher education, incentives (new & appropriate materials, training time during normal work hours) new furniture
- 06 Greater understanding, beginning with broader dissemination of material.
- 07 No response
- 08 Time, energy, results—change takes time
- 09 No response