

## BIJLAGEN

Instrument leerling tevredenheid NEW-plein  
Instrument competenties leerjaar 3  
Instrument competenties MBO  
Artikel ICSEI

## Voorbeeld Enquête gesloten.



### Enquête

Enquête	Copy: leerlingevaluatie NEW-plein 2012
Groep	
Referentie	Voorbeeld
Unit/Locatie	Instelling (Burg. Harmsmaschool)
Aantal vragen	47

---

1. In welke klas zit je?

- A. 1A
- B. 1B
- C. 1C
- D. 1D
- E. 1E
- F. 1F
- G. 1G
- H. 2A
- I. 2B
- J. 2C
- K. 2D
- L. 2E
- M. 2F
- N. 2G
- O. 2H

---

2. Ik ben een:

- A. Meisje
- B. Jongen

---

3. Hoe oud ben je?

- A. 11
- B. 12
- C. 13
- D. 14
- E. 15 of ouder

---

Als je het advies niet meer precies weet kun je het antwoord vanvraag 4 rn vraag 5 aan je mentor of docent vragen waar je nu bij zit.

---

4. Wat was je advies van de basisschool?

- A. Ik zat vorig jaar in de juniorklas.
- B. Basis
- C. Basis/ Kader
- D. Kader
- E. KGT
- F. Gemengd Theoretisch
- G. Theoretisch/ Havo

## Enquête

- H. Havo  
 I. Havo/ VWO

5. Heb je leerweg ondersteuning? (LWOO).

- Ja  
 Nee

De volgende vragen gaan erover wat je volgens jou op het NEW-plein hebt geleerd.

6. Op het NEW-plein geleerd om:

	heel weinig	weinig	neutraal	veel	heel veel
• goed samen te werken met anderen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• te luisteren als anderen iets zeggen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• de mening van anderen te respecteren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• dingen aan anderen uit te leggen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• zelfstandig te werken aan opdrachten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• mijn werk op tijd af te hebben	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• geconcentreerd te werken	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• vragen te stellen als ik iets niet begrijp	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• dat ik van mijn fouten kan leren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• zelfstandig beslissingen te nemen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• kritisch na te denken	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• te plannen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• stil te zijn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• te fluisteren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Hoe tevreden ben je met de volgende onderdelen van het NEW plein?

	zeer ontevreden	ontevreden	tevreden	zeer tevreden
• Voorbereiding op het NEW plein.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Voorbereiding op een andere manier van werken op het NEW-plein.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Ondersteuning van leraren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Zelfstandig werken op het lesplein.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Samenwerken op het lesplein.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Samenwerken met leerlingen uit andere klassen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Overleg momenten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Instructie van leraren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Studieplanner/ studiewijzer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Rust op het plein.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• De afwisseling van activiteiten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Je eigen inzet en motivatie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• De inzet en motivatie van leerlingen waarmee ik samenwerk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• De hoeveelheid opdrachten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Lengte van de les.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Tijdens de NEW-plein uren mag je zelf bepalen wat je wanneer doet. Vind je dit prettig?

1. niet zo  
 2. gaat wel  
 3. ja

9. De hulp op het NEW-plein is tijdens de werk- en overlegfase goed.

- 1. niet zo
- 2. gaat wel
- 3. ja

10. Kun je op het NEW-plein al je vragen stellen tijdens de werk- en overlegfase?

- 1. Ja
- 2. Gedeeltelijk
- 3. Nee

11. Ik weet hoe ik het huiswerk op het NEW-plein moet aanpakken.

- 1. klopt helemaal niet
- 2. klopt maar een beetje
- 3. klopt
- 4. klopt helemaal

12. Ik zet door met mijn werk op het NEW-plein ook als het even lastig is.

- 1. bijna nooit
- 2. vaker niet dan wel
- 3. vaker wel dan niet
- 4. bijna altijd

13. Heb je genoeg tijd om de opdrachten van je weekplanner af te krijgen?

- 1. te weinig
- 2. goed
- 3. te veel

14. Welke vakken krijg je niet op tijd af?

- A. Nederlands
- B. Engels
- C. Wiskunde
- D. Ik krijg alles af.

15. Ben je tevreden over de samenwerking tussen de docenten?

- 1. zeer ontevreden
- 2. ontevreden
- 3. tevreden
- 4. zeer tevreden

16. Wat gaat volgens jou goed en wat gaat volgens jou niet goed tussen de docenten die samenwerken op het NEW-plein?

We willen je nu graag een aantal vragen stellen over jouw plangedrag.

17. Hoe goed was je met het plannen op het NEW-plein in het begin van klas 1?

- 1. heel slecht
- 2. slecht
- 3. neutraal
- 4. goed
- 5. heel goed

18. Kun je in je eigen woorden aangeven wat je in het begin van klas 1 lastig vond aan het

plannen?

19. In hoeverre is jouw plangedrag op het NEW-plein vanaf het begin van de eerste klas beter geworden?

- 1. niet verbeterd
- 2. iets verbeterd
- 3. verbeterd
- 4. sterk verbeterd

20. Kun je een voorbeeld geven waar je aan merkt dat het plannen nu beter gaat?

21. Hoe tevreden ben je met de hulp bij het plannen op het NEW-plein?

- 1. zeer ontevreden
- 2. ontevreden
- 3. neutraal
- 4. tevreden
- 5. zeer tevreden

22. Waar zijn de topdrachten volgens jou goed voor? Geef de voor jou belangrijkste reden.

- A. Om meer te leren
- B. Om de tijd te vullen
- C. Om te laten zien waar ik goed in ben
- D. Om leuke dingen te doen op het NEW-plein.
- E. Iets anders, namelijk

23. Hoe vaak doe je een topdracht?

- 1. nooit
- 2. bijna nooit
- 3. soms
- 4. vaak

24. De topdrachten vind ik leuk.

- A. Eens
- B. Helemaal oneens
- C. Oneens
- D. Helemaal eens
- E. Ik maak geen topdrachten.

25. Ik weet van mezelf dat ik nog betere resultaten kan halen op school.

- 1. beslist niet
- 2. waarschijnlijk niet
- 3. misschien
- 4. waarschijnlijk wel
- 5. beslist wel

26. Als ik op het NEW-plein sneller kan werken dan andere leerlingen dan:

- A. vraag ik de docent om topdrachten te maken
- B. ga ik aan een ander vak werken
- C. ga ik andere leerlingen helpen
- D. ga ik door met het werk voor de volgende week.

27. In welke situatie ben je beter gemotiveerd: op het NEW-plein of in het stamlokaal?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit
- D. meer in het stamlokaal
- E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

28. In welke situatie doe je meer aan je werk?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit
- D. meer in het stamlokaal
- E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

29. In welke situatie werk je meer met de weekplanners?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit
- D. meer in het stamlokaal
- E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

30. In welke situatie werk je meer met andere leerlingen samen?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit
- D. meer in het stamlokaal
- E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

31. In welke situatie kun je je eigen werktempo meer zelf bepalen?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit
- D. meer in het stamlokaal
- E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

32. In welke situatie kun je beter zelf bepalen waar je aan gaat werken?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit
- D. meer in het stamlokaal
- E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

33. In welke situatie kun je beter zelfstandig werken?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit
- D. meer in het stamlokaal
- E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

34. In welke situatie kun je je beter concentreren op je werk?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal
- B. meer op het NEW-plein
- C. even veel/maakt niet uit



## Enquête

- D. meer in het stamlokaal  
 E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

35. In welke situatie kun je beter overleggen met andere tafelgroepen?

- A. veel meer op het NEW-plein dan in het stamlokaal  
 B. meer op het NEW-plein  
 C. even veel/maakt niet uit  
 D. meer in het stamlokaal  
 E. veel meer in het stamlokaal

36. Welk rapportcijfer geef je aan het les krijgen op het NEW plein? (1 t/m 10)

1

37. Welk rapportcijfer geef je aan het les krijgen in je stamlokaal? (1 t/m 10)

1

38. Krijg je extra hulp buiten het lokaal van een RT-er?

- Ja  
 Nee

39. Vind je het fijn dat je uit de les wordt gehaald voor RT-hulp?

1. Ja  
 2. Gedeeltelijk  
 3. Nee

40. Hoe tevereden ben je over de RT-hulp buiten de klas?

1. zeer ontevreden  
 2. ontevreden  
 3. tevreden  
 4. zeer tevreden

41. Vind je het fijn dat er RT-hulp aanwezig is op het NEW-plein?

1. Ja  
 2. Gedeeltelijk  
 3. Nee

42. Vraag je de RT-er ook om hulp als je ergens tegenaan loopt op het NEW-plein?

1. vaak niet  
 2. vaker niet dan wel  
 3. vaker wel dan niet  
 4. vaak wel

43. Vind je het prettig dat de RT-er jou direct kan helpen met een probleem op het NEW-plein en niet achteraf als je bij een ander vak zit?

1. Ja  
 2. Gedeeltelijk  
 3. Nee

44. Vind je het vervelend dat als jij op het NEW-plein geholpen wordt door een RT-er, iedereen kan zien dat je extra hulp krijgt?

1. Ja  
 2. Gedeeltelijk  
 3. Nee

45. Wat vind je prettiger? Dat je direct, als je tegen een probleem aanloopt, geholpen wordt door een RT-er of word je liever een keer uit de les gehaald?

  
**Enquête**

- A. Ik word liever direct bij mijn probleem geholpen  
 B. Ik word liever buiten het lokaal geholpen

---

46. Ik heb geen recht op RT. In mijn pleingroepje wordt wel iemand geholpen door een RT-er. Dit vind ik:

- A. vervelend en storend  
 B. niet vervelend of storend  
 C. handig, misschien heb ik er ook iets aan  
 D. Ik heb wel recht op RT

---

47. Heb je nog andere opmerkingen over het werken op het NEW plein of tips hoe we het kunnen verbeteren. Deze opmerkingen kun je hieronder opschrijven.

---

**Einde Enquête**  




Klas 3B Naam leerling	De leerling kan een reële planning maken	De leerling houdt zich aan zijn planner	De leerling werkt rustig en geconcentreerd aan zijn taken	De leerling zoekt eerst zelf naar oplossingen en roept daarna pas hulp in	De leerling kan goed omgaan met prikkels op het plein	De leerling helpt klasgenoten die daar om vragen	De leerling werkt goed samen met anderen tijdens een samenwerkingsopdracht	De leerling vraagt op een positieve manier hulp aan klasgenoten of aan tafelgroepsgenoten
A								
B								
C								
..								
..								
..								
Z								

Beste collega,

In welke mate bezit de betreffende leerling volgens jou de beschreven competenties?

Wij vragen je bovenstaande lijst volledig en voor elke leerling in te vullen.

De vragen kun je beantwoorden volgens onderstaand schema.

1 = - -	Zeer gering
2 = -	Gering
3 = +	voldoende
4 = + +	goed
indien de vraag niet van toepassing is kunt u een 0 in vullen	

Hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking,

De onderzoeksgroep

## Voorbeeld Enquête gesloten.

### Enquête

Enquête	terugkomavond maart 2013
Groep	
Referentie	Voorbeeld
Unit/Locatie	Instelling (Burg. Harmsmaschool)
Aantal vragen	17

Beste leerling,

Je bent alweer een poos van school en we hopen dat het goed met je gaat. We zijn erg benieuwd naar je ervaringen. Daarom verzoeken we je om onderstaande vragen te beantwoorden. Bij voorbaat dank voor je medewerking.

Met vriendelijke groeten,  
J. v.d. Velde en F. Kerkhof

1. Wat is je naam?

2. Wat was vorig jaar je examenummer?

3. Waar ben je dit jaar gestart

- A. Opleiding (opleiding invullen)?
- B. School (school invullen)?
- C. Schoolplaats (plaats invullen)?
- D. Iets anders nl:

4. Ben je van opleiding geswitcht?

- Ja
- Nee

5. Naar welke opleiding ben je geswitcht?

6. Waarom ben je van opleiding veranderd?

7. Hoe tevreden ben je op de opleiding of bij het werken leren wat je nu doet?

- 1. heel ontevreden
- 2. ontevreden
- 3. neutraal
- 4. tevreden
- 5. heel tevreden

8. Kun je in je eigen woorden aangeven waarom je tevreden of ontevreden bent?

9. Wat vond je van de overstap van de BHS naar de vervolgopleiding?

- A. Geen enkel probleem
- B. Het was eerst even wennen, maar gaat nu prima
- C. Overstap was moeilijk maar gaat nu goed

D. Overstap was moeilijk en het gaat nog steeds niet goed

10. Eventuele toelichting op de vorige vraag:

11. Hoe kijk je terug op de BHS?

12. Wat had de decaan je nog meer moeten vertellen?

13. Welk advies zou je de examenkandidaten van dit jaar willen geven?

14. Overige opmerkingen:

Nu volgt nog een aantal vragen over vaardigheden. We willen graag weten in welke mate jij zelf denkt dat je deze vaardigheden beheerst. Je kunt kiezen uit:

- klopt helemaal niet
- klopt een beetje
- klopt
- klopt helemaal.

15. samenwerken in een groep.

	klopt helemaal niet	klopt maar een beetje	klopt	klopt helemaal
● Ik sta open voor de ideeën van anderen in de groep	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik houd me aan de afspraken die we hebben gemaakt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik neem vaak besluiten zonder te overleggen met de anderen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik werk het liefst alleen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik vraag anderen vaak naar hun mening	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik weet vaak alleen de taken die ik zelf moet doen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik ben vaak niet op de hoogte hoe ver de anderen zijn met hun deel van de opdracht	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik werk het liefst met anderen samen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik weet precies waar de anderen in de groep mee bezig zijn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik weet de andere leerlingen in de groep goed te motiveren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik doe vaak minder dan de rest van de groep	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik help klasgenoten die mij daarom vragen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. plannen

	klopt helemaal niet	klopt maar een beetje	klopt	klopt helemaal
● Ik houd er bij het plannen rekening mee dat het vaak meer werk is dan ik denk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik heb het soms heel druk en soms heb ik bijna niets te doen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik moet mijn planning heel vaak aanpassen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
● Ik houd er in mijn planning rekening mee dat ik ook nog andere bezigheden heb	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Enquête

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ● Ik ben vaak te laat met het inleveren van mijn taken/opdrachten                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik stel mijn werk vaak uit tot het laatste moment                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik heb mijn opdrachten meestal (ruim) op tijd af                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik maak een tijdschema (in mijn agenda) bij mijn planning                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik denk altijd dat ik nog tijd genoeg om mijn opdracht/werk/taak af te krijgen | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik weet mijn opdrachten goed in de tijd te verdelen                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik weet mijn opdrachten goed in kleine deeltaken te verdelen                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### 17. zelfstandig werken

- |   | klopt<br>helemaal<br>niet | klopt maar<br>een beetje | klopt                    | klopt<br>helemaal        |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ● Ik laat mijn werk vaak liggen voor leukere dingen   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik kan me goed concentreren op mijn schoolwerk  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik weet goed wat ik het eerst moet doen als ik met mijn schoolwerk/opdracht bezig ben               | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Als de opdracht lastig wordt ga ik snel iets anders doen  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik laat me snel afleiden van mijn schoolwerk  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik weet heel goed waarvoor ik het schoolwerk doe  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik laat me snel door mijn vrienden/vriendinnen overhalen om iets anders dan mijn schoolwerk te doen | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik heb er naderhand de pest in als ik me niet aan mijn planning heb gehouden                        | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik leid een onregelmatig leven  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik kan goed omgaan met tegenslagen  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● Ik probeer eerst zelf een oplossing te zoeken voordat ik hulp vraag                                 | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Einde Enquête

**Paper for ICSEI conference  
January 2012, Malmö Sweden**

*The effects of an Open Learning Area (OLA) in the junior years of VMBO on learners' competences. How school based research results are used in school policy planning.*



**Working paper: not (yet) for quotation!!**

**Authors:** Hennie Brandsma(\*), Teije van der Bij (\*), Bettie\_Rinsma (\*\*), Fidan Yigitdol(\*\*) & Jeen Lindeboom (\*\*)

**Organisation:** (\*)NHL Hogeschool Leeuwarden/Educatief Centrum Noord en Oost ([www.ecno.nl](http://www.ecno.nl)) with

Burgemeester Harmsmaschool Gorredijk(\*\*).  
([www.burgharmsmaschool.nl](http://www.burgharmsmaschool.nl))

## **1. Introduction**

In this research paper we will address some issues related to schoolbased research and the impact this has on schoolpolicy planning and adaptation. Firstly we will describe the ins and outs of a schoolbased innovation regarding the implementation of an Open Learning Area in the Junior years of a secondary school in the Netherlands. Secondly – as an example - we will give the results of an experimental study that was carried out in order to evaluate the possible effects of this innovation on pupils' learning with regard to their meta cognitive skills and school results in Dutch, Mathematics, English and vocational subjects. Thirdly we will describe the way in which research results are used to adapt the innovation.

We will finish off by given some dillema's and questions related to the use of these results within a specific schoolcontext.

This research is carried out by a team of teacher-researchers from the school under the supervision of an experienced educational researcher.

## **2. Picturing the landscape**

The Burgemeester Harmsma School in Gorredijk (the school) in the Netherlands is a school for Preparatory Intermediate Vocational Education (VMBO). In the Dutch educational context the school stands out for its highly innovative culture.

In 1968 it was one of the first schools in the Netherlands that integrated vocational and general education in heterogeneous groups in the junior years of secondary education. As such it was in the front line of what was later called 'The middle school experiment'.

The school caters for pupils with a wide ability range and is known for its 'pupil centered' environment. Pupils are not streamed according to ability levels but first and second year pupils from all ability levels are placed within year groups consisting of some 25 pupils. Within these year groups they are placed in heterogeneous table groups of 5-6 pupils.

For teachers this means that they constantly have to adapt their program and learning and teaching arrangements to the various ability levels and learning styles of their pupils.

After the second year some streaming starts and then pupils are placed within the so called 'sectors'. Three of these sectors are vocational tracks (Technology, Trade & administration and Physical care & wellbeing) and one general (non vocational) track.

Some four years ago the school was awarded a very prestigious grant by the VO-raad (Council for all secondary schools) to participate in a National program called Expeditie, Durven, delen doen. (in short The Expedition). Some 14 secondary schools from all over The Netherlands were selected. The aim of this program was to help schools implement innovative learning environments and arrangements which could lead to better learning for pupils. In this nation wide program 'practice based research' was used to evaluate the process and effects of all of these newly developed learning environments. This process is described in several publications (lit)

During this period the school has implemented so called 'Open Learning Areas' (OLA) in the last two (senior)years of the four year program (they call it 'Lespleinen'). These learning areas already existed for the three vocational tracks (e.g. technology) but during this period they also implemented this program for other subject like foreign languages ('Talenplein'), (Social) sciences ('Wereldplein') and expression (drama, arts).

In general an OLA can be defined as

“a large open area where pupils from more than one regular classroom are placed together in a heterogeneous setting, working simultaneously and guided by more than one subject teacher and a pupil counselor”.

In these OLA's the challenge is to integrate theory and practice in such a way that it is motivating for pupils but also a stimulus for teachers from different subject areas to work together and to make more integrative assignments possible.

It is the strong believe of the school that this type of 'learning environment' is conducive for the motivation and learning of pupils because it incorporates 'real life' situations (eg, shop, office, garage, hospital) in the school. It is also a better preparation of the pupils for there next educational level (intermediate vocational education) that is all centered on what is called 'competence based learning'. In the OLA's there is also a strong emphasis on the acquisition of 'meta cognitive' skills like planning, cooperative learning and self-regulated learning. In this way pupils can

make their own decisions and study plans and are challenged to explore and extend their own 'talents'. It is believed that this stimulates the motivation of pupils but also prepares them in their further educational career.

### **3. The 'NEW-plein' experiment**

In Dutch education one can see two major trends. Firstly one can see a movement 'back to the basics' On all educational levels – from primary schools through secondary education and sometimes even up to higher vocational education – there is a focus on (Dutch) languages skills and mathematics. The second trend is what is called 'inclusive education' of pupils with special educational needs (SEN).

These two developments together with the OLA's in the two senior years gave rise to the NEW-plein experiment.

In order to prepare first and second year pupils for the open learning areas the school started an experiment (called NEW-plein) in the first two years (junior) for the three major (and selective) subjects: Dutch language, English and mathematics. (Nederlands, Engels, Wiskunde; hence NEW-plein). The aim of the experiment was to prepare the pupils for learning in an OLA in the aforementioned meta-cognitive competences but could also create possibilities for more inclusive education because a remedial teacher was an integral part of the NEW-plein teacher team. Help was readily available and could be offered 'just in time' when the pupils need it.

#### *What does the NEW-plein look like?*

The NEW plein is one large, open and multifunctional learning area. There is room for about 70 pupils (three learning groups). The area is flexible in the sense that it can be rearranged into three regular classrooms in less than 2 minutes. Around the NEW plein there is an extra room where teachers can give instruction to small groups of pupils.

In order to create cooperative working relations between pupils and between pupils and teachers the three subject teachers teach all three classes and are usually the mentor of one class. Every team is completed with one remedial teacher who can help the pupils with learning problems.



Pupils work in the NEW plein setting twice a week; one day for 120 minutes and another day for 60 minutes. This used to be once a week for three hours on a row but this model proved to be too much of a burden.

On the NEW plein pupils work in a regular time schedule: they start by making a individual learnomg plan and finish off with a moment of reflection. In the mean time there are several planned moments of individual and group work. Alternating these individual and group moments proved to be more conducive for their spell of attention.

Pupils are working with weekly planners. These plans are made by the pupils themselves and can vary accordingly to the needs and wishes of then pupil and allows them to focus on their own learning goals and individual learning track. Of course these plans are monitored and accepted by the NEW plein teachers. All of these plans are published in the Electronic Learning Environment (ELO) so they are readily available in school but also at home.

For this it is a necessary condition to have ample computers in the school. In the BHS there is a PC or laptop for every two pupils. Much of the learingprograms and assignments are available on this ELO.

One of the leading thoughts behind this experiment is that pupils are given the opportunity to develop their talents optimally. Teachers stimulate this by given pupils room for their own choices, expressing high expectations and by offering them extra challaging assignments (TOP-assingment). Within every 6 week period every pupil has to make two TOP assignments. These assignments vary in difficulty level and within these assignments specific attention is given to acquiring meta cognitive skills.

#### **4. Evaluation process**

In order to hold a grip on all these developments the management of the school installed a group of motivated teacher-researchers to evaluate the process and outcomes. These studies are carried out by this group under supervision of a qualified educational researcher from the University of Applied science in Leeuwarden.

This group of teacher-researchers made a 3 year evaluation plan (research program) involving several research questions and involving several response groups. The research would focus on three general topics:

1. what are the 'intended' goals of the NEW-plein experiment?
2. what can be said about the 'implementation process' of the experiment?
3. What can be said about the 'results or effects' of the experiment?

With respect to explicating the goals of the NEW-plein experiment the research group carried out a study in which they interviewed the policy makers of the school together with the external facilitator and also studied all relevant documents. One of the most important goals of this experiment is related to the acquisition of so called 'meta-cognitive skills in an OLA' during the junior years in order to be more prepared for the OLA's in the senior years. These policy goals are used to evaluate the results (or effects) of the experiment.

The implementation process.

The development of NEW plein is the result a more than three years of planning and experimenting.

During the first year (2008/2009) the management of the school gives out an assignment to a small group of teachers together with an external facilitator. They are asked to look for ways and possibilities to create an OLA also in the junior years. During this first year a small scale experiment (or rather pilot) is carried out for one subject and three classes for about a month. On the basis of a qualitative evaluation it was decided to start of with a proper experiment in the next school year (2008/2009). In this experiment three subjects and their teachers (English, Dutch and Maths') are included in the experiment.

The development group has outlined the conditions for the implementation of this experiment.

These conditions are:

- the model of team teaching is used (no direct link with subject and subject teacher)

- agreement between the teacher on 'OLA' management
- Remedial teaching takes place in the OLA (a RT is part of the OLA team)
- Development of extra TOP-assignments
- Availability of one large open learning area
- Extra space for small group instruction
- Sufficient high speed internet connections.

This first year was mostly used for further development of the concept (content, assignments, cooperation, discussions, setting rules etc). At this stage not much explicit attention is given to the development of extra (TOP) assignments and the pupils' meta cognitive skills.

During this period all the participants were involved in the process of evaluation. In general the teachers were involved in planned evaluative discussions. During these discussions the day to day workings of the Plein was discussed intensively.

During these discussions the teachers stated that it was hard to find ways to give expression to a more collective responsibility for the management of the Plein. Teachers found out that they reacted differently despite the prior stated agreements.

Also, because of the way the Plein is organized teachers have to work and consult together and do not only have a teaching role but also and - maybe more importantly - a role as a study coach. Both these two new elements (team teaching and the coaching role) gave rise to feelings of teachers' incompetence. In their weekly team consulting meetings a lot of attention was given and still is given to overcome these felt incompetences. This is especially the case with every new teacher who is assigned to the NEW plein.

For the pupils it was also somewhat exiting to work together with pupils from other classrooms. They also found it difficult to plan and structure their schoolwork. The Remedial Teachers on the Plein proved their position and could support the pupils when needed especially with planning.

At the end of the first year the NEW- plein was evaluated in different ways. Firstly in a more qualitative manner by the teachers involved and the management of the

school and also by means of an on-line evaluation for the pupils involved. On the basis of these evaluations some decisions were made:

- the experiment will be continued in the second year for the first year pupils involved (3 classrooms)
- the experiment will be extended to a group of first year pupils (also 3 classrooms)
- the duration of time on the Plein would be shortened, from 3 hours in a row into two separate periods (2 hours and 1 hour)
- The involvement of the mentors of the NEW-plein pupils will be strengthened
- More attention will be given to the training of NEW-plein teachers by means of regular inter-collegial consultation and thematic working conferences (e.g. how to give more attention to meta cognitive skills, how to manage the plein, the development of extra (TOP) assignments etc.

So as a result the experiment would continue in year two and a new experimental group would start in year one. During and at the end of year two the experiment was evaluated again by means of qualitative and quantitative measurements.

At the end of the second experimental year it was concluded that the experiment proved to be sufficiently successful to make the NEW-plein a regular part of the curriculum in the first two years of the school.

## **5. The experimental study**

At this stage we will describe at length the third research question:

“What can be said about the ‘results or effects’ of the experiment?”

The experimental study that was conducted was designed to find out whether the pupils that were trained in the ‘NEW-plein’ experiment showed better results in these meta-cognitive competences than (similar) pupils who were not trained in this new learning environment.

As stated before, some three years ago the ‘NEW-plein’ experiment started with three groups (about 60) of 1st year pupils (age 12). The other 6 groups (around 130)

took part in the experiment as a control group. As a regular policy, first and second year pupils in school are non-selectively placed in classrooms, i.e. each group contains the full range of pupils regarding their ability level. The three experimental classrooms were randomly picked without prior knowledge. Both junior years are non-selective i.e. no streaming according to ability-levels.

In the experimental condition all pupils are placed in one OLA for several hours on a run. Here they receive instruction in the three subjects, make learning plans, work both together and individually in the three before mentioned subjects. They work according to their own learning plan which they make in cooperation with the teachers. During these hours at least three teachers (each for one subject) are present together with a class-room assistant and a remedial teacher. The focus of the program in the NEW-plein is intentionally geared to the three meta-cognitive skills (competences like planning, cooperative learning and self-regulated learning). The control group pupils are placed in the regular classroom setting (one teacher) and there is not an explicit program for these meta cognitive skills.

All teachers in the “NEW-plein setting’ received a training on how to adapt their instructional behavior into a more coaching like mode.

The NEW-plein setting was carried through in the second year. At the start of the third year both the experimental pupils and the control group pupils are placed into the four sectors (three vocational and one general) based on their motivation and academic progress. So these sectors now consist of both type of pupils (experimental and control group). The teachers in these tracks are not aware of their pupils history. Only the project leader of the researchers could trace back each individual pupil into the experimental or control group.

Table 1 shows us some descriptive data regarding the composition of both the control and experimental group.

Table 1: Number of girls and boys within the experimental setting

		NEW-plein experiment		Total
		No (control)	Yes (experiment)	
Gender	Girl	70	29	99

	Boy	63	30	93
Total		133	59	192

Table 2: Number of pupils within each sector

Sector	No.	Percentage	Boys	Girls
Care & Wellbeing	45	23,4	1	44
Trade & Adm	37	19,3	22	15
Technology	39	20,3	39	0
General track	71	37,0	37	34

### *The research*

As stated before the aim of the experiment is to find out whether the type of learning environment NEW-plein is a better preparation for junior-pupils when they are placed in an 'OLA' in the senior years.

As a research hypothesis it is stated that at the end of the third year the experimental pupils perform better in the three meta-cognitive skills (planning, cooperative learning and self-regulated learning) than pupils who did not participate in the NEW-plein program. It is also stated that there is no negative effect on the cognitive skills (final third year grades in the three subjects Dutch, English and Math's) and the final score they receive for the vocational skills.

In order to assess the level of meta cognitive skills an instrument was developed. Each skill is represented by two or three indicative behaviors. For each of these behavioral skills 3rd year teachers could indicate the competence-level ranging from very low competence (1) to very high competence (4). In this way all individual pupils received three competence scores for the three meta-cognitive skills.

The teacher judges did not have any prior knowledge about:

- the aim of the study at hand
- the history of the individual pupils with regard to their prior placement in the experimental group.

In this way we try to avoid some kind of experimental bias. Because it is assumed that teachers from different backgrounds could have different views as to the competence levels each pupil received scores from three different teacher-judges; i.e. the mentor, a vocational teacher and a general subjects teacher. The individual behavioral scores were taken together to get one score for each skill. In this way

each and every pupil received 9 scores (3 skills as scored by three different teachers).

As a reminder we must state here that all pupils (from both the experimental group and the control group) are in year three mixed within of the four sectors. The judges have no knowledge from which group the pupils originate. This makes a reliable comparison between the two groups possible.

This instrument was tested with Cronbach's alfa (internal consistency). (see table 3)

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha for each of the three meta-cognitive competences.

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Planning	.882	6
Cooperative learning	.865	9
Self-regulated learning	.904	9
Total competences	.965	24

Table 4 gives an overview of the average scores (and standard deviations) for each skill

Table 4: Average scores and st. deviation for each skill

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Planning	174	3,06	,81
Self regulation	174	3,02	,77
Coöperative learning	174	3,13	,72
General competences	174	3,07	,72

The intercorrelations between the three competences range from .78 up to .88.

Tables 5 and 6 give an overview of the average scores for each of the teacher-judges with regard to the metacognitive competences

Table 5: Competence-scores for each of the types of teacher-judges

Competences	Mentor	General	Vocational
Planning	3.06	2.94	3.19
Self regulated learning	3.03	3.06	2.95
Coop. Learning	3.16	3.33	2.86
Overall competence	3,08	3,14	3.00

From this it can be seen that the three types of judges score rather different with regard to the three competences. The level of agreement between the three types of judges can be seen in table 6. The level of agreement with the total score is very high. The intercorrelations between the types of judges are lower than can be expected (<.70).

Table 6: The intercorrelations for competences as scores by the types of judges

Type of judge	Mentor	general	Total score
Mentor	--		.86 **
General	.49**	--	.81**
Vocational	.64*	.54**	.87**

Pearson Correlation (\*\* p < .01)

Table 7 shows the average scores on the end of year three subject grades and the overall correlations with the general competence score.

Table 7: End of year three subject grades

Subject	Mean	Std. Deviation	Correlation with 'Total competence
English	5,41	1,12	.61**
Dutch	6,64	,93	.60**
Math	6,23	1,44	.65**
Care & wellbeing	6,80	,46	,25
Technology	6,64	,63	,56**
Trade & administration	6,54	,56	,40*

Pearson Correlation (\*\* p < .01) (\* p < .05)

## 6. The results

The first hypothesis under study of course is the assumption that the pupils within the experimental group show better results on the three meta-cognitive competences (i.e. the original policy goal).

The second hypothesis is that there are no negative effects on the experiment with regard to the grade levels at the end of year three.

In order to test these hypotheses we conducted several analyses of variance for main-effects (eg. experiment vs control, male vs female, differences between sectors) and interaction-effects with the pupil characteristic 'gender' in the model.

### *Meta cognitive competences*



The first hypothesis under study is the assumption that the pupils within the experimental group show better results on the three meta-cognitive competences (i.e. the original policy goal).

*Main effects for experimental condition*

In table 8 the results of the first research question can be seen.

With regard to the main effect of the experiment it can be stated that there are no overall effects for the experiment on all of the measured competences. In general the placement of pupils in the NEW plein setting did not show significant effects on their meta cognitive skills in year 3.

Table 8: Differences in mean competences scores between experimental and control group

Competence	Experiment NEW-plein		
	Control (n=123)	Experiment (n=51)	Total (n=174)
	Average	Average	Average
Planning (ns*)	3,05	3,09	3,06
Self regul.(ns)	2,99	3,08	3,02
Cooperation (ns)	3,13	3,12	3,13
Total compet(ns)	3,06	3,10	3,07

(\* ns= not significant at .05)

Table 9: Differences in mean competence scores for each type of judge between experimental and control group

Type of judge	Experiment NEW-plein		
	Control (n=123)	Experiment (n=51)	Total (n=174)
	Average	Average	Average
Mentor (ns)	3,14	2,95	3,08
General (ns)	3,15	3,12	3,14
Vocational (ns)	2,94	3,14	2,99

Because we saw that there were rather low correlations between judges we also conducted an analysis between the experimental and control group for the competence scores from each judge type (Table 9). Although the differences are not significant we do see that the scores delivered by the mentor are (a bit) lower for the

experimental group. We see the opposite occurring when we take the vocational judges into account. They show a higher score for the experimental group.

*Main effects for gender*

In table 10 we do the same analyses with gender as a main effect in the model. It can be seen that girls perform better on all of the measured competences. The differences between boys and girls are about .5 which amounts to about ¾ of a standard deviation from the mean score.

Table 10: Differences in mean competences between boys and girls

Competence	Gender		
	Boy (n=93)	Girl (n=81)	
	Aver.	Aver.	Difference (s.d)
Planning (p<.00)	2,82	3,34	0,52(0.64 sd)
Self regul. (p<.00)	2,80	3,27	0,47(0,61 sd)
Cooperation (p<.00)	2,89	3,40	0,51(0.71sd)
Total compet. (p<.00)	2,84	3,34	0,50(0,69sd)

Table 11: Differences in mean competence scores for each type of judge between boys and girls

Judge type	Gender		
	Boys	Girls	Total
	Average	Average	Average
Mentor (p< .00)	2,78	3,40	3,08
General (p< .02)	2,98	3,30	3,14
Vocational (p< .00)	2,80	3,26	3,00

The general picture that girls do better on the meta cognitive skills is also reflected when the type of judge is taken into account. All three types of judges rate the girls higher.

*Main effects for sectors*

When we look at the differences between the four sectors (table 12) it can be seen that pupils within the technology sector perform much lower than the pupils in the other three sectors. In general they score 0.6 points lower than average and some 0,9 points when compared to the best scoring sector, i.e. Care and Wellbeing. The differences between Technology and Care & Wellbeing amount to more than 1 standard deviation.

Table 12: Differences in mean competences between sectors within school

Competence	Planning (p< .00)	Selfregulation (p< .00)	Cooperation (p< .00)	Total Compet (p< .00)
Sector				
Care & wellb. (N=35)	3,37	3,24	3,39	3,33
Trade & adm (N=36)	3,19	3,07	3,24	3,17
Technology (N=39)	<b>2,40</b>	<b>2,42</b>	<b>2,53</b>	<b>2,45</b>
General/Theor. (N=64)	3,23	3,23	3,29	3,25
Total (N=174)	3,06	3,02	3,13	3,07

### *Interaction effects: experiment and gender*

The primary results show very small (non-significant) main effects for the experiment. However an effect for gender was found. Girls show higher scores on all competences. In order to analyze this further we conducted an analysis of variance in which we model an interaction-effect between experiment and gender.

In the next tables we show these results. When we look at both tables (13.a and 13.b) we find that for boys all competences are lower (however non significant at  $p < .05$ ) for the boys in the experimental group.

The opposite effect is shown when we only take girls into account.

Girls perform higher (and some are significant) when they have been trained in these competences on the 'NEW-plein' in their junior years.

Table 13a: Differences in mean competences scores for boys between the experimental and control group

Experiment	Planning (ns)	Self regulation (ns)	Cooperation ( $p < .08$ )	Total compet (ns)
Control x boys	2,84	2,83	2,98	2,89
Experiment x boys	2,77	2,72	2,67	2,72
Total	2,82	2,80	2,89	2,84

Table 13.b: Differences in mean competences scores for girls between experimental and control group

Experiment	Planning (ns)	Self regulation ( $p < .06$ )	Cooperation ( $p < .02$ )	Total compet ( $p < .07$ )
Control x girls	3,29	3,18	3,31	3,26
Experiment x girls	3,45	3,47	3,62	3,51
Total	3,34	3,27	3,40	3,34

Thus an interaction effect was found with gender in the model. Girls perform better in the experimental group.

### *Interaction between experiment and sector*

From the data in table 12 it can be concluded that a main effect for sector was found. The pupils in the sector Technology scored much lower than the pupils in the other sectors and especially the sector Care & Wellbeing.

When we model interaction effects between Experiment and Sector (see Table 14) we only find a significant (negative) effect for experiment within the sector Technology with regard to Cooperative learning and to some extent also for the Total Competences. No effects show up in the other three sectors. Finding this result might be confounded by the fact that within the sector Technology there are only boys who on the whole show lower scores on the meta-cognitive competences.

Because of the fact that there are no girls in the technology sector and it was concluded that boys on the whole show lower scores we still don't know which factor (gender or sector) is the most important. To test this these two extra analyses were carried out for gender within the two sectors Trade & administration and the General track. (The sector Care & Wellbeing has only one boy so this analysis is not carried out.)

No significant effects however were found for gender in both of these sectors, (however girls do score somewhat better). So one might conclude that this experiment is not favourable for boys in general and especially unfavourable for boys who in the Technology sector.

Table 14: Differences in mean competences for sector Technology

	Planning (.19)	Self regulation (.15)	Cooperation (p<.006)	Total compet (p<.06)
Experiment				
Contr x Tech	2,50	2,53	2,72	2,58
Exp X Tech	2,06	2,08	1,91	2,02
Total	2,40	2,42	2,53	2,45

## Experiment and grades

The second hypothesis states that the NEW-plein experiment has no effect on the average grades of pupils both on the three general subjects and the vocational subjects.

From Table 15 it can be deduced that the experimental group scores somewhat lower on average when compared to the control group. Only the vocational grade pupils received for Technology, are significantly lower than the control group.

Table 15: Differences between experimental conditions in average scores on grades

End year 3 Grades	NEW-plein experiment		
	Control	Experiment	Total
English (ns)	5,47	5,28	5,41
Dutch (ns)	6,67	6,58	6,64
Math (ns)	6,35	5,98	6,23
Care & wellbeing (ns)	6,80	6,80	6,80
Technology (p<.05)	6,77	6,22	6,64
Trade & adminis. (ns)	6,56	6,50	6,54
Average grade (ns)	6,30	6,07	6,23

Table 16: Differences between gender in average scores on grades

End year 3 Grades	Gender		
	boy	girl	Total
English (n.s.)	5,28	5,56	5,41
Dutch (p<.00)	6,32	7,00	6,64
Math (n.s.)	6,21	6,26	6,23
Care & Wellbeing	No boys	6,82	6,80
Technology	6,64	No girls	6,64
Trade & adminis. (n.s.)	6,45	6,67	6,54
Average grade (p<.02)	6,09	6,38	6,23

On the whole girls outperform boys in all grades, but only the average score and the end of year grade in Dutch language shows significant effects.

From the information in both tables it can be concluded that the experiment has no effect on the grades received apart from the vocational grade pupils (all boys) received in the Technology sector.

## 7. Conclusions

In this research two hypotheses were tested.

The first hypothesis states that pupils who took part in the NEW-plein experiment would perform better on the three meta-cognitive competences in year three as compared to their fellow pupils who did not take part in this experiment. The second hypothesis states that there are no effects of the experiment on the subject grades.

There are some major conclusions to be drawn from this research;

1. It proved possible to construct a reliable (Cronbach's alpha) instrument for measuring individual pupil competences.
2. There are some differences in the way these competences were judged by the three types of teacher-judges. On the whole the vocational judges gave lower ratings than the mentors and the teachers in the non vocational (general subjects).
3. There are strong positive correlations (.60) between the overall competence score with the grade 3 scores in English, Dutch and Math's. The correlations with the vocational grades however are much lower (.25; .40) with the exception of the Technology score (.56).
4. No main effect for experiment was found on each of the measured competences.
5. No main effect for the experiment was found on each of the measured competences when the type of judge is taken into account.
6. There are large differences between boys and girls with respect to the measured competences. Girls outscore the boys by more than .6 of a standard deviation.
7. These differences between boys and girls are also represented when the type of judge is taken into account.
8. When 'gender' is modelled as in interaction (gender X experiment) it can be concluded that there are no significant differences for experiment in the competences when we look at boys only. When we look at girls we can

conclude that the experimental (NEW-plein) girls – slightly - outperform the control group of pupils.

9. A rather large effect is found on all competences when the sectors are taken into account. Pupils from the technology sector score much lower than pupils in the other three sectors. In general the differences are more than .6 of a standard deviation.
10. When 'sector' is modelled as in interaction effect (sector X experiment) it can be concluded that there are no significant differences for three of the four sectors (Care, Trade and General track), but some effects for experiment in the Technology sector. Within the technology sector two of the measured competences i.e planning and self regulation show no effects, but a rather large negative effect for experiment on cooperation and the overall competence measure can be reported. No significant effects however were found for gender in both of the sectors where we can find both girls and boys.
11. In general there are no effects of the experiment on the grades received apart from the vocational grade pupils (all boys) received in the Technology sector.
12. So one might conclude that this experiment is not favourable for boys in general and especially unfavourable for boys who in the Technology sector. Some positive effect can be seen for girls.

These results give rise to the suggestion that this kind of learning environment will favor girls more than boys. This finding looks like to be in accordance with other educational research carried out in general secondary (pre-university) streams which concluded that a pressure on developing these meta-cognitive competences show negative results for boys.

## **8 Discussion: Using school based data**

Since this research was carried out as a 'real-live' experiment within the school, the results have a major impact on the school policy regarding the further implementation of the program.



This study focuses on the impact the NEW-plein experiment had on the attainment of meta-cognitive skills and grades. During the whole experimental phase however all sorts of information was gathered with respect to the process. This information was used especially to adapt and fine-tune the experimental conditions. This process was described above.

However, now the school faces a more substantial dilemma. i.e. the school has to decide what to do with the finding that this program 'favors' girls and disfavors boys to some respect.

The preliminary findings have already been presented during a full scale staff meeting in June of 2011. The results gave then rise to a very lively discussion as to the necessary implications for the experimental program. No final conclusions have been drawn as yet. And rightfully so, because the experimental group (the first cohort) were placed in a not fully implemented OLA learning environment.

In order to come to more grounded findings the research group has planned some 'follow-up' and more 'in depth' studies in the two years to come. This is made possible thanks to a research grant from the Council for secondary education.

What are our plans:

1. Most of these first cohort pupils have progressed to the final (fourth) year of the VMBO program and will sit for their examinations this spring.

It is the intention of the research group to follow these first cohort pupils into their successive school career at the Intermediate vocational level (MBO).

2. But also the second group of experimental pupils (cohort 2) will be studied further. Because this second cohort also consist of (randomly selected) experimental and control groups, the same experimental design (as used in this study) will be used. It is expected that the effects will not be disturbed so much by the fact that the NEW-plein concept was not fully implemented for the first cohort. Because the teachers have gained one year of experience it is expected that this second cohort group will be trained in more 'mature' OLA.

3. A more 'in depth' study will focus on the teacher competences that are necessary in order to be fully equipped as a NEW-plein teacher.

4. The group of teacher-researchers will follow the implementation process and will document the way the research results are used in these discussions and how this may lead to policy actions.

These follow up studies will give more insight into the way this experiment has effect on the attainment of (several groups of) pupils.

During the session at the ICSEI we will interactively discuss the following issues :

- The theoretical validity of the research; are the findings with regard to the gender influence in accordance with other research and school practice?
- What kind of policy routes are open to the school, knowing that this program 'favours' girls. Is there a way out of this dilemma?
- The 'teachers-researchers' are the sometimes the messenger of 'bad news' and are seen as accomplices of the policy. Is there a dilemma and how can it be solved?
- Is this finding a ground for separate schools for boys and girls?
- Are there other intervening variables that could explain these findings?