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ABSTRACT

A Methodological Analysis of Research into the Effect of Professional Community on Student Academic Achievement

Brandon K Thacker
Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations, BYU
Doctor of Education

This study analyzed all published research articles examining the relationship between professional learning community efforts (plc) (used here as a broader category than, but inclusive of, Professional Learning Communities or PLCs) and student academic achievement (SAA) that reported primary research findings published before January 1, 2015. This study specifically identified primary, quantitative studies of SAA that in context are plc, but which may or may not be labeled as such, that were published before January 1, 2015. Analyses examined how many studies of plc and SAA were of a descriptive, correlational, causal comparative, quasi-experimental, or experimental design type, evaluated the internal validity of their findings, and assessed the generalizability of each study based on normative expectations of implementation and study design type. Each of the 57 studies meeting the inclusion criteria were evaluated using a Design and Quality of Implementation Matrix. Findings indicated that none of 57 primary research efforts examining plc and SAA exhibited acceptable levels of generalizability. For articles demonstrating high design and implementation scores, threats to external validity are presented and discussed. Recommendations are provided for improving the generalizability of research in plc.
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DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

This manuscript is presented in the hybrid dissertation format. The hybrid format focuses on producing a journal-ready manuscript which is considered by the dissertation committee to be ready for submission for publication. Therefore, this dissertation has fewer chapters than the traditional dissertation format. The manuscript focuses on the presentation of the scholarly article. This hybrid dissertation includes appended materials such as Appendix A, which contains an extended review of literature, and Appendix B, which is a methods section with elaborated detail on the research approach used in this dissertation project.

The format of the article section follows the *American Journal of Education’s* (AJE) author guidelines (see Appendix C). Citations and references in the article sections follow AJE style requirements rather than APA 6th format. The extended review of literature and detailed method sections follow APA 6th as required by the McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University. AJE is sponsored by Pennsylvania State University, is published by the University of Chicago Press, has a 2014 impact rating of 1.6 and has resided in the top quartile of educational journals since 2006. AJE aims to bridge the methodological diversity of educational scholarship while encouraging vigorous dialog between educational researchers. Articles submitted to AJE are double-blind reviewed by external reviewers. The manuscript length must be under 10,000 words including tables, figures and references. The target audience for the AJE consists of both academics and practitioners in educational leadership.
Background

Overview

The building administrator is the instructional leader for a school, and when a school is perceived to be lacking in student academic achievement (SAA) the building administrator is held accountable and expected to increase SAA. Professional learning community efforts (*plc*), trumpeted as an avenue to raise SAA (Fullan 2002; Lomos et al. 2012; McLaughlin and Talbert 2006; Roberts 2010; Schmoker 2004), have limited generalizability (Jones et al. 2013; Moller et al. 2013). The mixed research on the link between professional learning communities and SAA provides few clues to the instructional leaders as to which studies are reliable, valid, generalizable and hence most profitable to implement at their schools. This study explores the generalizability of primary (original) quantitative *plc* research in print before January 1, 2015.

This study is critical as misapplying the research linking *plc* and SAA risks loss of human and financial capital, institutional credibility, community support, and the educational future of students. A judicious building-level leader will not arbitrarily implement *plc* if there is no strong research base indicating that the risks are justified by the SAA. A school instructional leader finds it difficult to advocate for *plc* on the basis of research claiming increased SAA due to the technical difficulty in determining the generalizability of published research to a particular school context. To empower the instructional leader in better understanding the generalizability of *plc* research, this study poses the following research questions:

1. What primary quantitative research studies of SAA that in context are *plc*, but which may or may not be labeled as such, are available for this study?

2. How many primary studies of *plc* and SAA are of a descriptive, correlational, causal comparative, quasi-experimental, or experimental design type?
3. What is the internal validity of the findings? Does the design of each study and the quality of implementation support the conclusions drawn?

4. What is the external validity, and therefore the generalizability, of each study based on normative expectations of quality of implementation and type of study design?

**Need for the Study**

An instructional leader, justifying allocation of resources to implement **plc**, must determine the external validity of research linking **plc** and SAA; that is, are the findings of a specific study generalizable to their school? The research on the link between **plc** and SAA varies widely in design type and quality of implementation and, consequently, varies in the internal and external validity of the findings. Many building-level leaders lack the time to determine whether any of the research provides defensible evidence for the role of **plc** in increasing SAA at their site.

The superintendent of schools holds the building leader accountable for the use of scarce resources and requires defensible justification for the leader’s use of resources to implement **plc**. Where the application of resources can be justified by recourse to externally valid, generalizable research, the building-leader can, if necessary, defend the decision successfully.

Meta-analyses of **plc** research exist (e.g., Lomos et al. 2011a; Vescio et al. 2008), and building-leaders may initially accept the results as evidence of **plc** generalizability. However, due to the nature of meta-analyses, little information is provided clarifying the generalizability of the individual studies examined. The focus on effect-size in meta-analyses provides little insight into the quality of implementation of the study or the degree to which **plc** were effectively implemented at the site(s) studied. Building-leaders may not be able to discern the potential
limitations of the generalizability of the studies included in meta-analysis research on plc. Meta-analysis, in general, assumes that the large sample size will effectively and acceptably balance the limitations of one study with the strengths of another. However, in the Lomos et al. and Vescio et al. meta-analyses, the samples sizes were quite small (n = 7; n = 11). Lacking the covering logic of large sample size, the effect sizes reported could have been produced by studies with poor design or low quality implementation. These two confounding factors matter greatly to the utility of the results in a particular school setting. In contrast to meta-analyses, this study focuses specifically on the type and quality of design implementation in plc research, with the goal of evaluating the resulting application to specific school contexts.

**Review of Literature**

Groundwork for the development of plc can be traced to the 1970s and 1980s. When the open classroom teams failed to show expected results (Gamsky 1970), researchers turned to increasing educational effectiveness through professional development (McLaughlin 1979; Runkel et al. 1975). In the 1980s, the concepts of highly effective teams and learning organizations were introduced (e.g., Goodman et al. 1987; Hackman 1980; Kulik and Oldham 1987; Senge 1990). Researchers from various fields identified high work-team differentiation, high integration, performance orientation, and self-government as characteristics of high performing teams (e.g., London and London 1996; Sundstrom et al. 1990). Educational reform efforts would attempt to emulate many of these group characteristics in the decade that followed.

**Educational Reform and Professional Development**

In 1872, the Japanese government decided to modernize their educational system. Professional developers introduced the *criticism lesson* to expand the educators’ instructional repertoire (Mutch-Jones et al. 2012). An aspiring teacher presented an object lesson to fellow
teachers who evaluated the lesson in terms of content, method, and student response. By 1960, the criticism lesson had evolved into a format called lesson study (Fernandez et al. 2003). In many important ways, Japanese lesson study could be considered as plc. The term lesson study shows up first in American research studies in 1997 (Lewis and Tsucihida 1997; Robinson and Leikin 2012).

Long before 1997, the challenge of Japanese industrial and educational competition had reached America’s shores. In response to foreign competition, the Secretary of Education, T.H. Bell published a report entitled, “A Nation at Risk.” Recommendation #7 in this report was that “master teachers should be involved in designing teacher preparation programs and in supervising teachers during their probationary years” (The National Commission 1983, 9), signaling that job-embedded professional development was an acceptable avenue toward educational reform. Staff interaction had already received attention as researchers discovered that successful schools exhibited “patterned norms of interaction among staff” (Little 1982, 325).

Collaboration and Educational Reform

Early research on groups of individuals in organizations suggested that decentralization and site-based management were important for effective group development (Murphy 1990). Researchers, seizing upon the insight that “task groups form a link between the individual and the organization” (Gladstein 1984, 499), called for professional development to create communities of educators influencing the direction of reform efforts at the school level (Louis et al. 1998). Multiple strands of collaborative teacher groups developed. Schools moving beyond traditional lab schools by implementing collaborative groups for both professional development and educational reform were called Professional Development Schools (Darling-Hammond et al. 1995). In 1996, a year prior to the publication of the lesson study research, the National School
Reform Faculty at Brown University developed *Critical Friends Groups*, along with protocols and associated tools intended to help educators improve their practice (Dunne et al. 2000; Key 2006; Nave 2000).

In 1991, Wenger and Lave studied how a new employee is introduced to a set of best practices in a business context, calling such introductions *situated learning* (1991). By 2002, Wenger placed *situated learning* under the heading of *community of practice* (Wenger et al. 2002). Communities of practice, with a focus on continuous learning beyond the introductory period (Lieberman 2009), can become teacher learning communities (TLCs). In Lieberman’s TLC, eight to ten teachers at a site agreed to embed formative assessments in their practice. The teachers met regularly to report on their own progress, to discuss the work of other educators, to consider ways to improve the lesson, and to set goals and objectives for the next round. TLCs needed to be supported by administrators, be teacher driven, discuss concerns that emerged from the classroom, and be motivated by a spirit of inquiry (National Council of Teachers of English 2010). In 1990, one year prior to Wenger’s work, Peter Senge coined the term, *learning organization* (Senge 1990) to describe an organization that was continually evolving. Senge, writing for business organizations, described the leader’s role in a learning organization as that of a teacher. Senge used the of title *teacher* and thereby primed his concept for application to schools. Senge felt that, when applied to education, a learning organization meant redesigning and restructuring the teacher’s role.

There is a huge difference between individual capability and collective capability, and individual learning and collective learning. But this is rarely reflected in the way schools are organized, because education is so highly individualistic. A second dimension of the problem is that educational institutions are designed and structured in a way that
reinforces the idea that my job as a teacher is as an individual teaching my kids. (Senge 1995, 20)

As the prior examples illustrate, many of the reform efforts in the era of collaboration and educational reform were not labeled as PLCs, yet they exhibited many of the essential characteristics of plc. This era served as a bridge to the era of professional community that led to the era of Professional Learning Communities.

Professional Community and Educational Reform

According to Kruse, the five characteristics of a professional community are: (a) shared values, (b) collaboration, (c) a focus on student learning, (d) de-privatization of practice, and (e) reflective dialogue (Kruse and Louis 1993; Kruse et al. 1995). The inclusion criteria for this study drew heavily from the first three of Kruse’s characteristics and combined the fourth and fifth under a PLC’s heading of a reflective focus on results to determine best practices. The following short discussion demonstrates that first three characteristics of professional community echo the concepts of Senge’s learning organization and are shared with TLCs as well.

Shared vision and values. Senge envisioned an integrated system where leaders developed, among other skills, the new skill of building shared vision throughout the company (Senge 1990). When school staff constructed a shared vision for student learning; developed trusting, interpersonal relationships; and embarked upon a program of continuous learning, the staff established professional community (Hord 1997). Shared values provided a foundation for decision making that was open, ethical, collective, and participative (Kruse et al. 1995; Newmann and Wehlage 1995). The focus of the shared vision was on all students learning at high levels (DuFour 2004; Hord 1998).
**Collective responsibility for student learning.** Educational researchers claimed that professional community aided schools in the development of collective responsibility for student learning (Louis and Marks 1998). “Underlying the earliest discussions of professional community was the core assumption that the group’s objective was not to improve teacher morale or technical skills, but to make a difference for students” (Stoll 2007, 3). In schools where collective responsibility for students was high, the research literature claimed student academic gains were higher than in schools were collective responsibility for students was low (Lee and Smith 1996; Lemos et al. 2011b; Moolenaar et al. 2012).

**Collaborative efforts focused on student learning.** Senge noted that the complex challenges faced by business required collaborative learning among different but equally qualified individuals (1990). Collaboration within a school, Newmann et al. noted, occurred as teachers shared expertise with each other on how to best remediate or reteach concepts not yet mastered by their students (2000). Researchers claimed such sharing influenced students indirectly, with small but positive effects on SAA (Goddard et al. 2007; Newmann et al. 2000). One way teachers collaborated was through de-privatization of practice.

**De-privatization of practice.** De-privatization occurred when educators viewed each other’s teaching and then debriefed their colleagues based on their observations. Team teaching, classroom observations, and peer coaching are examples of this characteristic. De-privatization of practice was the characteristic least likely to be observed in studies of plc in schools (Bolam et al. 2005; Lemos et al. 2011b). More frequently teachers de-privatized their student formative data in a team or grade-level effort to increase student achievement in a particular curricular area. The motivation for classroom observation was to allow teachers to trade off the roles of mentor, advisor, and specialist all with an aim of providing aid and assistance to one another (Kruse et.
al. 1993). In view of recent trends towards de-privatized formative class data and the growing rarity of classroom observations, this characteristic was not among the inclusion criteria for this study, being, in a sense, subsumed by the criteria of collaborative efforts focused on student learning. If a study noted classroom observations, this fact was noted as a bonus characteristic for the research document.

**Reflective dialog.** Reflective dialog, a characteristic of plc, required educators to view their instruction through both the lens of a teacher and the lens of a researcher. As an example, while working with Japanese educators on implementing lesson study into the US curriculum, Fernandez et al. (2003, 173) noted:

> We observed the Japanese teachers continually encouraging the American teachers to see themselves as researchers conducting an empirical examination, organized around asking questions about practice and designing classroom experiments to explore these questions. In particular, the Japanese teachers emphasized four critical aspects of good research: the development of meaningful and testable hypotheses, the use of appropriate means for exploring these hypotheses, the reliance on evidence to judge the success of research endeavors, and the interest in generalizing research findings to other applicable contexts.

The concept of the teacher using a researcher lens is embodied in the fourth criteria for a documents inclusion in this study: a reflective focus on results to determine best practices. This inclusion criterion, with roots going back to the lab school efforts at the University of Chicago, is drawn from the PLCs era.

**Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)**

Later researchers studied other potential characteristics of plc beyond the five originally proposed by Kruse in 1993. One of these potential characteristics constitutes the fourth inclusion
criteria for this study. Others were noted by this study as bonus characteristics of the plc research documents.

**Continuous learning/formative data.** When collaboration moved beyond professional development focused on a set of teacher skills, was continuous, and changed the culture of the school, that professional development was called a Professional Learning Community (PLC) (Louis 2006; Stollar 2014). Changing a school culture in this way required time and multiple iterations of practice (Louis 2006). In a PLC, teachers would strive to develop not only instructional strategies but also the inclination to continually improve their instructional prowess (DuFour et al. 2006). Feedback between the students and teacher nurtured the continuous learning process. Using data from common formative assessments was proposed as a critical PLC component in 2004 (Dufour 2004). *A reflective focus on results to determine best practices* was used as the fourth inclusion criteria for this study. Beyond these critical four criteria, two additional plc characteristics were noted in the literature, although they were not required for inclusion in this study.

**Shared leadership.** Hord contended that adding shared leadership to Kruze’s characteristics of a professional community created a PLC (Hord 1997; Hord 1998). PLCs expected those closest to the instruction to control the allocation of resources directly affecting instruction (Sackney and Walker 2005). Mitchell argued “it means that leadership is enacted throughout the school by a variety of individuals in a variety of ways” (Mitchell and Sackney 2001, 2).

**High trust/supportive structures.** As teachers honed their skills collaboratively to improve student instruction, they developed a greater trust in one another and in the students (Louis and Marks 1998). Trust must also exist between teachers and administrators sufficient for
teachers to feel comfortable asking for help and exposing weaknesses (Byrk and Schnieder 2002). Trust and PLCs were seen as self-reinforcing, creating additional levels of trust to allow for advanced levels of community (Huffman and Kalnin 2002). In order to foster high levels of trust, appropriate temporal and social structures were needed to encourage PLC success (Stoll and Louis 2007). Adequate time and proximity were listed as critical components for effective PLCs (Bolam et al. 2005). For example, one study on social capital and professional community networks found the greatest variance in student achievement hinged on the proximity of veteran and novice teachers in learning teams (Penuel et al. 2009).

**Essential Characteristics of plc**

A *plc* is a complex phenomenon (Wilson 2014), and debate rightly continues over what constitutes its critical components thereby avoiding the “cold comfort of final definition” (Clegg et al. 2005, 149) and allowing continued insights into the restructuring of teacher roles. The following eight characteristics of an effective PLC were presented to the United Kingdom’s Department of Education and Skills in 2005, following a nationwide survey of PLC efforts (Bolam et al. 2005):

1. A shared value and vision
2. Collective responsibility for pupil learning
3. Learning focused collaboration
4. Individual and collective professional learning
5. Reflective teaching
6. Partnerships and shared authority
7. Inclusive membership, high trust levels
8. Supportive structural adaptations
Wilson notes Bolam’s claim that the most common characteristic of a PLC was shared mission and values. The next three most frequently noted characteristics were collective responsibility for pupils’ learning, collaboration focused on student learning, and reflective professional inquiry (Bolam 2005; Wilson 2014).

In the Method section I outline the inclusion criteria for a document to be included in the census of articles on plc and SAA. The first three criteria are essentially the same ones listed by Wilson with the fourth being modified to reflect DuFour’s contention that PLCs must be data driven, with formative data driving intervention and remediation strategies (Dufour 2004; Wilson 2014).

**Internal and External Validity**

A building-leader viewing data from a plc study can make inferences from the data. Validity measures the quality of an inference. Building leaders examining data from plc research frequently make two types of inferences. One inference might be that the plc are responsible for the gains/lack of gains in the research. Such an inference is made about the results internal to the research context and the quality of this inference is called *internal validity*. A second inference might be that the findings of gains/lack of gains would occur at the building-leader’s site. This inference refers to the generalizability of results outside of the research context, and the quality of this inference is called *external validity*. The ideal plc research will be conducted and designed in such a way as to provide high confidence in making both types of inferences from the data. While the main focus of this study is the generalizability of the research results to the building-leader’s site (external validity), high confidence should also exist that plc caused the reported findings (internal validity) since the building leader will implement plc in expectations of student gains.
Factors that reduce internal validity are usually classified under headings such as ambiguous temporal precedence, selection bias, history, maturation, pre-test/post-test, instrumentation change, mortality, regression to the mean, and diffusion effects. Threats to external validity are usually classified under headings such as reactivity and experimental effects (Campbell and Stanley 1963; Campbell and Stanley 1984). For this study, only those research efforts that allowed a high level of generalizability were deemed to have findings with external validity.

**Method**

Many reviews of *plc* and SAA limited their focus to those efforts explicitly labeled Professional Learning Communities (upper case PLC) and/or Professional Community (e.g., Lomos et al. 2011a; Yoon et al. 2007). A broader set of search parameters allowing *critical friends groups* and *communities of practice* used in another study found only 11 papers qualified for review (Vescio et al. 2008) and eight of the 11 dealt with SAA. While such a limited focus creates a tidy sample of studies to be readily accessed and reviewed, labels can also be overly restrictive and potentially misleading. For example, some reform efforts labeled PLC lack the cooperative characteristics claimed by experts to identify *bona fide* PLCs. Other reform efforts, under different labels, exhibit many of the essential cooperative characteristics and perhaps additional characteristics beyond those in a strictly identified PLC. As with some other instructional practices, “professional learning communities (PLCs) and teacher learning teams (LTs) can be traced to many sources” (Gallimore et al. 2009, 538) and exhibit varying sets of characteristics.

This analysis of *plc* research was based on a census of quantitative, primary research articles in English-language scholarly journals published between January 1, 1980, and January
After making a determination as to the design type of the research described in the article, this study next analyzed the likelihood that the plc created the student gains based on typical design expectations and limitations regarding causal claims (Jackson 2015; Mertens 2015; Mills and Gay 2015).

The research articles included in the census for this study had to both contain published quantitative, primary results concerning plc and SAA and exhibit, at least, the four following plc characteristics found most frequently to be part of plc (Bolam et al. 2005; DuFour 2004; Wilson 2014):

1. shared vision and values,
2. collective responsibility for and focus on student learning,
3. collaborative teaming and learning efforts, and
4. a reflective focus on results to determine best practices.

This census included all efforts identified as plc based on the above inclusion criteria, even those not identified specifically as professional learning communities. Rather than a handful of studies that qualified (e.g., Yoon et al 2007) this census resulted in 57 research articles. The decision to use a broad definition of plc (along with the use of the lower case acronym for such efforts) was purposeful and facilitated the following advantages over previous efforts: (a) no effective criticism can be leveled that the outcome of the analysis was predetermined or manipulated toward any particular objective by excluding favorable or unfavorable studies from the census through restrictive inclusion criteria, (b) no data from the more constrained studies has been lost to this analysis since a study qualifying under a more rigorous definition of plc would be included in this analysis, and (c) there is decreased chance of
parochial or cultural misinterpretation of the findings since there was no set of trademarked buzzwords used to determine inclusion.

Over 200 potentially qualifying articles were selected from searches on the Internet, EBSCO database, Web of Science database, or ERIC. The online searches used the following keywords, in various combinations: Achievement, Gains, Professional Community, PLC, Learning Community, Professional Learning, Lesson Study, Multi-Tier Systems of Support, Response to Intervention, Teacher Learning Community, Teacher Networks, Communities of Practice, and/or Critical Friends Group. Studies not looking at quantitative measures of SAA as a dependent variable, or containing no primary student achievement data, were eliminated. The remaining articles were examined to see if the professional community efforts described qualified them for inclusion as plc by exhibiting at least the four plc characteristics in the inclusion criteria, resulting in 57 articles in the census.

Each of the 57 qualifying articles was evaluated using an adaptation of Reynolds’s design and implementation evaluation matrix, itself based on Hite’s checklist for reviewing research documents (Hite 2001; Reynolds 2005). Study design components were marked as either being present in the article (Yes) or not found (No). The quality of the implementation of the corresponding components of the design were marked with a 1, 2, or 3 (Low, Medium, or High) based on expectations put forth in typical educational research design texts (e.g., Creswell 2014; Gay et al. 2012; Mertens 2015). Note that all scores were based on published details in the collected articles only. See Table 1 for a condensed version of the Design and Implementation Evaluation Matrix. Actual matrices used in the original analysis are available upon request from the corresponding author.
Table 1

*Design and Implementation Evaluation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and problem(s)</td>
<td>Purpose found and noted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problems found and noted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variables specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context of research clarified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method and methodology</td>
<td>Methods presented and discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methodology described (descriptive, correlational, causal-comparative, quasi-experimental, experimental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Implementation</td>
<td>Low/ Medium/ High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 / 2 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Procedures</td>
<td>Procedures sufficiently detailed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures reasonable for study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Population defined? Randomly selection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>Instrumentation reliable/valid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumentation appropriate for context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training of researchers adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Analysis suitable for methodology?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical information complete?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data are appropriate to context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical significance considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Internal validity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External validity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions warranted?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an example of how the matrix was used, one can consider the implementation component *Sample selected randomly*. If the research study employed some type of standard random sampling, such as simple random or stratified proportional random sampling, a mark of High (3 points) was awarded. If the research employed a convenience sample or a purposive
sampling method (e.g. “three schools are great examples of turn around schools and these schools are the focus of our study”), a mark of Low (1 point) was awarded. A mark of Low (1 point) was also awarded when a low response rate countered the design value of an attempted random sampling. If the research employed a randomized *cluster* sampling method or some other attempt to apply a random sampling procedure that masked the value of randomly selecting participants, a value of Medium (2 points) was awarded. Each sampling method has benefits and disadvantages, and it is the fit of the sampling method to the context that is most critical in determining validity (Mills and Gay 2015; Hite 2001).

Several examples will help clarify. When the sampling was random, design of research controlled for confounding variables, quality of implementation was high, and baseline data was sufficient to ensure that the *plc* was the cause of the reported student achievement, the article received a 3 for the first (internal) validity question. When the research design was quasi-experimental, quality of implementation was high, and comparative data was used to sufficiently combat all potential threats to validity, the article received a 3 for both (internal and external) validity questions in the Conclusions box. When threats to validity were not sufficiently counteracted when using a causal comparative study design, the research received a 1 or a 2 for both validity questions but might, if conclusions were carefully drawn by the researchers, receive a 3 on Conclusions being warranted.

Findings

The first section provides findings regarding the number of articles found to meet the inclusion criteria and the design type of each (research questions 1 and 2). The second section presents data on whether the quality of implementation and the study design provide confidence
in the article’s conclusions (the internal validity of the findings). Lastly, the question of
generalizability (the external validity) of the articles’ conclusions is examined.

**Design Type of Census Articles**

Table 2 provides the findings on how many primary studies of plc and SAA were of a
descriptive, correlational, causal comparative, quasi-experimental, or experimental design type.
The table addresses both research questions 1 and 2 regarding the published articles contained in
the census of studies.

Table 2

*Census Articles by Study Design Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Type</th>
<th>Number Found</th>
<th>Percent of Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal Comparative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a comparable number of studies which are descriptive, correlational or causal
comparative in nature. Such uniform distribution does not extend to the quasi-experimental or
experimental designs, which will be discussed later in the findings section.

**Internal Validity: Design Type and Quality of Implementation**

This section describes, among other things, how well the implementation fit the design
type of the study. While it is impossible to know the author’s intended design type, the steps
taken to implement the study and presented in the article are taken as evidence of the intent of
the author. The numeric rating of the implementation of the study should yield high scores for those studies with internal validity. It is reasonable to seek for internal validity since proponents of plc claim an effect on SAA and therefore must design and implement their study in such a way as to convince the reader that the change in SAA is due to plc and not due to other factors.

None of the studies in the census demonstrated high internal validity. This finding does not mean that plc never affect SAA, but based on the research one must remain agnostic about the impact. This paper adopted a broad definition of plc and included five to seven times the number of articles in the census as past researchers, so the finding came as a surprise to this author. Hereafter is a discussion of the internal validity of the top ten scoring studies to illuminate why no article in the census indicated a high confidence that plc created the student gains noted in the specific contexts of the research sites.

Five (50%) of the top ten studies (Bolam et al. 2005; Daly et al. 2011; Lomos et al. 2012; Moolenaar et al. 2012; Stahl et al. 2013) were correlational in design, and their findings dealt with association and not causation (see Table 3). Studies that are correlational in design do not attempt to determine causation. A correlation study might provide some insight into how plc might interact with SAA but provides only low to medium confidence that plc caused the changes in SAA.

The 16 case study schools (volunteers) in Bolam’s (2005) report to the British educational department on PLCs were presented as correlations and made no claims beyond association. Lomos et al. (2011b) found small effect sizes for schools with higher levels of plc, and included these warnings, “After controlling for important variables at student and teacher/school levels, an additional 7% of the variance among schools was explained by the presence of the five characteristics of professional community, with an effect
### Table 3

**Implementation Scores for Correlational Study Designs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Implementation</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures detailed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures reasonable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population defined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample selected randomly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation reliable/valid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable for context</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis suitable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data use appropriate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat. significance considered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of each problem addressed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All information in original</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions/generalizability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions warranted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Implementation Points</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
size of .25, which could be considered small” (729) and “The second limitation of this study lays in measuring student achievement at one point in time, which did not allow [us] to establish whether strong professional communities lead to higher levels of achievement and vice-versa” (729). Daly’s examination of human capital and student achievement likewise found no significant relationship between plc and SAA (2011). Daly ends with this disclaimer, “our analysis strategy was not intended to determine causality” (2011, 27). Lomos et al worked with Dutch secondary students’ exit scores and four categories of PLCs but found no significant relationship between PLCs and SAA, noting only one dimension had a positive effect: “The reflective dialogue sub-dimension was the only one significantly and positively associated with student achievement, with an effect size of .24” (2012, 123), an effect size that a year earlier Lomos had considered small.

Moolenaar et al.’s research (2012) into networks and teacher collective efficacy found that “a direct effect between advice network characteristics and student achievement could not be evidenced” and is similarly correlational in design. Stahl’s (2013) mixed methods Response to Intervention (RTI) research employed purposive sampling, was correlational in nature, and found comparable growth rates between the experimental and the comparison groups. Each of the high scoring correlational studies provided medium confidence that the plc was responsible for the student gains noted but did not eliminate other potential factors.

Four of the top ten studies (40%) were causal-comparative in design (see Table 4). The four studies (Boaler and Staples 2008; Goddard et al. 2007; Moller et al. 2013; Smylie et al. 2003) attempted to isolate the influence of plc on student achievement after the data was collected. Smylie et al.’s report to the Annenberg Foundation on SAA was causal-comparative in design in the beginning but over time failed to disentangle the focus schools from other district
Table 4

*Implementation Scores for Causal-Comparative Study Designs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal-Comparative</th>
<th>Boaler</th>
<th>Smylie</th>
<th>Goddard</th>
<th>Moller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Implementation</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures sufficiently detailed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures reasonable for study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population defined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample selected randomly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation reliable/valid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments reasonable for context</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of researchers adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis suitable for methodology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical information complete</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data used are appropriate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical significance considered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of each problem addressed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All information in original</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and generalizability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions adequately warranted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Implementation Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reform events occurring in the same time period (2003, 48), leaving Smylie’s findings of no significant difference in student achievement to be based only on patterns or association.

Boaler (2008) executed casual-comparative research of three schools, purposively selected, noting that the demographics of the schools differed at the beginning of the research study. Two of the three schools served as the comparison group and the third school, Railside, was used as the experimental school. Railside students showed impressive gains over the other two schools. In this five-year study, Railside students spent twice the time on subject as at the other two schools, a fact that likely accounted for some of the observed difference in SAA. The time on subject and the difference in initial demographics were never controlled for in the research, limiting its internal validity.

The Goddard causal-comparative research (2007) selected elementary schools randomly from a purposively selected school district. The Midwestern school district became the focus of their research. The authors themselves noted that a more randomly selected population is required before generalization of results can be meaningful. Within the Midwestern school district, self-reported survey items relating to \textit{plc} were associated with increased SAA. Considering the concerns of using self-reported survey data and the correlational nature of the analysis, a mark of 2 for internal validity was awarded.

Moller’s data analysis (2013) drew on \textit{cross-classified growth} modeling theory. Cross-classified growth modeling grows out of hierarchical modeling theory (Raudenbush and Byrk 2002) and shares many of the assumptions of regression analysis. Discussion about the ability of cross-classified growth models to support causality is ongoing (Desimone et al. 2013; Grady and Beretvas 2010). Fielding and Goldstein (2006, 23) hint at the inadequacy of using cross-classified models to indicate causality:
Such model results on observational data should not be over interpreted to yield firm causal explanations. However, they might suggest ways in which interventions might be designed which can then be trialed in a designed framework to yield more firmly based interpretations.

Moller’s database (2013) contained four data points from Kindergarten to eighth grade. Over the nine-year period, from 1998 to 2006, numerous opportunities existed for the educational environment to change (such as the passage of No Child Left Behind in 2001) and thereby threaten the internal validity, since the projections were made in 1998. Moller is to be applauded for applying this technique to a relatively large sample (4,000+ students) and for the careful statistical checks carried out at various points in the data analysis. The correlational nature of Moller’s assumptions limits the internal validity of the findings.

Only one (10%) of the top ten studies was quasi-experimental in design (Saunders et al. 2009), suggesting high potential for internal validity. However, regarding internal validity, the developers intervened robustly in the experimental schools. They concluded that “when developers themselves deliver the intervention, the effect size is more likely to be overstated” (Saunders et al. 2009, 1027). A quasi-experimental study design may claim generalizability of the study results. Saunders et al. is therefore discussed in the next section on external validity as well.

**External Validity: Quality of Design and Implementation**

Research using an experimental or a quasi-experimental design can most easily claim external validity. Of the 57 studies, none were experimental in design, with only three (5%) being quasi-experimental studies; of those three studies, only Saunders (2009) received high scores in the Quality of Implementation matrix (see Table 5).
Table 5

*Implementation Scores for Quasi-Experimental Study Designs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Implementation</td>
<td>1 / 2/ 3</td>
<td>1 / 2/3</td>
<td>1 / 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures sufficiently detailed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures reasonable for study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population defined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample selected randomly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation reliable/valid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments reasonable for context</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of researchers adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis suitable for methodology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical information complete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data used are appropriate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical significance considered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of each problem addressed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All information in original</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and generalizability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions adequately warranted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Implementation Points</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, no studies exhibited external validity. Of the three quasi-experimental studies, both Saunders et al. (2009) and Gallimore et al. (2009) examined the same schools. Saunders et al. (2009), attempted to ensure that the experimental and comparison schools were comparatively similar, even compensating for the mid-project changes in design. Still the authors pointed out two factors limiting the external validity of their findings. First, the schools were self-selected with years of prior exposure to similar reform efforts. Second, it involved only urban, elementary schools with high percentages of Hispanic students. In Gallimore et al. (2009), the self-selected participating schools were also urban elementary schools. In addition, Gallimore’s comparison measures were only taken at the beginning of the project (which experienced a major change in research design mid-project). Regarding the internal validity of their study the authors remarked that “we cannot satisfactorily specify the contribution of several plausible alternative mediators” (Gallimore et al. 2009, 542).

The third study (Pang and Ling 2012) used a quasi-experimental design involving four teachers (two in a comparison group and two in the learning study group) in a Hong Kong primary school and presented no statistical validation that the control group was initially similar to the experimental group. The lack of random selection also undermined the generalizability of the findings, while the lack of statistical control undermined the internal validity of the research. However, the sampling information may be missing due to publishing guidelines as the authors stated that “due to space limitations, we highlight some of the important features of this learning study that illustrate how learning study, and variation theory in particular, can contribute to professional development among teachers” (Pang and Ling 2012, 600).

In summary, none of the 57 research studies in the census exhibited high levels of external validity, meaning that their findings cannot reasonably be expected to pertain to
locations beyond the context of the study. The three quasi-experimental design studies lacked randomly selected samples necessary for external validity of the findings. Among the top ten studies with high Design and Implementation Evaluation Matrix scores, the four with a casual-comparative design failed to compensate for purposive samples or historicity threats to the findings. While some of the research in the census produced findings reflecting a positive association between plc and SAA, those findings did not support external validity and should not produce expectations or inferences of similar results elsewhere.

Discussion

Research questions 1 and 2 dealt with the state of plc research. The bulk of the research in the census was descriptive, correlational, or causal comparative in design (95%) and, as such, only lays the foundation for causal studies. Two of the three quasi-experimental research studies, both published in 2009, looked at the same urban, title I schools with high levels of Hispanic students (English Language Learners). The third study, published in 2012, was initially submitted for publication in 2010 and likely reported findings from Hong Kong’s 2009 school year. In the six years since 2009, no plc research using quasi-experimental design was found. No research studies using a quasi-experimental design have been published on school populations that were rural or suburban.

The highest scoring quasi-experimental effort by Saunders (2009) did not use the terms PLC or professional learning community in its title (Increasing Achievement by Focusing Grade-Level Teams on Improving Classroom Learning: A Prospective, Quasi-Experimental Study of Title I Schools) or keywords (Keywords: professional development, school/teacher effectiveness, educational reform, longitudinal studies, elementary schools, organization theory/ change). This
article would likely have been over-looked if search terms had been limited to those for traditional PLCs.

Research question #3, “Does the design of each study and the quality of implementation support the conclusions drawn?” dealt with the internal validity of the studies. No studies were found with high internal validity. Much of this may be due to the large number of studies that were correlational or descriptive in design and no claims were made regarding causation. The dearth of plc studies with high internal validity in this census indicates that while many correlational studies hint at an association between plc and SAA, causation appears to be a difficult dimension to establish. Even though one-third of the articles in the census were causal-comparative in design, the focus on the linkage to SAA needs to be better established.

Varying levels of fidelity were found in the way plc were implemented using various subsets of Bolam et al.’s nine characteristics (2005). While beyond the scope of the research questions for this study, it may be that all nine characteristics are required before plc can clearly influence SAA. It may be that an as yet undiscovered additional characteristic is needed.

Research question #4 addressing the generalizability of a study’s findings dealt with issues of external validity. Since none of the research designs in the census were experimental and only three were quasi-experimental in design, finding research results with external validity to support generalizability was difficult. Of the 57 research studies in this census, not one evidenced high levels of external validity. In fact, few of the studies even claimed a reasonable amount of external validity, while 14 studies actually disclaimed it. To better assist instructional leaders, future research efforts should seek to design studies that provide reasonably high levels of external validity.
Without clear external validity, the instructional leader, who does not enjoy the luxury of time, may take one of three options in deciding how to respond to the findings of plc research. First, given that “causal research is often difficult to locate and therefore its use is rare in educational policy endeavors” (Hite 2001, 60), a building-level administrator may choose to pursue professional learning communities without claiming that the research reasonably warrants expectation of increased SAA, stressing instead other potential and inferred benefits of plc (Ermeling and Gallimore 2013; Moller et al. 2013; Sleegers et al, 2013; Voelkel 2011). Second, a building-level administrator may rely on proximal similarity (Campbell and Stanley 1984; Trochim 1998). Proximal similarity is the placing of contexts into their relative ranking of similarity. For instance, if a study looked at subjects similar to one’s students, in a setting similar to one’s school, with backgrounds similar to one’s student demographics, then one can decide that the settings are likely proximally similar to one’s site and that one may expect similar results. While one never can generalize with certainty using proximal similarity, one’s confidence increases the more that the study context approaches that of one’s own school. Third, the building level administrator may pursue alternate reform efforts separate from plc.

Limitations

While this census sample reviewed the largest number of research studies on plc and SAA to date, some limitations exist both to the census and the conclusions drawn. Limiting the census to studies that published quantitative, primary results concerning plc and SAA limited our discussion to studies comparing gains in test scores. All of the limitations of each such assessment to capture SAA automatically apply. This census sample includes only research results published in the English language. This fact removes from the census research published in other languages. Second, electronically indexed articles are more likely to be found in highly
developed countries, though Internet searches helped compensate for this regional bias. Third, the fact that the research is published introduces three potential sources of bias: (a) small, single school, independent efforts by principals to implement professional learning community are not intended for publication and so their results are less likely to be in the census, (b) studies published in educational journals tend to mirror the interests of the journal editor and/or journal audience. Statistically non-significant findings are far less likely to be published, which could slant the census towards research demonstrating statistically significant relationships or those deemed worthy of publication, (c) editors’ restrictions on the amount of space describing study methodology may require submitters to eliminate descriptive material that would otherwise be included in the scores on the Design and Implementation Evaluation Matrix.

The need for studies with stringent design constraints, producing high external validity of findings, could be somewhat reduced if the contextual factors most critical in determining proximal similarity were included in the published description of a study. This strategy may stretch the normative limitations on describing research design to clarify design, context, and implementation elements. The additional design and context details would assist the building-level administrator in applying proximal similarity to a school’s own context. Additional research is needed to estimate the utility of each contextual factor as it facilitates the building leader in the application of proximal similarity.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

Future research needs to determine the extent to which *plc* have been implemented on site (Sleegers et al. 2013) using metrics and tools already available (Taylor et al. 2014; Whalan 2012; Wiliams et al. 2007) before attempting to analyze if student academic achievement increased at sites labeled as PLCs. Too frequently, little information, other than self-attributed survey results,
is available to determine how fully a PLC was implemented in the *plc*. Evaluating to what extent the school’s faculty bought in and practiced the characteristics of a PLC should not rest solely on a faculty self-evaluation. An objective measure of PLC implementation should be provided to help reduce the influence of teachers’ *fog of battle* experience during instruction on the self-evaluation survey results.

Since educational researchers are limited in their ability to randomly place students in *plc* environments, care should be taken to randomize the unit experiencing *plc*. Effort should then be expended to ensure that the selected *plc* units (schools or classroom) and corresponding control units match in regard to demographics, learning time, and educational context. Strategically selected control groups within and outside the same district can compensate for the lack of randomly selected students.

The need for studies with stringent design constraints, producing high external validity of findings, could be somewhat reduced if the contextual factors most critical in determining proximal similarity were included in the published description of a study. This strategy may stretch the normative limitations on describing research design to clarify design, context, and implementation elements. The additional design and context details would assist the building-level administrator to apply proximal similarity to a school’s own context. Additional research is needed to estimate the utility of each contextual factor as it facilitates the building leader in the application of proximal similarity.

With the goal of generalizable research that connects *plc* and SAA, a serious need exists for high-quality, casual-comparative or quasi-experimental research. Study designs that avoid purposive samples, instead utilizing random selection of participants, should be encouraged and published.
Imagine a world where instead of spending untold hours reading published research, a building-level administrator can review four or five quality studies and immediately pivot to implementing instructional practices that empower teachers to help students achieve at higher levels. Such a world beckons education researchers to implement quality research designed to maximize the generalizability of the findings to contexts beyond those of the specific research studies. PLCs have come a long way in the 20 years since the professional development schools of 1995. However, the current state of PLC development would be anticlimactic if researchers fail now to ply the available research tools to generate findings with internal validity that support the link between PLC and student achievement and external validity to support the generalizability of their findings to other educational contexts striving to improve student learning.

Do not imagine that these findings assert that PLC do not improve SAA. There are simply no primary, quantitative studies that prove that PLC do so. The existing evidence fails in ways that may not be noted by the voices trumpeting the academic gains of PLC. This need not stop the implementation of PLC but let us not assume that research has as yet established a positive, strong link between PLC and SAA.
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APPENDIX A: EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

Many reviews of professional community efforts’ (plc) tie to student achievement limit their focus to those efforts labeled Professional Learning Communities and/or Professional Community (Lomos, Hoffman, & Bosker, 2011a; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007). Using broader search parameters another study found eleven papers qualified for their review (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). While limited focus creates a tidy universe of studies that can be readily accessed and reviewed, labels can also restrict and mislead. The number of studies examined in such cases is small. Some reform efforts labeled PLCs lack the cooperative characteristics thought to identify learning organizations. Other reform efforts under different labels exhibit many of the essential cooperative characteristics. As in so many other educational topics “professional learning communities (PLCs) and teacher learning teams (LTs) can be traced to many sources” (Gallimore, Ermeling, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2009, p. 538).

Groundwork for the development of PLCs occurred in the 1980s when concepts of teams and learning organizations were formulated (Goodman, Rawlin, & Schminke, 1987; Hackman, 1980; Kulik & Oldham, 1987; Senge, 1990). Researchers from various fields identified high-work team differentiation, high integration, performance orientation, and self-government as characteristics of high performing groups (London & London, 1996; Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990). When open classroom teams of the 1970s failed to show expected results (Gamsky, 1970), researchers (McLaughlin, 1979; Runkel, Wyant, & Bell, 1975) explored increasing educational effectiveness and student learning through professional development.

Educational Reform via Professional Development

In 1872 the Japanese government decided to modernize their educational system. To expand their educators’ instructional repertoire the criticism lesson was introduced into the
In a criticism lesson an aspiring teacher presented an object lesson to fellow teachers who evaluated the lesson in terms of content, method, and student response. By 1960 an evolved format was called lesson study (Fernandez, Cannon, & Chokshi, 2003). In a lesson study session collaborative teams of educators would: (a) select a goal, (b) create a lesson aligned to that goal, (c) present the lesson to the students while colleagues monitored student reactions, (d) gather together afterwards to discuss the presentation of the lesson and the observed student reactions, and (e) make improvements to the lesson plan. In many important ways, Japanese lesson study could be considered as plc.

The term lesson study shows up in western research studies about 1997 (Lewis & Tsuchida, 1997; Robinson & Leikin, 2012). Long before 1997, the challenge of Japanese competition had reached America’s shores. In 1983, Secretary of Education, T.H. Bell, published a report entitled, “A Nation at Risk.” Recommendation #7 for teaching was that “master teachers should be involved in designing teacher preparation programs and in supervising teachers during their probationary years” (The National Commission, 1983, p. 9) demonstrating that by 1983 professional development was an acceptable avenue toward educational reform. Staff interaction received attention as researchers discovered that more successful schools exhibited “patterned norms of interaction among staff” (Little, 1982, p. 325).

**Collaboration in Educational Reform**

Early research on groups of individuals in organizations suggested that decentralization and site-based management were important for effective group development (Murphy, 1990). Seizing upon the insight that “task groups form a link between the individual and the organization” (Gladstein, 1984, p. 499), researchers in 1993 called for professional development
to create communities of educators influencing the direction of school reform efforts at the school level (Kruse & Louis, 1993). Multiple strands of collaborative teacher groups developed. Schools going beyond traditional lab schools by implementing collaborative groups for both professional development and educational reform were called *Professional Development Schools* (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster, & Cobb, 1995). Cosner (2011) describes collaboration in such schools:

Grade-level teams met weekly during the school day in all three schools and were expected to analyze these assessments and draw upon analysis to monitor student progress and inform instructional planning and decision-making. The university network tasked principals and literacy coordinators to provide leadership for this reform work and expected schools to use three whole-school professional development sessions, scheduled shortly after each of the three cycles of grade-level data-based collaboration, as settings to engage each grade-level team in formal discussions about their data-based collaboration, understandings from, and use of data analysis. (p. 572)

A second collaborative strand was the creation of *Critical Friends Groups* (CFG). In 1994 the Annenberg Institute funded the National School Reform Faculty (NSRF) at Brown University. By 1996 NSRF developed *Critical Friends Groups* along with protocols and associated tools intended to help educators improve their practice (Dunne, Nave, & Lewis, 2000; Key, 2006; Nave, 2000). Dirim (2010) illustrated the use of such protocols:

Commonly used protocols involve looking at student work in which a teacher brings a sample of student work and presents the work along with a focusing question. Members of the group then take turns describing and hypothesizing about the work while the presenting teacher takes notes. After several rounds of comments, the presenting teacher
shares what she found useful in the conversation. Then the group debriefs the entire process. Protocols used for peer observation involve two teachers using a predetermined format and focus for observing each other’s teaching. Problem-solving protocols open with the presenter asking questions about a specific dilemma. Participants then ask probing questions and discuss the problem among themselves while the presenter takes notes until the discussion is finished, at which point the presenter shares what she heard that was useful or important for her dilemma. All CFG protocols use specific turn-taking rules, and then feedback given is observational, not judgmental. (p. 4)

A third collaborative strand traces its roots back to 1991 when Wenger and Lave studied how a new employee is introduced to a set of best practices in a business context, calling such introductions situated learning. By 2002 Wenger placed situated learning under the heading of community of practice (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). In an educational context, a community of practice seeks to ask and answer the following questions (Wenger, 2006, p. 5):

1. How to organize educational experiences that ground school learning in practice through participation in communities organized around subject matter?

2. How to connect the experience of students to actual practice through peripheral forms of participation in broader communities beyond the walls of the school?

3. How to serve the life-long learning needs of students by organizing communities of practice focused on topics of continuing interest to students beyond the initial schooling period?

Communities of practice with a focus on continuous learning beyond the introductory period (Lieberman, 2009) can become Teacher Learning Communities (TLCs). In Lieberman’s TLC, eight to ten teachers at a site agreed to embed formative assessments into their practice.
The teachers met regularly to report on their own progress, to discuss the work of other educators, to consider ways to improve the lesson, and to set goals and objectives for the next round. TLCs needed to be supported by administrators, be teacher driven, be discussing concerns that emerged from the classroom and be motivated by a spirit of inquiry (National Council of Teachers of English, 2010).

In 1990, one year prior to Wenger’s work, Peter Senge coined the term learning organization (Senge, 1990) to describe an organization that is continually evolving. Senge, writing for business organizations, described the leader’s role in a learning organization as that of a teacher. Senge’s use of the title teacher primed his concept for application to education:

Leaders are designers, teacher, and stewards. These roles require new skills: The ability to build shared vision, to bring to the surface and challenge prevailing mental models, and to foster more systemic patterns of thinking. In short, leaders in learning organizations are responsible for building organizations where people are continually expanding their capabilities to shape their future, that is, leaders are responsible for learning. (p. 9)

Senge felt that, when applied to education, a learning organization meant redesigning and restructuring the teacher’s role (Senge, 1995):

There is a huge difference between individual capability and collective capacity, and individual learning and collective learning. But this is rarely reflected in the way schools are organized, because education is so highly individualistic. A second dimension of the problem is that educational institutions are designed and structured in a way that reinforces the idea that my job as a teacher is as an individual teaching my kids. (p. 2)
As the prior examples illustrate, many of the reform efforts in the era of collaboration and educational reform were not labeled PLCs, yet they exhibited many of the essential characteristics of *plc*. This era served as a bridge to the era of professional community that led to the era of PLCs.

**Professional Community and Educational Reform**

Kruse lists the five characteristics of a professional community as: (a) shared values, (b) collaboration, (c) a focus on student learning, (d) de-privatization of practice, and (e) reflective dialog (Kruse & Louis, 1993; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1995). The inclusion criteria for this study used the first three of Kruse’s characteristics and combined the fourth and fifth under a heading of *a reflective focus on results to determine best practices*. The following discussion demonstrates that the first three characteristics of professional community echo the concepts of Senge’s learning organization and are shared with TLCs as well.

**Shared vision and values.** Senge envision a integrated organization where leaders developed, among other skills, the new skill of building shared vision throughout the company (Senge, 1990). When school staff construct a shared vision for student learning; develop trusting, interpersonal relationships; and embark upon a program of continuous learning, the staff establishes professional community (Hord, 1997). Shared values provide a foundation for decision making that is open, ethical, collective, and participative (Kruse et al., 1995; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). The focus of the shared vision should be on all students learning at higher levels (DuFour, 2004; Hord, 1998).

**Collective responsibility for student learning.** Educational researchers have claimed that professional community aids schools in the development of collective responsibility for student learning (Louis & Marks, 1998), that Senge found so lacking in educational institutions (
In the earliest discussion of professional community, the critical assumption was that the objective was to make a difference in student learning with increased teacher morale and teaching skills as secondary (Stoll & Louis, 2007). Educators who broaden their scope of responsibility soon discover that collective responsibility for student learning is self-reinforcing (Whalan, 2012). One researcher claimed a self-reinforcing cycle developed; as teachers felt efficacious in their instruction, the teachers would expend greater effort helping students learn, which in turn would increase their perception that students are capable learners (Rosenholtz, 1989). In schools where collective responsibility for student learning was high, the research literature claimed that student academic gains were higher than in schools where collective responsibility for students was low (Lee & Smith, 1996; Lomos et al., 2011b; Moolenaar, Sleegers, & Daly, 2012).

**Collaborative efforts focused on student learning.** Senge noted that the complex challenges faced by a learning organization required collaborative learning among different, but equally qualified individuals (Senge, 1990). Collaboration within a school occurs as teachers share expertise with each other on how to present concepts not yet mastered by the students. An individual teacher may be the expert one moment and the learner the next (Lieberman, 2000). As teachers hone their skills collaboratively to improve student instruction, they can develop a greater trust in one another and in the students (Louis & Marks, 1998). Evidence of collaboration might be found as various course goals are aligned with each other although each course is taught by different instructors (Visschers & Witzers, 2004). Researchers claimed that such collaboration influenced students indirectly with positive yet small effect on student achievement (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007; Newmann, King, & Youngs, 2000). One way that teachers collaborate is through de-privatization of practice.
**De-privatization of practice.** Team teaching, classroom observations, and peer coaching are examples of de-privatization of practice. Classroom observation allowed teachers to trade off roles of mentor, advisor, and specialist all with an aim to provide aid and assistance to each other (Kruse & Louis, 1993). De-privatization of practice is the characteristic least likely to be observed in studies of *plc* in schools (Bolam, McMahon, Stoll, Thomas, & Wallace, 2005; Lomos et al., 2011b). More frequently teachers would de-privatize their student formative data in a team or grade-level effort to increase student achievement in a particular subject area. In view of the recent trend of rarity of classroom observations, this characteristic was not among the inclusion criteria for this study, being subsumed by the criteria of collaborative efforts focused on student learning.

**Reflective dialog.** Reflective dialog requires the educator to view their instruction though both the lens of the teacher and the lens of a researcher. As an example, while working with Japanese educators to implement lessons study into the US curriculum, one researcher (Fernandez et al., 2003) noted:

> We observed the Japanese teachers continually encouraging the American teachers to see themselves as researchers conducting an empirical examination, organized around asking questions about practice and designing classroom experiments to explore these questions. In particular, the Japanese teachers emphasized four critical aspects of good research: the development of meaningful and testable hypotheses, the use of appropriate means for exploring these hypotheses, the reliance on evidence to judge the success of research endeavors, and the interest in generalizing research findings to other applicable contexts. (p. 173)
Attending to reflective dialog reduces the concern noted in a study of 40 districts, which found that community learning time was rarely used to talk about improving instruction (Ermeling & Gallimore, 2013). The concept of the teacher as researcher, with roots going back to the lab school efforts at the University of Chicago, is developed into this study’s fourth inclusion criteria as evolved during the PLC era.

**Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)**

Researchers studied other potential characteristics of PLC beyond the five originally proposed by Kruse in 1993. When collaboration moved beyond professional development focused on a set of teacher skills, was continuous, and changed the culture of the school, that professional development was called a Professional Learning Community (PLC) (Louis, 2006; Stollar, 2014).

**Continuous collective learning/formative data.** Changing a school culture required time and multiple iterations of practice (Louis, 2006). In a PLC, teachers would strive to develop not only instructional strategies but also the inclination to continually improve their instructional skills (DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2006). Recent research stressed the importance of focusing on PLCs as a multi-dimensional and multi-layered construct (Sleegers, den Brok, Verbiest, Moolenaar, & Daly, 2013). Feedback between the students and teacher nurtured the continuous learning process. Data from common, formative assessments were proposed as a critical PLC component in 2004 (Richard DuFour, 2004). Feedback as an important factor of learning has been recognized for several decades. A review of feedback literature published up to the year 1992 differentiated between process feedback and result feedback (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Process feedback, feedback that relates to task learning or changes in learning strategies, was identified as being strongly associated with high achieving groups (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).
Traditionally teachers provide students results feedback. Results feedback focuses on performance acceptability (such as proficiency level or percent correct). In a PLC, emphasis shifted toward process feedback; for example, a teacher compares their initial approach with alternate strategies suggested in a PLC and gains a heightened sense of self-efficacy by increasing the number of instructional strategies available for employment during instruction. A reflective focus on results to determine best practices was the fourth inclusion criteria for this study. Beyond these critical four criteria, two additional PLC characteristics were noted in the literature, although they were not required for inclusion in the census for this study.

**Shared leadership.** Hord contended that adding shared leadership to Kruse’s characteristics of a professional community created a PLC (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Hord, 1998; Hord, 1997). Gains hinted at in earlier research (Darling-Hammond, 1994) required some decentralization of decision making. A PLC expected those closest to the instruction to control the allocation of resources directly influencing instruction (Sackney & Walker, 2005). Mitchell argued that a PLC requires that leadership be spread throughout the school in a many different ways (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001).

**High trust/supportive structures.** As teachers honed their skills collaboratively to improve student instruction, they developed a greater trust in one another and in the students (Louis & Marks, 1998). Trust must also exist between teachers and administrators sufficient for teachers to feel comfortable asking for help and exposing weaknesses (Byrk & Schnieder, 2002). Confidence to voice a lack of knowledge signaled to researchers that the group was indeed a learning community (Richmond & Manokore, 2010). A PLC creates additional levels of trust and allows for advanced levels of community (Huffman & Kalnin, 2002). In order to foster high levels of trust, appropriate temporal and social structures were needed to encourage success of
the PLC (Stoll & Louis, 2007). Proximity and adequate time for discussion were listed as critical components for effective PLCs (Bolam et al., 2005). For example, one study on social capital and professional community networks found the greatest variance in student achievement hinged on the proximity of veteran and novice teachers in learning teams (Penuel, Riel, Krause, & Frank, 2009).

**Essential Characteristics of plc**

A plc is a complex phenomenon (Wilson, 2014), and debate rightly continues over what constitutes its critical components thereby avoiding the “cold comfort of final definition” (Clegg, Kornberger, & Rhodes, 2005, p. 149) and allowing deeper insight into the restructuring of teacher roles. Commenting on the eight characteristics of an effective PLC presented to United Kingdom’s Department of Education and Skills in 2005, Wilson notes that the most common characteristic of a PLC was shared mission and values (Bolam et al., 2005; Wilson, 2014). The next three most frequently noted characteristics were collective responsibility for pupils’ learning, collaboration focused on student learning, and reflective professional inquiry. Wilson argues that while other characteristics (high trust, shared leadership, etc.) may be critical for effective PLCs these characteristics are less frequently found (Bolam et al., 2005). In the Method section, Appendix B, I outline the inclusion criteria for a document to be included in the census of articles on plc and student achievement. The first three criteria are essentially the same ones listed by Wilson with the fourth being modified to reflect DuFour’s contention that PLCs must be data driven with formative data driving intervention and remediation strategies (Richard DuFour, 2004; Wilson, 2014).
APPENDIX B: DETAILED METHODS

Many reviews of PLC and student academic achievement limit their focus to those efforts explicitly labeled Professional Learning Communities (upper case PLC) and/or Professional Community (Lomos et al., 2011a; Yoon et al., 2007). A broader set of search parameters used in another study, allowing critical friends groups and communities of practice, found only 11 papers qualified for review (Vescio et al., 2008) and eight of the 11 dealt with student academic gains. While such a limited focus creates a tidy sample of studies to be readily accessed and reviewed, labels can also be overly restrictive and potentially misleading. For example, some reform efforts labeled PLC lack the cooperative characteristics claimed by experts to identify bone fide PLCs. Other reform efforts, under different labels, exhibit many of the essential cooperative characteristics and perhaps additional characteristics beyond those in a strictly identified PLC. As in so many other educational topics, “professional learning communities (PLCs) and teacher learning teams (LTs) can be traced to many sources” (Gallimore et al., 2009, p. 538) and be defined in various ways.

This analysis of PLC research was based on a census of quantitative, primary research articles in English-language scholarly journals published between January 1, 1980, and January 1, 2015. The decision tree for inclusion of a given article is shown in Figure 1.

![Decision Tree](image)

*Figure 1. Planning/evaluation cycle.*
The analysis of each article in this census first determined the design type of each research document, that reported student academic achievement findings in the presence of plc. Next, this study analyzed the likelihood that the plc created the student gains based on typical design expectations and limitations regarding causal claims (Jackson, 2015; Mills & Gay, 2015).

The two inclusion criteria for research articles in the census for this study included: (a) published quantitative, primary results concerning plc and student academic achievement; (b) studies that exhibited, at least, the four following plc characteristics (Bolam et al., 2005; Richard DuFour, 2004; Wilson, 2014):

1. shared vision and value,
2. collective responsibility for and focus on student learning,
3. collaborative teaming and learning efforts, and
4. a reflective focus on results to determine best practices.

This census included all efforts identified as plc based on the above inclusion criteria, even those not specifically identified as professional learning communities. Rather than a handful of studies that qualified (Yoon et al., 2007), this census resulted in 57 research studies. The decision to use a broad definition of plc (along with the lower case acronym for such efforts) was purposeful and facilitated the following advantage over previous efforts: (a) no effective criticism can be leveled that the outcome of the analysis was predetermined or manipulated towards any particular objective by excluding favorable or unfavorable studies form the census through restrictive inclusion criteria; (b) no data from the more constrained studies has been lost to this analysis; and (c) there was decreased chance of parochial or cultural misinterpretation of the findings since there is no set of trademarked buzzwords used to determine inclusion.
The focus on quantitative results focused on student academic achievement is reasonable because so many of those promoting PLC argue for implementation precisely because it will increase student achievement. This is not to say that there are no other claimed benefits to PLC, but increased student learning is a major focus in much of the literature.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Over 200 potentially qualifying articles were reviewed from searches on the Internet, EBSCO database, Web of Science database, and ERIC. The online searches used the following keywords in various combinations: Achievement, Communities of Practice, Critical Friends Group, Gains, Learning Community, Lesson Study, Multi-Tier Systems of Support, PLC, Professional Community, Response to Intervention, Teacher Learning Community, and/or Teacher Networks. Studies not looking at quantitative measures of student academic achievement as a dependent variable or containing no primary student achievement data were eliminated. The remaining articles were examined to see if collaborative efforts described qualified for inclusion as PLC by exhibiting at least the four characteristics in the inclusion criteria, resulting in 57 articles in the census.

**Data Analysis**

Each of the qualifying articles was evaluated using an adaptation of Reynolds’ design and implementation matrix, itself based on Hite’s checklist for reviewing research documents (Hite, 2001; Reynolds, 2005). Figure 2 illustrates the decision tree for the review of the published research articles. Study design components were marked as either being present in the article (Yes) or not found (No). The quality of the implementation of the corresponding components of design was marked with Low, Medium or High (1, 2, or 3) based on expectations put forth in
typical educational research design texts (Creswell, 2014; Gay, Airasian, & Mills, 2012; Mills & Gay, 2015). Note that all scores are based only on published details in the collected articles.

Figure 2. Decision tree for review of published primary research articles.

Table 5 provides the Design and Evaluation Matrix. The Design Elements section of the matrix consisted of a check mark for a YES response and a blank box for a NO response. The Quality of Implementation section of matrix used the ordinal numbers 1, 2, and 3 to represent Low, Medium, and High ratings. A high rating indicated high likelihood of quality, and a low rating indicated low (or lack of) quality indicators. The rubric used to assign ratings of High, Medium or Low for each section of the Design and Implementation Evaluation Matrix is provided in Table 6.

Validity

Since validity is one of the major methodological focal points of this study, a review of the basic constructs of validity is needed. Validity, as presented here, relates specifically to how contemporary quantitative researchers construct this term. A discussion of validity in ontologically qualitative terms is not germane to this discussion.
### Table 5

**Design and Implementation Evaluation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and problem(s)</td>
<td>Purpose Found and noted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Problems found and noted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variables specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context of research clarified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method and methodology</td>
<td>Methods presented and discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methodology described (descriptive, correlational, causal-comparative, quasi-experimental, or experimental)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Implementation</td>
<td><strong>Low / Medium / High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 / 2 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Procedures</td>
<td>Procedures sufficiently detailed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures reasonable for study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Population defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randomly selected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>Instrumentation reliable/valid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumentation appropriate for context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training of researchers using instrument adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Analysis suitable for methodology?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical information complete?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data appropriate to context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical significance discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Each research problem addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All information in the original?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Internal validity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External validity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions warranted?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal and External Validity**

Threats to internal validity are usually classified under headings such as ambiguous temporal precedence, selection bias, history, maturation, pre-test/post-test, instrumentation change, mortality, regression to the mean, and diffusion effects. Threats to external validity are usually classified under headings such as reactivity and experimental effects.
**Table 6**

*Rubric for Design and Implementation Matrix Elements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Elements</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Low Rating</th>
<th>Medium Rating</th>
<th>High Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Procedures</td>
<td>Procedures sufficiently detailed</td>
<td>Important details are missing or details are scant.</td>
<td>Educator would substitute for some missing steps to replicate study.</td>
<td>Educator would be reasonably able to replicate the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures reasonable for the study</td>
<td>Procedures are appropriate for one of the three (listed in High Rating).</td>
<td>Procedures are appropriate for two out of the three (listed in High Rating).</td>
<td>Procedures are appropriate for the context, grade level(s) and research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Population is defined</td>
<td>The intended target population must be assumed by the reader.</td>
<td>The target population can be divined by studying the author’s claims.</td>
<td>The intended target population is clearly delineated and fully described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample selected randomly</td>
<td>The sample was convenient or clusters self-selected themselves.</td>
<td>Every cluster of members had an equal chance to be included in the sample.</td>
<td>Every member of population had an equal, independent chance to be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>Reliable and valid</td>
<td>Assessment was developed by the authors and reliability unsubstantiated.</td>
<td>Assessment was checked for reliability. Assumption of validity made</td>
<td>Assessment is widely recognized as both statistically reliable and valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable for the context</td>
<td>Requires high levels of guessing. Not designed to measure desired parameters.</td>
<td>Appropriate for student grade level. Approximates measuring parameters.</td>
<td>Appropriate for student skill level. Measures desired parameters accurately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Elements</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Low Rating</td>
<td>Medium Rating</td>
<td>High Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Analysis suitable for methodology</td>
<td>Misapplication of statistical test for the study design.</td>
<td>Statistical test is appropriate for either the study design or data collected.</td>
<td>Statistical test is appropriate for both the study design and data collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical information complete</td>
<td>Only mean, n-size, and significance or effect size are reported.</td>
<td>Most of the critical statistical information is reported.</td>
<td>Reports mean, SE, n-size of each group, normality analyses, and effect sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data used are appropriate for design</td>
<td>Statistics based on data inconsistent with design type.</td>
<td>Most of the statistics fit design type and research problem.</td>
<td>Statistics presented are internally consistent with research problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical significance considered</td>
<td>No test of significance reported.</td>
<td>Appropriate test statistic for design type but low bar for H0 rejection.</td>
<td>Appropriate selection of Chi squared, F, or T statistic for design type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Purpose of each research question addressed</td>
<td>New research question emerges from the results.</td>
<td>Research question discussions are intermixed.</td>
<td>Each research question discussed individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All information available in original</td>
<td>Focus is mainly on results with perfunctory discussion of process and data.</td>
<td>Only detailed process description available in document or from authors.</td>
<td>Original data and process description available in document or from authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Elements</td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Low Rating</td>
<td>Medium Rating</td>
<td>High Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and Generalizability</td>
<td>Internal validity high</td>
<td>Fails to address several potential confounding influences (listed in High Rating).</td>
<td>Addresses 2 or 3 of the confounding influences (listed in High Rating).</td>
<td>Accounts for non-randomized sampling, Attrition, Historicity, and Teacher Intervention confounding factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External validity high</td>
<td>Low internal validity or non-causal design type.</td>
<td>Medium internal validity and causal design type.</td>
<td>High internal validity, causal design type, and insignificant cultural limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions adequately warranted</td>
<td>Conclusions not supported by data analysis.</td>
<td>Each conclusion aligns to design type and supported by data analysis.</td>
<td>Each conclusion aligns to design type and supported by rigorous data analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Given the ratings are ordinal in nature, comparison between study’s aggregated points is not meaningful. Ratings are useful for giving focus to areas of strength in a study or when comparing two studies on the same evaluative category.
Ambiguous temporal precedence is a threat when the targeted outcome cannot be shown to change only after the administration of the treatment. In some research studies the levels of teacher personal efficacy are found to be higher in schools with high student achievement. Is the high student achievement a result of high levels of teacher personal efficacy, or do teachers feel more efficacious in schools where high achievement is widespread? Studies with high internal validity can control for ambiguous temporal precedence by including schools with a fairly recent history of high achievement along with schools with a tradition of high achievement.

Selection bias occurs when randomization of students included in the sample is not achieved. Volunteer sampling greatly increases the risk of bias in selection. Selecting control groups of students in the same manner as the treatment group and with essentially the same characteristics help control for this threat.

Historical effects threaten validity when a unique set of initial factors change dramatically over the course of the research. Longitudinal studies covering a period of dramatic changes in curriculum or social custom are subject to such a threat.

Maturation threats to validity occur when the natural development of student skill sets is driven by changes to the individual over time. Complex changes in the brain physiology occur as children age and develop greater ability to think in abstract terms. Longitudinal studies are particularly vulnerable to this threat unless a similar control group is followed as well.

Testing effects threaten validity when exposure to a pre-test heightens a participant’s sensitivity to or interest in a particular skill. A study that surveyed teachers in a faculty meeting to determine the amount of de-privatization of practice in the school might classify the school as low in professional community while, following the faculty meeting, the teachers implement
increased collaboration after having once been exposed to the concept. A control group helps evaluate the importance of this threat.

Instrumentation changes threaten validity when the test form is changed. Studies running more than one year often find their students testing at different grade levels. Statistical compensation should be used to equate the two test forms before calculating any student achievement gains.

Mortality threats occur when selected students leave the sample. High non-response rates and high levels of participant turnover are both warning flags that this threat needs to be considered. Checking the descriptive statistics of both the pre- and post-mortality group can flag any patterns of potential bias. Are students of lower social economic status more likely to change schools than students from higher income homes?

When the research design was quasi-experimental, quality of implementation was high, and comparative data was used to sufficiently combat all potential threats to validity, the article received a High (3) for both (internal and external) validity questions in the Conclusions box. When threats to validity were not sufficiently counteracted when using a causal comparative study design, the research received a Low (1) or a Medium (2) for both validity questions but might, if conclusions were carefully drawn by the researchers, receive a High (3) on Conclusions being warranted.
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