

Example of research proposal on research questions

[Law](#), [Evidence](#)



1. Quantitative - What effect did the faculty development program (fdp) have on teachers' teaching approaches?

2. Qualitative- How did the teachers' teaching methods alter in answer to the FDP?

2. In a climate where faculty liability is greatly needed on study and research, enhancement in the eminence of instruction is a mounting issue. The progress of high-quality practice of teaching is vitally significant. Teachers at research rigorous schools frequently should bargain on clashing probabilities about method of teaching and conducting research: universities might seem to openly acclaim good teaching, but clandestinely assess good research, principally in verdicts of support and term (Leslie, 2002; Wright, 2005). While a propagation of teaching centers has required to deal with the mounting compound challenges of teaching in college level through the faculty development programs (FDPs), and a scholarship of faculty improvement began to burgeon (Eggins & Macdonald, 2003; Elvidge, 2004), there has been a relative shortage of study gazing at the effects of these programs. In this research, we search to explore the bond linking key constructs of an expanded paradigm of teaching and learning in a research-intensive framework. Using a mixed-methods approach, we depict on an inclusive four-year study of a FDP designed for pre-term faculty to evaluate the effects of a year-long FDP on faculty approaches to teaching.

ATI. The eight items on each scale were averaged to produce two subscale (CC and IT) scores. The pre- and post tests were analyzed for gains and/or losses on each subscale. Paired t-tests were done to find out if there were statistically significant changes in conceptual and transmission scale scores

during the course of the program. Independent t-tests were used to find out if there were statistically significant differences in CC and IT gains between FDP faculty and control faculty. All numerical studies were executed with statistics for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12 for Windows. Cohen's d (standardized mean difference) effect sizes were also calculated (Cohen, 1988).

Critical reports. In each of the four years, FDP faculty worked on their projects over the course of the program. They were assigned to a project group with two or three other participants. Each group met three times with a program facilitator to discuss and critique each others' projects. All 49 FDP participants submitted a critical project report at the completion of their participation, which were then analyzed for three specific categories of evidence: (a) evidence of student-centered teaching practice, (b) evidence of personal statements of change in their approach to teaching, and (c) evidence of personal statements of change attributed to their participation in the FDP.

Interviews. We interviewed 25 FDP faculty members individually within a month after the program ended. The interviews usually lasted 40-50 minutes each, and were audio-taped and fully transcribed. We focused our analysis primarily on faculty reports of change to determine whether or not the data supported the evidence from the critical reports. We analyzed the interviews for evidence of (a) student-centered teaching, (b) a change towards student-centered teaching, and (c) a change towards student-centered teaching that could be attributed to participation in the FDP.

The ATI answers the quantitative question “ What effect did the faculty

development program (fdp) have on teachers' approaches to teaching?" while the qualitative question " How did the teachers' teaching strategies change in response to the FDP?" and the sub question are answerable by critical reports and the interviews made. The research was done sequentially to fully assess the changes to the faculty development of the participants throughout the duration of the program. The research done sequentially to fully determine the change of the teaching of the participants throughout the entire program.

3. This study takes a mixed method approach of research to evaluate the effect of the FDP on the change in teaching faculty approaches. The center of the research is on whether there was a change that may be attributed to the FDP. Moreover to significantly rising the quantity of topics in the research from a prior study (Light et. al., 2004), the design utilizes three techniques to evaluate change. The first glances at changes in how faculty approach to teaching as measure by the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI) at the opening and ending of the program. The second method centers on articles of tangible change executed in or designed for their teaching, as signified in written significant reports of the teaching programs which each participants submitted at the last part of the program. The third method studies reports of change made by participants all through comprehensively post-program interviews.

. Bottom of Form

Source:

Light, G. et al. (2009). Assessing the impact of a year-long faculty development program on faculty approaches to teaching. International

<https://assignbuster.com/example-of-research-proposal-on-research-questions/>

Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 20(2), 168-181.

Leslie, D. W. (2002). Resolving the dispute: Teaching is academe's core value. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 49-73

Eggins, H., & MacDonald, R. (Eds.). (2003). *The scholarship of academic development*. Buckingham, United Kingdom: The Society for Research into Higher Education.

Light, G., Luna, M., Drane, D., Fleming, V. (2004, April). Transforming pre-tenure faculty approaches to teaching: faculty development at a research university. Paper presented at the 2004 annual AERA meeting, San Diego, CA.