

An analysis of the transcript about the teentalk research study critical thinking ...

[Literature](#), [Russian Literature](#)



The research study was aimed at carrying out an evaluation of a Teen Talk project in a school within the London Borough of Greenwich. The Teen Talk center was a health drop in center in the school. This was a pilot study that involved all stakeholders and was aimed at assessing whether the Teen Talk project was meeting its goals and objectives. The researchers employed questionnaires, surveys, one-on-one discussions and interviews as methods of collecting data. The study, as the researchers stated, was not aimed at highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the program, but to highlight the positives and the areas that needed improvement. Generally, the Teen Talk project was providing the students with great services. There was an indication that only a portion of the school population knew about the Teen Talk center and there was little communication and integration with schools offering similar programs. The findings indicated that the project was achieving most of its goals and objectives but there were a few areas that needed improvement and development.

Factors that helped the researchers carry out the Teen Talk study

The researchers were warmly received and welcomed to the school. They also built a rapport with the school coordinator who was instrumental to the success of the evaluation. One of the researchers said “ I built up a good rapport with the coordinator and she was incredibly helpful to the overall evaluation.” They were permitted to conduct interviews with the students in the program, and also the staff within the Teen Talk program and the school in general. The researchers spent quality time in the service; getting to know the activities that took place, how it worked, how the different agencies

worked and how the young people who were part and parcel of it felt. The researchers were able to talk to the staff and students at length to know how their attitudes and opinions about the program. The researchers also reported that part of their initial visit was to allay the fears about the evaluation of the Teen Talk project. From the onset, the researchers were able to clarify that the evaluation was not about the quality or the credibility of the staff at the school but a potential model that was going to be helpful to both the school and the community. As one of the researchers (Elaine) stated, " It was not about identifying particular strengths and weaknesses of individual members of that team"

Factors that hindered the Teen Talk study

The researchers encountered a difficulty in conducting surveys as only a small portion of the school population was knowledgeable about the service. The lack of knowledge of the service affected the survey element of the research. One of the researchers stated " So it was actually quite difficult, for example, to engage some year groups, despite the constant phone calls and constant reminders and asking tutors." The researchers needed to get a wider cross section of the overall range of students and also not to divide them in terms of their ability. A limited understanding of the service made it difficult for the collection of data. The staff did not help the researchers in data collection as they could not understand of what use the survey element and the questionnaires would be to the project. The tutors could not understand where the whole program sat in an integrated way within the wider personal health and social education (PHSE), school development

curriculum and other programs as well. The tutors found it difficult accommodating the researchers at the beginning of the study. The researchers met the teachers and it became easier but it proved to be time consuming and tedious. Lack of time also proved to be a hindrance to the research to the study. The researchers went directly to the people who had the driven initiative within the school. In retrospect, the researchers feel that they would have taken more time speaking to the teachers who in some way were disconnected to the service. The researchers also arrived at the school with the assumption that all people had knowledge of the project. With time limitations, they did not spend more time with the people who had little knowledge about the project. One of the researchers said “ You know you only have a certain number of days. Your looking to spend— how you’re going to spend most effectively your time and it seemed the most obvious to go and speak to key staff within the service”

Implications of the findings

This study indicated the need of allowing more time and funds to small-scale studies of this type so as to allow broader investigations. With limited time and funding, the studies are not able to capture a broader perspective of the project as only the key staff would be targeted. The studies also revealed that it is not enough to target the key individuals directly affected by the project, but there is also the need to those not directly affected by it.

Another key implication of the study is that it is necessary to make sure that all informants are made aware of the study before hand to ensure their full cooperation.