Triple R Teaching

Hello! This is Anna Geiger from Reach All Readers. In today's episode I interview Nate

Principles of Teaching." In today's episode we talk about how teachers can evaluate education research, and then we go more specifically into things like balanced literacy and constructivism, things that we may have thought were supported by research but may not be. I hope you enjoy our conversation, and be sure to head to Amazon and check out his book. Here we go!

Anna Geiger: Welcome back, Nate!

Nate Hansford: Hi! It's really cool to be back on your podcast. I actually love being a returning guest on a podcast. I think it's kind of special because you get to know the host a little bit better.

Anna Geiger: When I talked to you a long time ago, I'm sure it was over a year ago, I had wanted to talk to you about research and how that works and how teachers can understand it, because that's something you've spent a lot of time on.

Now we get to talk about your book in which you really break that down for teachers called "The Scientific Principles of Teaching: Bridging the Divide Between Educational Practice and Research." I was able to get an advanced copy and read through it, and my notes are all over it.

I would love to talk about why you wrote it and what it's going to do for teachers. What was your goal in writing it?

Nate Hansford: I think my main goal was to promote teacher self-efficacy. I think we've been inundated by the celebrity model in education of, "I'm the expert, therefore you should trust my opinion, and everything I say is science and fact." We're in the science of reading movement now, and I think that's largely been a good thing, but at the same time, I think we're still kind of trapped a little bit in that celebrity model. There are a lot of celebrities in that space, and sometimes they do sort of say, "It's

science because I said so." This is not to pick on any one individual person, but I think that's a dangerous idea.

I've heard some people defend it and say, "Well science is too complex for teachers to understand; they're not scientists. They just have to listen to trusted experts." I think that's really problematic because how are they determining who's the expert if they don't have any base-level understanding of science themselves?

So part of the goal of writing the book was to give teachers a very basic understanding of science, when it comes to social sciences at least, so that they can understand if the arguments they're hearing make sense from a scientific perspective, but it was also to give them a broad overview and summary of education research so that they would have an informed position or understanding when they heard new information.

The real goal was so that teachers could evaluate scientific claims themselves with some level of efficacy because I really think if we want to have an evidence-based teaching movement, we need to have teachers who understand evidence.

Anna Geiger: You've talked in the book about how there's this divide between educational practice and research. In other words, what teachers are doing may not be informed by research, or we think something is, but it's not. Why do you think there is that divide?

Nate Hansford: I think it comes right back to the same thing about celebrity culture. Even in universities, I think that exists. How many professors absorbed that Fountas & Pinnell/Lucy Calkins/Marie Clay model of reading instruction? Not necessarily because their research arguments were compelling, because they didn't really present a lot of research, but because the story they were selling sounded compelling. I feel like we've just been inundated with that for so long.

Look at learning styles. I think a lot of people in that evidence-based teaching perspective know that teaching to learning styles isn't really an evidence-based pedagogy or teaching method, and yet it was so popular. I live in Canada, and we actually put it into law. We had policies by the Ontario government saying, "You will teach to learning styles," and it was like every single program or class or course I ever took in education said, "You have to teach to learning styles."

In fact I remember thinking, even before I had learned anything about research, that there was just something about it that just didn't sit right with me. It didn't make sense

in the sense that I get this boxed quiz personality test and I find out my personality, and then suddenly the teacher's going to know better how to teach me?

It just doesn't seem to make a ton of sense. If you're a musical learner and your teacher is teaching you via musical style, is that really going to be effective? Am I going to learn math via music? Does my music or math teacher need to make a rap about every single formula? It just seems so impractical and illogical.

Yet it was a very attractive idea to a lot of people, I think, because like a lot of pseudoscience, it hinges on a little bit of truth. I think that's what pseudoscience in general does; it takes a kernel of truth and tries to make it universal.

I think we all do learn a little differently. I'm sure somebody would debate me on that, but I think most people would accept that. We all have different strengths and weaknesses. There are definitely people out there who seem to be better at math than language, although I would even argue a lot of that might be coming down more to personal preference because they are actually similar parts of the brain where we learn that skill, but I think that little kernel of truth made people really willing to accept that idea of learning styles.

I think it's led to a big divide between what is popular in education versus what is evidence-based, and I've seen a tremendous amount of progress in that regard over the last four years.

When I first started talking about this and writing about this and blogging about this, I just felt like I was this one weirdo in the dark screaming out on the internet like, "Hey, everything that's popular is not backed by research, and everything that's backed by research is not popular!"

It's probably nothing to do with me, by the way, but it does really feel like a lot more people have come into this space and are having a lot of success. Shout out to Emily Hanford who did her podcast, "Sold a Story," on this very topic, a little microcosm of it at least, and millions of people listened to that podcast.

I think we've made progress, but I think we've got to be careful that we don't fall down the same rabbit hole. I do see people who are selling programs, for lack of a better word, and I'm not going to throw any individual under a bus, but they are trying to claim the science of reading is very specific to their topic or their program. I've heard people say this exactly, "My program is the REAL science of reading program." Whereas

I don't know that you'd find too many real experts who would agree with that statement.

Anna Geiger: I think, first of all, it's this whole idea of understanding what exactly scientifically based research is, and what that even means for something to be research-based.

I know when I had my first balanced literacy course that I sold a number of years ago, I had somebody ask me, "My principal wants to know if it's research-based."

At the time, I was like, "Well, I think so. I mean, I'm doing it!" - it was a balanced literacy course. I was like, "Well, it's based on the work of Fountas & Pinnell and Lucy Calkins." That's what I told them. That's literally what I told them. My assumption was that they'd done the research and I was following in their footsteps, so yeah, it was. But I didn't even know where to go from that.

That's a really nice thing about the beginning of your book is it really lays out what exactly is scientifically based research, and you talk about all the little picky things that we need to know without getting too deep. You talked about effect size and things like that in a way that's very readable. I think teachers might want to read it a couple of times, but it's definitely very readable, which is great because when you first get your hands on a scientific study, it's very overwhelming.

There was a quote in a book I read, "The Reading Glitch," that said, "For most teachers, the idea of sitting with a research article is about as appealing as eating a bowl of cold sauerkraut," which I agree with, at least at first.

You show us things to point out, you show us things to take a look at, and you're also good at helping teachers see the gaps in the study or what makes a study unreliable, or maybe not as trustworthy as we might like.

Maybe we can talk about that, what are some factors that affect the quality of a study? Like people say, you can find a study to support anything, but that doesn't mean you're going to find a quality study to support anything. What are some things that regular teachers can keep their eyes out for?

Nate Hansford: The first thing I would point out is to identify what kind of research it is, because I would say 90% of research, and this is a rough estimate, I'm not citing an

exact figure here, but I would say 90% of education research is either theoretical or a case study. That's problematic because those aren't really studies.

I think when people hear the word "peer-reviewed" or "in a research journal" or "this is written by a researcher," they assume that it's science, and that's not really accurate. There are so many papers that aren't REALLY science. Even the Reading Rope, and not to throw the Reading Rope under the bus, it's a great graphic, but I often see people's cite that as science. In fact, I've even seen reading companies cite, "My program is efficacious because of the Reading Rope."

I'm like, "Whaaaaaat are you talking about?" when I see that, because that's not a study on their program, that's a visual representation of a theory of reading instruction. You can't cite the Reading Rope as scientific evidence because it's not science, it's a visual representation of a theory.

One thing we can think about as the basic scientific model for all sciences is we that have to test ideas. We have to have experiments. In education, generally, the basic model of an experiment is that when we test, one group gets the treatment or the teaching method that we want to test, and one group does not. If you have a study that has a control group and a treatment group, you automatically know this is a real scientific study on teaching.

If you have a paper that's like, "We have one group of students," then that's a case study. It can be interesting and it can give us interesting data, but it's not really a hard science version of education research.

Similarly, if you have no case study and you just see a summary of their opinion, then you know again, that's more of a theoretical paper. A lot of things that get published in education journals are just that, either a case study or a scientific theoretical paper.

The basic study format is a treatment group versus a control group. That's the first thing to look for.

Generally speaking though, I don't think teachers should read individual studies unless there's only one study on the topic. Let's say you're thinking about adopting a program and you find out the company has a study on their website. Well then, it might make sense to read that study and get a little bit of understanding of it.

For the most part, it's something to avoid because education studies can show a really wide range of results. I've talked about this before. I think this leads to the myth of, well, science can't make up its mind.

I've talked about this before with the analogy of the egg. Everybody's heard on the radio or the news, "A new study shows eggs are good for you," or "a new study shows eggs are bad for you."

They're like, "Oh, scientists can't make up their mind!"

It's not that the scientists can't make up their mind, it's just that we see variability in science! So you have to look at what does the average result show. That's why looking at one study, especially the one new study, is really kind of useless for the most part, because unless you read every study on a topic, you actually don't really understand what the science shows on the topic.

Luckily, we have papers that summarize all of the research on a topic, and the best form of this, in my opinion, is meta-analysis because it'll tell you what was the average result.

As an example, I am submitting a meta-analysis for peer review on Reading Recovery. It's not published yet, but I did publish a summary to my blog. In that study, we found some Reading Recovery studies showed really, really positive large effect sizes. In fact, we found one study with an effect size over 3, which is enormous for Reading Recovery!

Anna Geiger: Right, that's crazy. Crazy.

Nate Hansford: And we found studies with negative effect sizes where the students who got the Reading Recovery treatment did worse than the students who did not receive the treatment.

So if I want to prove Reading Recovery works, I would just cite the study that shows the effect size of 3. If I want to prove it doesn't work, I could just cite the study that has a negative effect size.

That's why it really doesn't make sense for teachers to be reading one individual study unless it's the only study on the topic. If it is, then you've got to be like, "Well, that's interesting. We've got one study, but we need to see more research."

That's why, generally speaking, if you're a teacher, I think it makes more sense to read a meta-analysis that's going to tell you what does ALL of the research show instead of trying to read all of the studies for yourself or become super literate on evaluating the quality of individual studies and trying to pick out what's the best study on the topic, because that gets real complex real fast.

Anna Geiger: How can a teacher evaluate the quality of a meta-analysis? They're not all created equal either, are they?

Nate Hansford: No, they're not. There are tons of criticism papers out there of meta-analysis, and I will throw one little dig at the people who write those criticisms. I think usually when people write a criticism, it's because they don't like the results of a specific meta-analysis. They're kind of grumpy, and this meta-analysis proves something works that they hate or vice versa, it proves something doesn't work that they love, and they want to be like, "Ah, the real problem is the meta-analysis."

That said, a good meta-analysis should be only looking at experimental studies, studies that have a treatment group and a control group. When you look at meta-analyses that are done before the 2000s, and there are tons of them, oftentimes they included studies that were both, the case studies where it's just the treatment group and no control group. That creates really enormous effect sizes if you include those studies.

Generally speaking, if you do a meta-analysis, the first thing I would say to look for is did they exclude case studies? You go to the inclusion criteria section and you read the section that says did they exclude studies without control groups? If they didn't exclude studies without control groups, it's not going to be a very good meta-analysis, truthfully. There are some exceptions to that rule, but it's too complicated to get into in a podcast.

Another thing to look for is did they use a moderator analysis? I say that because a moderator analysis shows how results changed in different scenarios, because sometimes meta-analysis shows a pedagogy works or a teaching method works in one scenario, but not another.

For example, there was a growth mindset meta-analysis that came up last year, and it got criticized because they gave one effect size, and they didn't really have a good moderator analysis. They didn't show how does this change across different scenarios?

Anna Geiger: Okay, gotcha.

Nate Hansford: Looking to see do they have that moderator analysis is another key thing for me.

Then some of the really high quality meta-analyses will have even more advanced stuff like a regression analysis, or they'll include things like what were the results for standardized assessments, because studies that don't use standardized assessments tend to show higher results.

The more level of control, the more they've modeled what happens in different scenarios, what did different kinds of studies show, in my opinion, the better the paper is.

Anna Geiger: Your book tackles a lot of different pedagogies, as you call them, in education. For example, you talked about multiple intelligences theory and learning styles, and we talked about that a little bit previously. In general, what are some education fads that have been popular over the years or even currently that aren't based on science?

Nate Hansford: Yeah, I think obviously the big one that's going to come to mind for us right now is balanced literacy.

Here's a funny story, I saw Shanahan a couple of years ago write in response to an article I wrote criticizing balanced literacy. He wrote, "There's no such thing as balanced literacy." He didn't qualify it in any way, and I actually emailed him about it a couple weeks later and I was like, "What is he talking about? Obviously there's a thing called balanced literacy. I was taught all about it in university and all these teachers are teaching balanced literacy!"

But I think he's right. The reason I say that is because when I look at the definitions of balanced literacy and I look at the definitions of whole language, I can't tell the difference. I really think, truthfully, that balanced literacy is a rebranding of whole

language.

I think the same could be said for science of reading. I think in a lot of ways science of reading was just a rebrand of systematic phonics, because with systematic phonics, the big criticism you got was that they're only teaching phonics. So we came up with this term of structured literacy or science of reading, and we're like, "No, it's not just phonics. It's other things too!" It was a good rebranding; I think it worked really well.

I think with balanced literacy they were trying to say, "Oh, we're not JUST teaching whole words. We're teaching phonics too, a little bit of phonics, a little bit."

The problem is that if you look at a whole language definition, they said the same thing because whole word instruction actually came before whole language instruction. It was just that they were teaching kids to memorize words. They weren't teaching phonics, so they came out with whole language and said, "We teach ALL of language, including phonics," and it's really all the same stuff.

We've been really having the same debate for 20 years, but truthfully, it's kind of been settled for 20 years from a science perspective, in my opinion. We know a systematic phonics approach, or a science of reading approach, or a structured literacy approach, whatever you want to call it, is more effective than a whole language approach or a whole word approach. That's the really big one out there right now.

I think another one that comes up a lot more in math is this idea of inquiry-based learning. You hear things like productive struggle or you hear discovery-based learning. Not in my current school board, but in previous school boards, I won't say any specific ones, I've been told things like, "Never teach the kids a math formula." I hear that all the time.

It was funny, I got in a debate on Twitter about that and somebody said, "Nobody's saying that."

Somebody angrily replied to them saying, "I'M saying that!"

I was like, "Okay, yes, there are people because this person's arguing for it," but there's no research to support this idea of never teaching formulas.

I think in a lot of ways, the whole language movement is really connected to this idea of not teaching directly, not teaching explicitly. It really is just like a reinvention of the same argument. We're really talking about explicit instruction versus implicit instruction, and, for the most part, research seems to support a more explicit approach over a less explicit approach.

I think the danger of having that discussion too is that we can get into this dichotomy of saying it's DI versus inquiry-based learning, and that's probably not true. There are probably incidences where we want to use inquiry-based learning and there are probably incidents where we want to use explicit instruction or direct instruction, whatever you want to call it.

We really need to find that balance. The term balanced literacy is actually not a terrible term. We do need to have a balance of things in our instruction, and we need to consider the holistic well-being of the kid as well as their academic success. But largely, we know that the more explicit your instruction is, probably the better the academic outcomes are going to be.

A lot of what we need to do in a classroom, I think, is balancing how do we make school a fun and engaging place, while also making it a place where they're going to learn a lot?

Anna Geiger: Yeah. Well let's talk a little bit more then about Chapter 13, which is constructivist teaching versus traditional teaching. Can you talk a little bit about the way you see the difference between traditional and constructivist teaching? How are they different? I know there's a lot of nuance in there in terms of things that are hard to tease out, so maybe talk to us about that.

Nate Hansford: Yeah, well it is incredibly difficult to talk about actually because there's so much complexity here and nuance.\

Constructivism was originally a learning theory that basically said learning doesn't happen in a straight line; it's going to be unique to every student, and their social experiences are going to impact it. There's some truth to that. How many people learned all of their learning in a specific sequence exactly as their teacher intended them to learn?

Whereas the traditional understanding of learning really came more from this idea of learning being linear - you learn step one, you learn step two, you learn step three, you learn step four - and your teacher gives that knowledge to you.

Whereas the constructivist idea was, well, kids are going to discover some knowledge. They're going to discover some from here, some from there, and they're going to really make their own understanding.

If I have to say which learning theory is better, I'd say constructivism, but then we get into can we teach based on a constructivist model and be like, "We're going to intentionally make our teaching non-linear and non-explicit," then it gets a lot more foggy.

This is a shout out to Corey Peltier who is always saying it's not supposed to be a teaching method, it's supposed to be a theory of learning. We had a whole bunch of teaching methods that were based on this constructivist learning idea, and to some extent, we can say this fits under a progressive model under education.

I kind of hate that idea because it phrases this as a left versus right thing, and I think that's a very dangerous idea. I don't want to politicize education. There are good ideas on the left about education and there are good ideas on the right about education. Which I hate to say because truthfully, I'm not very right wing, I'm pretty left wing, I'm pretty progressive myself.

But when we break that into a teaching method, it becomes very difficult to teach based on this linear step-by-step method.

Then evaluating it is even more difficult because, like I said, there's not one constructivist teaching method. It's like a hydra; it has ten heads and there are so many different ideas and schools of thought.

Here's a shout out to someone who I don't agree with, generally speaking. I've seen Dr. Sam refer to balanced literacy and whole language as a constructivist teaching model for reading instruction. I would actually agree with him on this point, that it's a constructivist approach to teaching reading. Where we would disagree is I would say that that's probably not a good idea, and he would probably say it is.

Some things included in that constructivist model include things like problem-based learning, discovery-based learning, inquiry-based learning. These are all just different constructivist models. Even some of these ideas like cooperative-based learning fit into this constructivist model too.

If you want to ask, is constructivist teaching effective, then you've first got to ask, well, which version of it? Because there are so many different versions.

Then you have to ask the question, in what context? Because okay, maybe discovery-based learning doesn't work, but does problem-based learning work, and does it work for a certain subject or a certain grade? Those are all very different questions. Phrasing things in this dichotomous lens is difficult.

I will say that this is one area where I think the media and education do a bad job of reporting on sciences. We often refer to things as evidence-based or not, good or bad, science-based or not. Generally speaking, it's probably more of a continuum of evidence. Does something have a lot of evidence, a little bit of evidence, or some evidence? Where's the context which makes sense?

Unfortunately I think it's really easy from a marketing perspective on all sides of these debates to just say, "This is the answer." Saying something really nuanced is not very sellable, it's not very marketable, because people want easy answers. I think we have to always balance being...

You and I are in a similar role. We're both teachers. We're both trying to communicate science to some extent to teachers. I think we fall into this problem where the more we simplify what we say, the more marketable it becomes, the more easy it is for people to understand, but the less likely that what we're saying is accurate. Then the more accurate we become, the more nuanced we become, the harder it becomes for teachers to follow what we're trying to say, the harder it becomes-

Anna Geiger: Yeah, that's all so true. That's so true. So what's the answer?

Nate Hansford: I don't know. I'll get back to you on that. I'm always playing with this balance, and truthfully, it becomes harder and harder for me because over time... I'm a teacher, but I enjoy research, and I've been dabbling a little bit more and more into research, and my understanding has been going up a lot over time.

I started this project really in 2018, and my knowledge is way higher today than it was in 2020 or even 2022. I find I want to talk with more and more nuance the more I learn, but then I always worry that I'm disenfranchising the people who want to listen to what I have to say the more that gets added to it.

I think you just have to keep that in your brain like, "Okay, I have to balance accuracy with people understanding what I'm saying. If I start to tell people about P values and confidence intervals in my conversation, I might lose them." But you might have to understand those things yourself if you want to understand these things on a deep level.

Anna Geiger: I think sometimes it's helpful when talking to teachers of different... Maybe for someone who's a beginner to something it helps to say clearly, "I'm simplifying this. There's a lot more to this. I'm going to give you the bare minimum." Sometimes that can help, I think. When I hear people say that to me, that helps.

Nate Hansford: That's solid evidence. I've got to keep that in mind.

Anna Geiger: One nice thing about your book is that you talk about all those different things, like there's a chapter on constructivist versus traditional, and at the end of each chapter you have summary points to remember, which I always love because they're very, very helpful. Then you have some reflection questions so teachers could talk together about some of these things.

You also break it down very clearly with research references. I don't have it right now, I just have all the pages printed from my printer, but when I get the actual book, I can see it as something that I can constantly refer to because I know that the evidence is listed there. I think it would be a resource for teachers where if someone says a particular thing is based on science, they can look it up and see what references you've shared.

What about teachers that want to stay current? I know you are unusual in that you really enjoy digging into research, and most teachers aren't going to do that or conduct meta-analysis. What's your best advice for teachers, because we've talked about how you don't want to just follow an individual, but at the same time, in some ways, we need to rely on people to translate for us because teachers aren't necessarily going to have the time to do that or the time to learn how to do that. What is your advice for teachers?

Nate Hansford: Yeah, I think I've got to give them a multifaceted answer, if that's okay.

Anna Geiger: Sure.

Nate Hansford: This book is actually a second edition, and I think it's a lot better than my first edition, a ton better, but evidence changes over time. There are so many things that do change over time, and my opinion is constantly changing on things. I recently wrote a blog about changing my mind about Reading Recovery three or four times.

I think one of the resources you can use, there's actually a website called Visible Learning MetaX where John Hattie has kept a database of all meta-analyses in education and he has them broken down by topic. You can click on almost any topic in education and then you can see how many meta-analyses have been done on the topic, and you can see what is the average effect size for them. Then you can see, if you look more carefully, you can see what is the context? What grades was that for, et cetera? That's a really valuable tool that's really quick and easy to use. Just go to Google, type in Hattie MetaX, and then look up the teaching factor that you want to look in. That's the simplest answer.

Now, there are people out there who'd be like, "Well, we can't just look at meta-analyses, you've got to understand deeper than just the one effect size." I think then it does pay to follow some people in this space. I think when you're choosing people, it helps if you have a basic understanding of research to know if what they're saying is true, because if you follow people and they say, "What I'm saying is true because case study X or because Scarborough's Rope or the Simple View of Reading," not to throw them under the bus, those are all theoretical things. They're not necessarily hard science.

I think when you look at people, you should be asking, are they citing research studies to prove their point or to support the point? I think that's really important.

I know you, Anna, you're a podcaster, but you're interviewing a lot of researchers in the field, so I think you have a really valuable insight as being a teacher who's talking to researchers in person on a regular basis.

I think finding these voices is really valuable. I think you're a good person to follow. I

think Dr. Shanahan is a good person to follow. I was actually just funnily going through my book citations, and I think I cited Shanahan 27 times. John Hattie is a good person to follow.

I think just asking yourself, is this person citing research when they say something to support what they say? I think that's really valuable. At the very least, are they talking to researchers on a regular basis because I can think of a handful of podcasters in this space who also just constantly interview researchers, and I think that's also a valuable lens to look through.

If you don't want to do the research yourself, you have to find people who are actually staying up to date with the research.

Anna Geiger: Yeah, and even if the person you ask doesn't know, they could say, "Let me ask around." I have a professor that I reach out to a lot and she'll share some articles with me if I'm trying to find out if there's any research on a particular topic. Sometimes it's about who you know that can find things for you.

I think that what you said before was really spot on where if you're asking somebody about something and they try to cite something that's not an actual research article, then it's the wrong person to go to. Thankfully, as we know on Twitter/X, it's really a place to share these things, which was surprising to me a couple of years ago. As you start to follow people, these things start to come up in your feed and all of a sudden it's not history anymore.

Nate Hansford: I don't know why it is, but I find academics tend to be on Twitter more and teachers tend to be on Facebook more.

Anna Geiger: Yeah, Facebook isn't the place.

Nate Hansford: I've gotten some valuable information from Facebook over the years, but I feel like you do tend to get more opinions from the classroom on Facebook, and you tend to get more research cited on Twitter. I have no idea why that is. I think it's so weird that the academics have chosen Twitter and the teachers have chosen Facebook, but that definitely seems to be a thing.

I think another valuable sign is if someone says, "I don't know." You talked about that. If

they say, "I have to look that up," that's a great sign. If people are like, "I don't know," or, "That's not my area of expertise," or were like, "I would have to look that up," that means they're being honest.

If someone's like, "I know everything about everything," that's a terrible sign because literally nobody knows everything.

Anna Geiger: I heard a presentation with Jan Hasbrouck at one time, who of course we know is really about fluency - she knows many things, but she talks most about fluency. She said something, I can't remember it exactly, but it was like, "Whenever someone asks a question about comprehension, I want to go hide," or something like that. She was just open about this not being her top area, and of course, I'm sure she knows a ton about it, but she recognizes that she specializes in certain things. Like you said, that's really comforting to hear. You don't want to hear somebody think they know everything.

Nate Hansford: I feel that way about assessment. People sometimes ask me questions about assessments, and I'm like, "Ooooooooh, don't ask me about that. Ask somebody else."

Anna Geiger: Yeah, for a lot of questions that people ask me, I have a list of places to send them to get the answers if I really don't know.

Thankfully, we can all keep learning, and your book is a great way to get teachers to feel like they're not completely in the dark when someone shares details of a study, that their head doesn't have to spin when they hear effect size. They can get the general idea of what that means. That's where we all have to start, is just become familiar with these basic terms and then we can start to be part of the conversation.

Nate Hansford: And I don't think it's that complicated. I heard this idea that, "It's too hard for teachers. They can't learn it."

I don't think that's true! I'm a teacher. I'm in a classroom every day. I don't expect everybody to have the same passion for research that I do, but I think it's kind of condescending and demeaning that we say, "Well, teachers don't need to know research." I disagree. I think it's pertinent to our jobs.

Anna Geiger: Well you're doing a great job of making this a thing that teachers can

aspire to now that there's a guide basically to understanding research, and then the way you broke down specific areas. I'm really excited for your book to come out - for real. Now I don't remember, I don't know for sure when this podcast is going to air, but probably about the time that your book is coming out, so can you give us the exact date?

Nate Hansford: I forgot to look it up. I was starting to look it up. I think it's April 26th.

Anna Geiger: Okay, I could update that.

Nate Hansford: My conference is on that day too, so it might be just in my head like, "Oh, day of my conference, day the book comes out," and my brain's just confusing dates, but I do know it's at the end of April.

Anna Geiger: Okay, good. I'll update that when I add the ending to this.

Well thanks for talking about it. I'm really excited to get my hands on it, and I know a lot of teachers will be too!

Nate Hansford: Thanks for having me on your podcast again.

Anna Geiger: As it turns out, Nate's book is being released on May 7th, 2024, so head over to Amazon and get your copy, and you can find the show notes for today's episode at reachallreaders.com/episode166. Talk to you next time!

Closing: That's all for this episode of Triple R Teaching. For more educational resources, visit Anna at her home base, reachallreaders.com, and join our teaching

episode of Triple R Teaching.