

Registry of Efficacy and Effectiveness Studies

Study Title:

Effects of Working With Oral History Interviews. A Cluster Randomized Controlled Intervention Study on History Lessons.

Registry ID: 14881.1v1

Version History

The first version of this entry was published on March 21, 2023 8:21:05 AM EDT

Currently viewing this version.

Section I: General Study Information

PI name: Katharina Totter

PI affiliation: University of Tübingen

Co-PI name: Wolfgang Wagner

Co-PI affiliation: University of Tübingen

Co-PI name: Christiane Bertram

Co-PI affiliation: University of Konstanz

Co-PI name: Ulrich Trautwein

Co-PI affiliation: University of Tübingen

Primary Funding Source(s):

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

Award Number(s):

Project Number: 416879869

IRB Name:

Ethikkommission der Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Tübingen (Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences Ethics Committee of the University of Tübingen)

IRB Approval Date:

2021-12-08

IRB Approval Number:

A2.5.4-194_ns

Other Registration Name:

Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport Baden-Württemberg (state ministry of culture)

Other Registration Date:

2021-11-02

Other Registration Number:

31-6499.21/655/1

Study Start Date:

2020-10-01

Study End Date:

2023-09-30

Intervention Start Date:

2022-05-09

Timing of entry:

Prior to analysis of outcome data

Brief Abstract:

In this cluster randomized controlled intervention study involving ninth-grade German history lessons, we are studying the effects of oral history interviews on student learning. In three lessons of 90 min each, we will compare two intervention conditions and a control condition in which teachers taught as they usually do. In one intervention condition, in-person oral history interviews were conducted in class, whereas the other intervention condition presented videos of oral history interviews. Teachers were randomly assigned to the three different conditions, with teachers in the two oral history conditions attending a 2-day professional development training program in which they were instructed how to teach the three lessons for the intervention. The final samples comprised 50 teachers, 63 classes, and 1,301 students. The analyses will test for the effects of working with oral history interviews overall as well as the comparison between in-person and video interviews on central student outcomes, such as competencies, knowledge, motivation to study history, interest in history, and evaluations of the lessons.

Keywords:

historical thinking competencies, intervention study, randomized controlled field study, teaching history, oral history

Comments:

The intervention ended on July 28, 2022. The project was funded by the DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft), where it is listed under the project's number 416879869 and can be found under <https://gepris.dfg.de/gepris/projekt/416879869?language=en>. The applicants' respective numbers are TR553/11-1, BE6291/2-1, and WA3160/2-1.

Additional information about the grade levels used in the study: In Germany, the grade levels can differ by 1 year on the basis of education time (8 years being the G8-track, 9 years being the G9-track) in high school. The grade level the intervention was designed for was ninth grade (G8-track) and 10th grade (G9-track) because the topic is included in the educational plans at the respective level. For easier reading, we refer to both levels as the ninth grade in this preregistration.

Section II starts on the next page.

Section II: Description of Study

Type of Intervention:

Curriculum/Product, Practice

Topic Area of Intervention:

Oral History Interviews

Number of intervention arms:

2

Target school level:

9

Target school type:

high school (Gymnasium)

Location of Implementation:

International : Europe

Further description of location:

Germany, Baden-Württemberg

Brief Description of Intervention Arm 1:

Teachers in the condition involving in-person oral history interviews attended a 2-day professional development training program in which they were trained in how to conduct the three lessons for the intervention with each lesson lasting 90 min. In these lessons, students worked on the topic of the transformation after 1990 in Germany. The goal of the first lesson was for learners to recognize that, even 30 years after the reunification, there are clear differences between East and West Germany, as opinion polls have repeatedly shown. The students developed questions for contemporary witnesses from the East and West to ask for the reasons for the differences that remain. In the second lesson, students worked with two contemporary witnesses, one from East Germany and one from West Germany. For the in-person condition, these contemporary witnesses came to the classes in person and talked about how things were before, during, and after the fall of the Wall. Taking the teachers' class schedules into consideration, the contemporary witnesses were taken from a pool of $n = 6$ people from East Germany and $n = 5$ people from West Germany on the basis of their schedules. After being matched into pairs of two (one from the East, one from the West), $n = 8$ different pairings went into the classes. In the third lesson, additional sources and contextual information on the post-1990 transformation in East Germany were used to verify the statements in the oral history interviews and to answer the question about the reasons for the persistent differences between the East and West. During the 2-day professional development training program, all teachers in the intervention conditions were given the same instructional and learning materials to use with their students. There, the group of teachers in the in-person condition were separated from those in the video condition for a 90-min portion of the training to cover the part where their conditions differed. Teachers who were in the in-person oral history interview condition received specific training in the second lesson, in which they had to work with the contemporary witnesses who came to their class(es).

Brief Description of Intervention Arm 2:

Teachers in the intervention condition that used videos of contemporary witnesses were given specific training for the second lesson, in which they had to include a 30-min video clip of oral history interviews of two contemporary witnesses, one from East Germany and one from West Germany. Similar to the in-person condition, the witnesses reported on how things were before, during, and after the fall of the Wall. The contemporary witnesses in the videos did

not differ from the ones who came to class and were randomly assigned to the classes on the basis of the frequencies with which a particular pair of witnesses visited classrooms in the in-person intervention condition. Because the intervention, the instructional materials, and the learning materials for the teachers in the 2-day professional development training differed in only the second lesson, see Condition 1 (in-person) for the description.

Brief Description of Comparison Condition:

The teachers in the control condition taught their classes as usual, following the education plan of the state for ninth-grade history education. The teachers in the control condition did not receive any training or materials in the respective school year regarding the intervention and were told to teach the education plan set forth by the state in their classes as they normally would. In the school year after the study took place, they will all be able to take part in the 2-day professional development training program and will be given the corresponding materials and will be granted access to the video of oral history interviews developed in the study. They will also be given the opportunity to work with in-person oral history interviews.

Comparison condition:

Business-as-usual

Comments:

The state's history education plan for the students in the intervention focuses on Germany during World War II and Germany afterward being divided into former East Germany former West Germany as two different states and systems. The education plan's last topic regarding the division of Germany during this period is the fall of the Wall and the Reunification of Germany that followed it. For the intervention study, the topic of the time period after the Reunification (Transformation after 1990) was added to the curriculum for the intervention groups.

Section III: Research Questions

Confirmatory research questions:

Question 1:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to perform better in historical thinking than the control group.

Question 2:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to be non-inferior to the group that worked with videos of oral history interviews in historical thinking.

Question 3:

We expect the students in the intervention group that worked with videos of oral history interviews to perform better in historical thinking than the control group.

Question 4:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to perceive the relevance of history as higher than the control group.

Question 5:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to perceive the relevance of history as higher than the group that worked with videos of oral history interviews.

Question 6:

We expect the students in the intervention group that worked with videos of oral history interviews to perceive the

relevance of history as higher than the control group.

Question 7:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to evaluate their opportunity to learn topic-related knowledge through the oral history interview more favorably than the students who worked with videos of oral history interviews.

Question 8:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to evaluate their methodological learning about the essentials of history itself more favorably than the students who worked with videos of oral history interviews.

Question 9:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to evaluate the motivational power of the oral history approach more favorably than the students who worked with videos of oral history interviews.

Question 10:

We expect the students in the intervention group that experienced in-person oral history interviews to perform better in factual knowledge than the control group.

Question 11:

We expect the students in the intervention group that worked with videos of oral history interviews to perform better in factual knowledge than the control group.

Exploratory research questions:

Question 1:

We will explore differences between the intervention groups in factual knowledge as well as the development in students' expectancy-value beliefs in the subject of history and students' interest to further explore the topic of German 20th-century history.

Comments:

Question 1, Question 2 and Question 3 mark the primary outcomes of this study.
The other confirmatory questions are regarded as secondary outcomes.

Section IV-A: Study Design (Selection)

Study Design:

Randomized Trial (RT)

Comments:

The study is a cluster randomized controlled intervention study.

Section IV-B: Study Design (Input)

Study Design: Input

Unit of random assignment of intervention:

Teacher

Assignment within sites or blocks:

No

Probability of assignment to treatment:

0.375 for intervention groups; 0.250 for control group

Unit outcome data measured:

Student

Intermediate clusters between unit of random assignment and unit of measurement:

No

Comments:

The study was designed with cluster-level assignment, and the unit of assignment is teachers.

Before randomization, $n = 15$ teachers (25%) declared they would take part in the study with more than one class. Due to the design of the intervention, teachers with more than one class could not have their classes assigned to different treatment groups. To account for this imbalance in the size of the units of measurement (students), teachers were assigned to the three conditions with probabilities of 37.5% for the two intervention groups (i.e., in-person and video) and 25% for the control group, taking the number of classes into account via stratified random assignment. In a first step, all teachers with one class were randomly assigned on the basis of the probabilities reported above. Then, all teachers with more than one class (14 teachers with two classes and one teacher with three classes) were assigned to the conditions with the same probabilities. With this approach, teachers' assignment probabilities did not differ within the same assigned condition while ensuring that the number of students and classes in the conditions would reflect the probabilities of assignment.

After randomization, because the allocation through randomization had to be carried out early in the school year to ensure that the organization of the intervention would go as planned, $n = 6$ teachers (10%) reported changes in the number of classes they were teaching because the schools had to reorganize their class schedules. One teacher gave one of their two classes to a colleague. The class received the intervention but was not added to the analytical sample, as the teacher joined the study after randomization. Therefore, whereas the number of classes in the conditions changed, all teachers (unit of assignment) remained in the conditions they were assigned to.

Design Classification

Based on the responses above, this study has been classified as:

RT: 2-level Cluster Randomized Trial

Section V: Sample Characteristics

Approximate number of students per teacher: 26

Number of teachers in the comparison condition: 13

Number of teachers in the intervention condition1: 20

Number of teachers in the intervention condition2: 17

Were there certain students that were targeted for the study?

No

Were there certain students that were excluded from the study?

No

Were there certain teachers that were targeted for the study?

Yes - History teachers who were interested in taking part in the intervention and were informed they would get to teach at least one ninth-grade class by their school during the time when the intervention was going to take place.

Were there certain teachers that were excluded from the study?

Yes - After randomization, one teacher took over a class from a teacher who had been randomized with two classes. Because this new teacher was not randomized, the class was excluded from the sample (but still received the intervention). After randomization, teachers who (a) did not get the grade or timetable with 90-min units promised by their school's officials (n = 4), (b) dropped out of the school system (n = 1), or (c) dropped out due to severe sickness (n = 5) did not take part in the study.

Comments:

For more information about the sample, see Appendix A.

Section VI: Outcomes (Input)

Confirmatory question 1: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test historical methodical competences

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 1: Outcome Measure 2

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test of the central epistemological principles of history

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 1: Outcome Measure 3

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: HiTCH-Test (short inventory) (Trautwein et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 1: Outcome Measure 4

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test understanding oral history (Bertram et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .73

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 2: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test historical methodical competences

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 2: Outcome Measure 2

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test of the central epistemological principles of history

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 2: Outcome Measure 3

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: HiTCH-Test (short inventory) (Trautwein et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 2: Outcome Measure 4

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test understanding oral history (Bertram et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .73

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 3: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test historical methodical competences

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 3: Outcome Measure 2

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test of the central epistemological principles of history

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 3: Outcome Measure 3

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: HiTCH-Test (short inventory) (Trautwein et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 3: Outcome Measure 4

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test understanding oral history (Bertram et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .73

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 4: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Relevance of History (translated from van Straaten et al., 2018)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .92

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 5: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Relevance of History (translated from van Straaten et al., 2018)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .92

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 6: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Relevance of History (translated from van Straaten et al., 2018)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .92

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 7: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Content learning scale (Bertram et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .80

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: No

Please Describe:

This measure is part of the evaluation of the teaching unit of the intervention. Because the control group did not receive the intervention, data were collected only in the two intervention groups.

Confirmatory question 8: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Thinking history scale (Bertram et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .69

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: No

Please Describe:

This measure is part of the evaluation of the teaching unit of the intervention. Because the control group did not receive the intervention, data were collected only in the two intervention groups.

Confirmatory question 9: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Interest in oral history scale (Bertram et al., 2017)

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: .86

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: No

Please Describe:

This measure is part of the evaluation of the teaching unit of the intervention. Because the control group did not receive the intervention, data were collected only in the two intervention groups.

Confirmatory question 10: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test factual knowledge

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Confirmatory question 11: Outcome Measure 1

Outcome domain: Student Achievement - Social Studies

Minimum detectable effect size:

Outcome measure: Test factual knowledge

Scale of outcome measure: Continuous

Normed or state test: No

Test-retest reliability: N/A

Internal consistency: N/A

Inter-rater reliability: N/A

Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups: Yes

Section VII: Analysis Plan

Baseline data collected prior to start of intervention:

Yes

Description of baseline data:

The instruments that were used to assess the outcome measures were also administered at pretest to all groups as baseline data, the only exception being the evaluation of the intervention's teaching unit, which was collected only in the intervention groups at posttest.

In addition, participants' knowledge of the topic prior to the intervention, their reading and cognitive skills, as well as personality measures and demographics were collected at pretest in all groups.

Covariates you plan to include in the model:

Covariates you plan to include in the model:

Analytic model:

-

Plan to handle cases with missing outcome data:

full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimation

Planned multiple comparisons adjustment, confirmatory question 1 (Student Achievement - Social Studies):

Yes

Number of planned comparisons to adjust, confirmatory question 1 (Student Achievement - Social Studies):

This confirmatory question is linked to Confirmatory Questions 2 and 3. We will use a multistep procedure (Röhmel & Pigeot, 2010).

Correction for multiple comparisons, confirmatory question 1 (Student Achievement - Social Studies):

other

Planned multiple comparisons adjustment, confirmatory question 2 (Student Achievement - Social Studies):

Yes

Number of planned comparisons to adjust, confirmatory question 2 (Student Achievement - Social Studies):

See confirmatory question 1. We will use a multistep procedure (Röhmel & Pigeot, 2010).

Correction for multiple comparisons, confirmatory question 2 (Student Achievement - Social Studies):

other

Planned multiple comparisons adjustment, confirmatory question 3 (Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes):

Yes

Number of planned comparisons to adjust, confirmatory question 3 (Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes):

See confirmatory question 1. We will use a multistep procedure (Röhmel & Pigeot, 2010).

Correction for multiple comparisons, confirmatory question 3 (Student Social, Emotional, & Behavior - Attitudes):

other

Comments:

See Appendix B for a description of the analysis plan and the power analysis. Note that the outcome domain of Confirmatory Questions 1, 2, and 3 is "historical thinking" (categorized "Student Achievement - Social Studies").

Section VIII: Additional Information

Links:

No links have been added yet.

Files:

File Name: [Appendix A.pdf](#)

Description: Information about the sample

File Name: [Appendix B.pdf](#)

Description: Description of the analysis plan and the power analysis

Comments:

-
