IMPACT OF PRIOR EXPERIENCES ON FUTURE PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVE LEARNING

Matt DeMonbrun
University of Michigan
School of Education

Cynthia J. Finelli
University of Michigan
College of Engineering



PURPOSE

- Researchers have emphasized the need to improve the quality of undergraduate teaching through the use of evidence-based instructional practices for STEM fields
- Despite research supporting the benefits of EBIP in the engineering field, the conversion from research into practice has been slow
- There are a number of barriers to the adoption of these practices, including concerns about student resistance to active learning
- This paper examines students' responses to different types of instruction in the engineering classroom and how their responses may differ across courses between semesters



METHODOLOGY

- Five engineering specialties at a large public university in the Midwest, including:
 - electrical engineering, computer science engineering, chemical engineering, mechanical engineering, and biomedical engineering
- One course section was randomly selected from each of the engineering disciplines
 - Sophomore-level courses (i.e., 200-level courses)
 - Minimum enrollments of at least 50 students
 - No laboratory or discussion sections



SURVEY INSTRUMENT

- Two student surveys, based on the Student Response to Instructional Practices instrument (DeMonbrun et al., 2017)
- Survey 1 administered between the 5th and 7th weeks of the semester
 - Asked about the frequency of the types of instruction used in their current class and response to four of the most-used types of instruction in a prior course
- Survey 2 was administered between the 13th and 15th weeks in the course
 - Asked about their response to same four types of instruction in the current course and their overall evaluation of the course/instructor



MOST FREQUENTLY USED TYPES OF INSTRUCTION

- 1. "Listening to the instructor lecture during class,"
- 2. "Answering questions posed by the instructor during class,"
- 3. "Brainstorming different possible solutions to a given problem," and
- 4. "Discussing course concepts with classmates during class."



CLASSROOM RESPONSE

- Value the degree to which students see the activity as worthwhile
- Positivity how positive or negative students feel about the activity
- Participation the extent to which students do or do not participate or demonstrate resistance



LISTENING TO LECTURE

Student Response	Prior	Current	
Value	3.78	3.25	***
Positivity	2.83	3.02	**
Participation	3.20	3.05	*

^{*} p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001



ANSWERING QUESTIONS POSED

Student Response	Prior	Current	
Value	3.73	3.16	***
Positivity	2.66	3.20	***
Participation	3.08	3.23	**

^{*} p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001



BRAINSTORMING DIFFERENT SOLUTIONS

Student Response	Prior	Current	
Value	3.82	3.13	***
Positivity	2.78	3.02	***
Participation	3.10	3.24	**

^{*} p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001



DISCUSSING CONCEPTS

Student Response	Prior	Current	
Value	2.01	2.17	*
Positivity	2.73	3.17	***
Participation	3.23	3.20	

^{*} p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001



DISCUSSION

- Student participation in EBIP is context dependent, and it varies by the type of instruction used in the classroom
- 2. Despite significant differences, most of the mean response scores for each of the four types of instruction remained between 2.5 and 3.5, suggesting that these differences are often small
 - One exception is the value response score for "discussing concepts with classmates during class," which was an entire point lower that each of the other three types of instruction



DISCUSSION

- 3. Finally, contrary to beliefs that students' opinions about EBIP are immutable, these results suggest that student response can significantly change throughout the course of the semester.
 - This is important for faculty concerns that poor prior execution of these practices might impact how a student responds to future occurrences of the same practice



THANK YOU!

Matt DeMonbrun mdemonbr@umich.edu

: mattdemonbrun

