



# Kent Academic Repository

Quinlan, Kathleen M. (2019) *Commentary Cluster 5: Enhancing Student Motivation, Interest and Participation: Young Academics' Experiments with Active Learning*. In: *Early career academics' reflections on learning to teach in Central Europe*. Staff and Educational Development Association, London, pp. 58-67. ISBN 978-1-902435-63-3.

## Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/77208/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

## The version of record is available from

[https://www.seda.ac.uk/resources/files/publications\\_256\\_Cluster5\\_Commentary\\_Quinlan.pdf](https://www.seda.ac.uk/resources/files/publications_256_Cluster5_Commentary_Quinlan.pdf)

## This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

## DOI for this version

## Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

## Additional information

## Versions of research works

### Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

### Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

## Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact [ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Published in:

Early career academics' reflections on learning to teach in Central Europe  
Gabriela Pleschová and Agnes Simon (eds). London: Staff and Educational Development  
Association. ISBN: 978-1-902435-63-3 pp. 115-117

For full, open access text, see: <https://www.seda.ac.uk/Early-career-academics-reflections-on-learning-to-teach-in-Central-Europe>

### **Commentary Cluster 5: Enhancing Student Motivation, Interest and Participation: Young Academics' Experiments with Active Learning**

Kathleen M. Quinlan

Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Kent

Stimulating interest is vital to education, as the level of a student's interest influences their attention, goals, ability to self-regulate, study strategies, and learning outcomes (Renninger & Hidi, 2016). Despite its importance, there is little higher education research on how different forms of instruction promote students' interest. Therefore, it is gratifying to see these early career academics experimenting with ways to capture students' interest and promote participation.

**Kašpárková** hypothesised that active learning, connecting theory to practice, and real-world group activities would be motivating to students. Her evaluation supported these assumptions. She revised the objectives, learning activities and assessment in a personnel psychology course to highlight relevance to all students, not just those who intended a career in human resources. Introducing learning material before seminars reduced in-class lecturing and allowed time for discussions with peers, role plays, and facilitated problem-solving. Continuous assessments involved projects, presentations, and application of principles to real life scenarios. By framing her work in terms of Biggs' (1996) theory of constructive alignment, she explicitly recognised that students' behaviour is shaped not just by their interest in the subject, but by how they will be assessed. Thus, aligning assessments to revised objectives is an important principle for supporting student engagement. While I would have liked to have seen more detail of the revised objectives, as the revised objectives capture what she assumes will interest students, her attention to the overall system of alignment in a short report is commendable.

**Padrtová** also assumed that active learning would stimulate students' interest and, in turn, learning. She designed three activities for each 90 minute session: a Skype call with an expert on the subject, student discussions in pairs, and interactive mini-lectures. Bringing in expert speakers by Skype is an unusual and promising innovation. While guest lectures are not new, technology now makes it easier to bring in experts from around the world for short interactions with students. Using peer observation, she was able to document the extent and nature of interaction in each of the three types of activities, showing that teacher-to-student interaction was most frequent, followed by student-to-teacher and student-to-student. She surveyed both students' interest and knowledge to assess the extent to which students were interested in and learned from each of the three types of activities.

While the pair work generated lively discussion between peers, students found the expert mini-lectures via Skype and the interactive, teacher-led mini-lectures to be most interesting. They also learned the most from those activities they found most interesting, consistent with research on interest (Renninger and Hidi 2016). However, higher degrees of interaction alone were not associated with higher interest or learning. Again, this finding, though counter to Padrtová's hypothesis, is consistent with the literature on interest (Bergin, 1999; Rotgans, & Schmidt, 2011). The nature of the task set for students (i.e. the extent to which it is novel, prompts thinking and questioning, is controversial or surprising, and relevant and important) seems to matter more than the classroom format itself (e.g. whether it is paired discussions, or interactive lectures).

**Voca** also focused on interaction, though the stated and evaluated goals were to enhance interaction and higher order cognitive learning, rather than interest or motivation per se. To overcome student passivity in lectures, he introduced two 4 minute pair-work discussions per lecture. The innovation was successful in that students engaged easily and reported that the activities were useful for their learning. The learning outcomes were more positive for the group who engaged in pair-work during six of the 15 lectures than the control group who did not. Although the pair work seemed to contribute to more participation in the plenary session, students were generally focused on comprehension and understanding, rather than higher order questions. This result may be because of the nature of the task set for the pair work, which required students to share their lecture notes to fill in gaps and ask questions that clarified concepts. As with Padrtová, attending to interaction alone is not sufficient. One also needs to attend to the cognitive demands of the tasks (e.g. are they focusing on comprehension, application, evaluation or synthesis). To the extent that Voca is not fully satisfied that students engaged at higher levels of thinking, it is also worth reconsidering the assessments, by setting the innovation within the wider framework of constructive alignment (Biggs 1996), as Kašpárková did.

Each of the three cases represent impressive accomplishments for early career educators. All three teachers succeeded at designing thoughtful innovations that supported student interaction, participation and learning. The authors clearly stated the goals of their innovations, developed appropriate teaching methods to address those goals, designed bespoke evaluation tools, and reflected thoughtfully on the outcomes. These innovations offer lessons for all educators about how to increase student interaction and how to use cognitively stimulating activities that capture students' interest, such as applications to the real world and interactions with leading experts on the topic. Taken together, they also remind readers to consider the whole system of instruction and how teaching activities are aligned with objectives and assessment.

## References

Bergin, D.A. (1999). Influences on classroom interest. *Educational Psychologist*, 34(2), 87-98. doi: [10.1207/s15326985ep3402\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3402_2)

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32: 347-364. doi: [10.1007/BF00138871](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871)

Renninger, K. A., & Hidi, S. (2016). *The power of interest for motivation and engagement*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rotgans, J. I., & Schmidt, H. G. (2011). Situational interest and academic achievement in the active-learning classroom. *Learning and Instruction*, 21, 58-67. doi: [10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.11.001)

## **Biography**

Kathleen M. Quinlan is Reader in Higher Education and Director of the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Kent. She holds a PhD in Education from the Stanford School of Education and has researched teaching and learning in higher education for more than twenty years. She has led educational development programmes at The Australian National University, Cornell University's College of Veterinary Medicine, and the University of Oxford and served as Educator-in-Residence (August 2014) at the National University of Singapore. Her recent work focuses on emotions in learning and teaching. She is researching what interests students about their subject and studying in higher education and the link between teachers' emotions and their values. She edited the book, *How Higher Education Feels: Commentaries on Poems that Illuminate Emotions in Learning and Teaching* (Sense Publishers, 2016). She is a Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy.