



Scripting inquiry-based learning in a teacher education program for adult learners: how learners use and experience structuring interventions

Ruth Boelens, Bram De Wever - Department of educational studies

Introduction

Aim and research questions





How and to what extent were the scripts **actually used** by th groups, and is this related to (a) how they tackled the assignment, and

Ill-structured or complex tasks

Adequate support, especially for novice or inexperienced learners tasks e.g. Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007; van Merriënboer & Kirschner, 2013)

Providing SRL support (e.g. Charles et al., 2013; Järvelä et al., 2014)

How to optimize the design of and support in inquiry practices to facilitate student learning?

Learning disabilities 1. Dyslexia

RQ1

Worked example

- Demonstration of the task/problem students need to carry out/solve
- Aims to improve task understanding and goal setting

Problem-solving steps (process worksheet)

 Provides learners with steps they need to go through to solve the problem (van Merriënboer & Kirschner, 2013)

Planning tool

To stimulate students to collaboratively plan their work
Planning aspect of socially shared regulated learning (see e.g. Järvelä et al., 2014)

Evaluation tool

• To stimulate students to collaboratively evaluate and reflect on their assignment (see e.g. Järvelä et al., 2014)

(b) the quality of the final product?



To what extent do students **perceive** the scripts as helpful for the development of their written product?

Method

- N=9, adult learners with a background in secondary education (no HE degree)
- Design & implementation of an inquiry task in pre-service teacher training
 - Inquiry task was to solve a problem (a case study) by conducting a problem analysis (5 steps) and preparing an action plan (2 steps)
 - Collaborative learning (3 dyads and 1 group of 3 students)
 - Shared google document, 4 weeks
 - Product = written assignment
 - Support: worked example, problem-solving steps, planning & evaluation tool
- Analyses
 - Detailed revision history in the shared google document (coding scheme)
 - Semi-structured interviews with students (during & after assignment)
 - Final product (content analysis, rubric)



Research questions	Groups	Worked example	Problem-solving steps	Planning	Self-evaluation	Task execution	Product score (max=10)
Actual use of scripts	Group 1 (n=2)	Went through and evaluated the worked example during face- to-face meeting with teacher	Completed the steps in a sequential way, from step 1 to step 7	Filled in the planning tool during task execution, i.e. didn't think about it in advance	Completed after task execution No specific changes were made based on this evaluation	One group member did most of the work, while the other person added a few things	6.14
	Group 2 (n=3)		Since the work was divided, steps were not handled sequentially	Divided the steps and set deadlines before task execution		All group members contributed equally to the written product: provided feedback to each other	8.86
	Group 3 (n=2)		Information is missing	Filled in the planning tool during task execution, i.e. didn't think about it in advance		All group members contributed equally to the written product: one person started, afterwards the other person came into action	7.50
	Group 4 (n=2)		Completed the steps in a sequential way, from step 1 to step 7	Filled in the planning tool during task execution, i.e. didn't think about it in advance		All group members contributed equally to the written product: one person started, afterwards the other person came into action	5.68
Students' individual perceptions (n=9)		Clear expectations (n=7)	Provided direction, made the task more easy to tackle (n=8)	Useful to regulate myself and other group members (n=3)	Useful (no explanation) (n=2)		
		Unnecessary (n=1) Useful, but insufficient (n=1)	Too much repetition (n=1)	Not useful, hard to foresee when time will be available to work on the task (n=6)	No opinion (n=2) Missing (n=5)		

Conclusions and discussion

	Actual use	Perceptions	Conclusions	Future research		
Worked example	Obligatory	Positive, contributed to task orientation	⇒ Seem to work well			
Problem-solving steps	Sequentially or divided the steps			Redesign learning activities		
Planning	 Only used by 1 group > related to task execution and product score ⇒ G2: clear planning + deadlines > divided steps, all members contributed equally, and provided each other with feedback > best product score ⇒ G1,G3,G4: no planning, X started, and Y needed to catch up or did little of the work 	Majority: no added value	⇒ Some work to do…	Focus on: - Collaboration scripts (e.g. De Wever et al. 2014) - (Self-)evaluation / reflection (e.g. Ng, 2016)		
Self-evaluation	Used as summative assessment	(ś)				

Important to investigate to what extent scripts are actually used by students (see e.g. De Wever, et al. 2008) to explore what works and what students need

SIG 20 Conference: Inquiry in and outside classrooms – August 22-24, 2016 – Ghent, Belgium