DOCUMENT SUMMARY

This paper details ten years of results from implementing Peer Instruction (PI), a pedagogy that replaces passive lecturing with active, collaborative conceptual questioning. The research provides compelling evidence that interactive methods are superior to traditional instruction, not only for improving conceptual understanding but also for enhancing quantitative problem-solving skills. This is core evidence for Enlitens, demonstrating that moving away from rigid, traditional methods leads to deeper and more robust learning, and provides a framework for explaining and overcoming resistance to new, more effective approaches.

FILENAME

Crouch_2001_Peer_Instruction_evidence_for_interactive_methods

METADATA

- **Primary Category**: RESEARCH
- **Document Type**: research_article
- **Relevance**: Core
- **Key Topics**: pedagogy, alternative_assessment, evidence-based_practice, standardized_testing_critique, student_motivation, conceptual_understanding, collaborative_learning
- **Tags**: #pedagogy, #assessment_critique, #standardized_testing, #collaboration, #active_learning, #motivation, #resistance, #implementation, #evidence, #conceptual_change

CRITICAL QUOTES FOR ENLITENS

- "In recent years, physicists and physics educators have re-alized that many students learn very little physics from tra-ditional lectures."
- "traditionally taught courses do little to improve students understanding of the central concepts of physics, even if the students successfully learn problem-solving algorithms."
- "students develop complex reasoning skills most effectively when actively engaged with the material they are studying, and have found that cooperative activities are an excellent way to engage students effectively."
- "Unlike the common practice of asking infor-mal questions during a lecture, which typically engages only a few highly motivated students, the more structured ques-tioning process of PI involves every student in the class."
- "All measures indicate that our students' quanti-tative problem-solving skills are comparable to or better than those achieved with traditional instruction, consistent with the findings of Thacker et al."

- "the vast majority of students who revise their answers during discussion change from an incorrect answer to the correct answer."
- "we find that no stu-dent gave the correct answer to the ConcepTests prior to discussion more than 80% of the time, indicating that even the strongest students are challenged by the ConcepTests and learn from them."
- "In traditional introductory science courses, students gener-ally read the textbook only after the lecturer has covered the topic (if ever)."
- "in the classroom, the instructor must not be discouraged by complaints such as, 'When are we going to do some real physics?' and must continue to explain to students the rea-sons that the course is taught this way."
- "It is common for some or many students to be initially skeptical about this form of instruction. Consequently, proper motivation of the stu-dents is essential."
- "It is important to note that student evaluations and attitude are not a measure of student learning; as discussed in Sec. II, we saw high learning gains for the students in the algebra-based course in spite of lower perceived satisfaction overall."
- "research indicates that student evaluations are based heavily on instructor personality[31] rather than course effectiveness."
- "Another challenge is students' resistance to the method (7% of respondents). Because most students are unaccustomed to active participa-tion in science classes, some feel uncomfortable participating in discussions, or initially consider the discussions a waste of time."

KEY STATISTICS & EVIDENCE

- **Conceptual Mastery (FCI Test)**:
  - Upon changing from traditional instruction to Peer Instruction (PI), the average normalized gain on the Force Concept Inventory (FCI) doubled from 0.25 to 0.49.
  - With continued refinements to the PI method, the normalized gain steadily increased, reaching 0.74 in 1997.
  - A traditionally taught algebra-based course in 1999 produced a normalized gain of 0.40, while the same course taught with PI in 1998 and 2000 produced gains of 0.65 and 0.63, respectively.
- **Quantitative Problem Solving**:
  - The average score on the Mechanics Baseline Test (MBT) increased from 66% with traditional instruction to 72% in the first year of PI, eventually reaching 79%.
  - Performance on a final exam consisting entirely of quantitative problems increased from a mean score of 63% (traditional) to 69% (PI), a statistically significant increase ($p=0.001$).
  - On an identical quantitative problem given on a final exam, students taught with PI averaged 7.4 out of 10, while students taught traditionally the previous year averaged 5.5 out of 10 (effect size of 0.57).
- **Effectiveness of Peer Discussion**:
  - Analysis of an entire semester of ConcepTests showed that after discussion, the number of students giving the correct answer increases substantially, especially when the initial correct percentage is between 35% and 70%.
  - For all ConcepTests in Fall 1997: 40% of answer pairs were correct both times, 32% changed from incorrect to correct, 22% were incorrect both times, and only 6% changed from correct to incorrect.
- **Widespread PI Adoption & Success**:

- A survey of 384 PI users found that 90% of courses (27 of 30) fall in the "medium-g" range for FCI gains, a range that contains 85% of interactive engagement courses and no traditionally taught courses.
- Of 384 identified PI users, 332 (86%) planned to use PI again, while only 7 had no plans to use it again.

Table 1: Force Concept Inventory (FCI) and Mechanics Baseline Test (MBT) results

Year	Method	FCI pre	FCI post	Absolute gain (post-pre)	Normalized. gain (g)	MBT	MBT quant. questions	N
Calculus-based								
1990	Traditional	(70%)	78%	8%	0.25	66%	62%	121
1991	PI	71%	85%	14%	0.49	72%	66%	177
1993	PI	70%	86%	16%	0.55	71%	68%	158
1994	PI	70%	88%	18%	0.59	76%	73%	216
1995	PI	67%	88%	21%	0.64	76%	71%	181
1996	PI	67%	89%	22%	0.68	74%	66%	153
1997	PI	67%	92%	25%	0.74	79%	73%	117
Algebra-based								
1998	PI	50%	83%	33%	0.65	68%	59%	246
1999	Traditional	(48%)	69%	21%	0.40			129
2000	PI	47%	80%	33%	0.63	66%	69%	126

Export to Sheets

METHODOLOGY DESCRIPTIONS

Peer Instruction (PI) Method Overview

Peer Instruction engages students during class through activities that require each student to apply the core concepts being presented, and then to explain those concepts to their fellow students. A class is divided into a series of short presentations, each focused on a central point and followed by a related conceptual question, called a ConcepTest.

The process for each ConcepTest is as follows:

1. **Individual Thought**: Students are given one to two minutes to formulate individual answers and report them to the instructor.
2. **Peer Discussion**: Students then discuss their answers with others sitting nearby. The instructor urges students to try to convince each other by explaining their underlying reasoning. This discussion typically lasts two to four minutes, during which the instructor moves around the room listening.
3. **Group Answer & Explanation**: The instructor ends the discussion, polls students for their answers again (which may have changed), and then explains the correct answer before moving to the next topic.

To free up class time for these activities, students are required to complete reading on the topics before class.

Pre-Class Reading Assignments

To incentivize and guide pre-class reading, the instructors replaced reading quizzes with an adaptation of "Just-in-Time Teaching". Before each class, a three-question, free-response web assignment is due.

- Two questions probe difficult aspects of the reading.
- The third question asks, "What did you find difficult or confusing about the reading? ... Please be as specific as possible."
- Students receive credit based on effort, not correctness, which allows for more challenging questions and reduces grading effort.
- This feedback allows the instructor to tailor the class to the students' identified needs.

Cooperative Activities in Discussion Sections

To reinforce the interactive pedagogy, discussion sections are structured around cooperative activities. In the mechanics semester, a weekly two-hour workshop is held.

- One half is devoted to conceptual reasoning and hands-on activities using the *Tutorials in Introductory Physics*.
- The other half is devoted to quantitative problem solving, where students work in groups on homework problems after the instructor models a solution. The instructor circulates and helps groups by asking guiding questions rather than giving answers.

POPULATION-SPECIFIC FINDINGS

- The study found different levels of student satisfaction and resistance between two distinct populations: a calculus-based course for mostly honors biology or chemistry majors, and an algebra-based course for primarily non-science majors.

- In the calculus-based course, student evaluation scores remained high (4.5/5.0) after implementing PI, and written comments indicated most students appreciated the interactive approach.
- In the algebra-based course, average evaluation scores dropped significantly to 3.4/5.0, with more dissatisfied students. The authors surmise that students in this course are "on average less interested in the course and more intimidated by the material".
- This difference in satisfaction existed despite the fact that students in the algebra-based course achieved high learning gains.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Strategies for Motivating Students & Overcoming Resistance

- **Explain the "Why"**: It is essential to thoroughly explain the reasons for using a non-traditional method from the start. The instructor must not be discouraged by initial complaints and must continue to explain the rationale.
- **Grade What Matters**: Including conceptual questions on exams makes it clear that conceptual understanding is taken seriously. Providing equation sheets or using open-book exams shifts the focus away from memorization.
- **Show Them the Data**: Regularly presenting class-averaged data on performance can show students that the method is helping them learn and can increase motivation.
- **Be Persistent**: Instructors report that while students may be initially skeptical, they often "warmed up to it as they found the method helped them learn the material". A period of adjustment is normal when learning a new way of doing things.
- **Circulate and Engage**: To fully engage students in discussions, it is important for the instructor to circulate through the classroom, helping to guide and encourage students.

Overcoming Implementation Challenges

- **Time to Develop Materials**: 13% of instructors cite the time needed to create good ConcepTests as an impediment.
  Solution: Use publicly available, free databases of questions developed by others to minimize duplication of effort.
- **Colleague Skepticism**: 10% of respondents report skeptical colleagues who question taking away lecture time.
  Solutions: Collect and share data on student learning gains, compare exam results with and without PI, invite skeptics to class, or share positive student feedback.
- **Syllabus Coverage**: 9% of respondents find it difficult to devote class time to ConcepTests due to the quantity of material to cover.
  Solutions: Some instructors reduce the amount of material covered. The majority require students to learn some material on their own, especially by assigning and incentivizing pre-class reading.
- **Student Resistance**: 7% of respondents cite student resistance to active participation.
  Solutions: Thoroughly explain the pedagogy, be persistent, show students performance data, and have the instructor circulate during discussions to encourage participation.