NC STATE UNIVERSITY Student Experiences in Community College Precalculus: A Mixed Methods Study of Student Engagement and Understanding

Background Information

- Measuring the effects of teaching on student learning in undergraduate mathematics is an open question in mathematics education research (Hiebert & Grouws, 2007: Speer, Smith, & Horvath, 2010)
- Not a lot is known about students' experiences in community college mathematics courses (Mesa, Celis, & Lande, 2014)
- However, roughly 50% of undergraduate students taking mathematics courses are doing so at community colleges (Rodi, 2007)
- Historically, community college students struggle to pass precalculus on their first attempt (Barnes, Cerrito, & Levi, 2004)
- Personal investment
- Student engagement is positively associated with academic achievement (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2009; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Finn & Zimmer, 2012; Newmann, 1989; Skinner & Belmont, 1993)

Student Engagement in Math

Elementary

- Teacher-reported behavioral engagement
- Declines daily over the schoo year, and throughout elementary school
- Positively related to structured environment
- Positively related to mathematica growth

Middle

- Engagement in mathematics declines through middle school • Classroom-level engagement
- positively affects individual engagement • Cooperative group work &
- structure foster engagement Classroom-level achievement
- negatively relates to individual engagement
- Students report lecture is least engaging • Group work,

Secondary

- interesting activities, & technology positively affect engagement
- Assigned seats positively affect engagement
- Females tend to be emotionally disengaged • Latin@ students
- especially benefit from group work

Undergraduate

- National Survey of Student Engagement
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement
- Not much research on student engagement in mathematics classrooms

Research Questions

- What is the nature of community college students' engagement in precalculus during class time, and what role do teaching approaches have on these experiences?
- 2. Is there a relationship between student engagement and understanding of precalculus concepts, and if so:
 - What are characteristics of this relationship? a)
 - Is there an association between this relationship and teaching b) approaches?

Method

Convergent Parallel Design

Quantitative & Qualitative data are collected concurrently and analyzed separately (Decuir-Gunby & Schutz, n.d.)

• Results are blended together to tell a more complete story



Derek A. Williams

Department of STEM Education

Table 1: Cross-t	tabulation of eng	gagement co	des from we	ekly p	osts				
	~Concentrate	~Enjov	~Interest	Conc	entrate	Eniov	Enjoy	Interest	
[•] Concentrate	40	,				<i>,</i>	Neutral		• The
Enjoy	2	195							2.8
Interest	6	13	47						rep
Concentrate	0	22	2		172	1 1 1			or l
njoy Spiov Noutral	0	0	2		24	144	24		enjo bej
ntorost	2	0	2		5 Л	0 1 Q	54 1	20	
Table 3: <i>Param</i>	<u>eter estimates fo</u>	or three need	ds and their	intera	ctions.	10	I	25	
			4.0				High Co	maatanaa	
Intercent		Esuma	$\frac{100}{8} < 00$	$\frac{100}{101}$	3.3		High Co.	Inpetence	
Compoten			~ 00	01	3.25 3.2				
Belonging	mass	0.2	20 < .00	01	ti 3.15 9 3.1				
Autonomy		0.2	21 < .00	17	0.05 age				
Autonomy	y EI	0.0	$) \qquad 0.$		ар Э 2.95				
COMP*B		-0.($\frac{1}{1}$	J.ð	2.9 2.85				
COMP*A		-0.(0.0	17	2.8			Autonomy	
BEL*AU		0.0	$\frac{15}{2}$		_	Low Bel	longingness	— High Belo	ngingnes
COMP*B	EL*AUIO	0.0	0.0	184 L			·	•	
Kanaom Effects		1	2 < 00		Fig. 2. D	ecompos	sing 3-way	/ interaction	
Compoten			.5 < .00						
Delencine		0.0	0.0	02					
Autonomy	gness	0.0)4 0.0	04					
Autonomy	y	0.0	$\begin{array}{ccc} 0.0 \\ 0.0$	04					
Toblo 1. Daram	ator astimatos fo	U.	$\frac{50}{1}$ < .00		ill balanc	a around			
1abic 4. 1 aram	eier esiimaies jo	T INTEE NEED		ige-ski	ποαιαπό	e groups)		
ixed Effects	Es	stimate	p-value			Challenge-	Skill Balanc	e Charicterizatio	ns
BORED					Anxiety	,			
Inte	ercept	3.08	< .0001						/
CON	ЛР	0.17	0.03	ıge			29	ed	
BEL		0.23	0.02	haller			Challene	rtable	
AUT	Ю	0.22	0.0004	0			Comic		
ANXIOUS									р
Mai	n Effect	-1.63	0.0004			_	Sk		В
CON	ЛР	-0.09	0.44			alization	of Challe		
BEL		-0.01	0.94	L I E	3. 4. visu	lanzation	i of Challe	enge-skill gro	oups
AUT	Ō	-0.01	0.94						
CHALLENG	GED					Cnal	llenge-Ski	III Balance	
Mai	n Effect	-0.47	0.15	• \	Weeks ch	naracteriz	zing stude	nts as bored	tended
CON	ЛР	0.16	0.06	(correspond with highest levels of engagemen Aggregated across the semester, anxious stud tended to report being drastically less engage 		ement		
BEL		0.01	0.93	• 1			studen		
AUT	Ю	-0.16	0.03	1	peers (needs fulfilment does not dampen t		this ef		
COMFORT	ABLE				Doota rof	lasting h	oradom au	agast low on	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Mai	n Effect	0.28	0.42	•]	especially	y when c	course mat	erials are per	ceived
CON	ЛР	0.26	0.007	e	 easy Confidence is important when materials are perceived as hard 				
BEL		-0.16	0.19	• (are		
AUT	Ю	-0.14	0.07	ł	percerved				
Random Effects									
Intercept		1.02	< .0001						
Residual		0.43	< .0001						
			Resea	rch	Quest	ion 2 -	– Enga	gement-l	U nde
Relations	nip Between Stude	ent Engagmer	nt and		Engage	ement-U	nderstand	ling Relation	nships
	Understand	ing		• ()uantitativ	ve reculto	did not rev	eal significant	r ~
25		$y = 0.6271x + 6.7805$ $R^2 = 0.0273$			differences in understanding between classes				
<u>ع</u> 20	•	•	R = 0.0273	• N	• No association between student engagement and understanding in this sample			and	
⁵ / ₂ 15			• ••				5 Junipie		
on 10 م				• (Qualitative	ely, differe	ences in stu h different ¹	dents' underst levels of enjoy	anding ment in
5	••••••			t	ask-based	interview	VS	J~J	
	• •• •	- •		• F	kegardless	s ot under	standing, st	tudents can ex	hibit hig

2 3 4 5 6

Semester Average Engagement

Fig. 7. Understanding-Engagement Relationship

• Qualitative results from task-based interviews leaves open the possibility of a relationship between understanding and engagement existing on a larger scale

Results



Balanced	Meaning-Making	Student-Supportive	Traditional
) edom	(8) Confidence	(3) Easy	(6) Boredom
) ifused iety ompetent d ching Negative	(90) Confused ~Competent ~Belong Fast-paced	(9) "I don't like math"	(36) ~Competent Test
) edom Long	(12) ~Enjoy		(5) ~Enjoy ~Prepared
fidence pared epared ching Positive by joy	(68) Confidence Enjoy ~Enjoy Test Confused	(10) Confidence Test	(31) ~Enjoy Enjoy Test
) npetent ifidence ching Positive icentrate	(52) Confidence Competent Test Concentrate Interest	(21) Test Confidence Belong	(34) Competent Test
) ching Positive	(13) Confidence	(2) Test Confidence	(7) Test
ογ	(9) Confidence Enjoy	(3) Enjoy	(11) Enjoy Confidence

• Regardless of their instructor's teaching approaches, students tended to report similar levels of engagement However, the ways in which this level of engagement was attributed to various themes differs based on

Theoretical Framework

Understanding of Precalculus Concepts

Reasoning about Graphical Representations

- Static Shape Thinkin - "Operating on a gra as an object in and o tself" (Moore & Thompson, 2015, p
- Emergent Shape - Understanding a gra multaneously as wh is made (a trace) and how it is made (covariation)" (Moore Thompson, 2015, p. 785)