Pedagogical implications of participation; instructor and student perspectives

Katrina Groeller, Renae Latoski, Jaehyuk Lee, and Guanglong Pang

Dr. Insung Jung and Dr. John Dirx

EAD 866, EDU 301 Fall Semester 2020

Department of Education, International Christian University and Michigan State University

INTRODUCTION

Participation is a popular teaching method used frequently in classrooms worldwide. Instructors use participation to engage student, fostering an interactive environment to help individual students learn better themselves and from each other. This paper links participation methods to learner-centered teaching (LCT) and culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP). Additionally, we use technology acceptance model (TAM) to suggest that technology can facilitate participation to achieve better learning outcomes during the current COVID-19 pandemic and worldwide transition to online education.

We begin the paper by reviewing the literature on participation as a teaching method, followed by a brief theoretical introduction on CSP, LCT and tam. We then describe our methodology and research findings. Given our focus on participation, it is important to gain insights from both instructors and learners. The data is collected from three sources: syllabus content analysis, survey to instructors who created those syllabi, and self-reflection by students who participated in those classes. We believe the multiple data sources from both instructors and learners form A triangulation effect to increase the validity of the research design and bring out balanced perspectives on participation.

Our three datasets collectively reveal that both instructors and learners highly value participation activities, and both sides see LCT and CSP as enhancing participation activities. Additionally, we learned that participation activities are often found in LCT practices and that most LCT is rooted in CSP. Syllabus analysis demonstrates the importance of active participation, expecting students to engage in-depth and critically with course concepts and peers. Self-reflection highlights how diverse life trajectories of our colleagues intersect with our education experience, expressing our need for LCT and CSP. Instructor surveys uncovers instructors' understandings and purposes for practicing participation, LCT, CSP, and more important the connections between them. Finally, we account for the implication of the current pandemic for using participation methods in teaching by suggesting a technology-facilitated methodology–Collaborative Online International Learning–for its emphasis on student participation in both LCT and CSP contexts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Participation

Student participation is a key element in the learning process, namely a combination of student preparation, contribution to discussion, group skills, communication skills and attendance (Rocca, 2010). The ideal class discussion is when almost all students are participating, interested, and listening, bringing students together in a class and providing students an active role in the educational process. Rocca identifies teachers who implement participation activities encourage higher level thinking like interpretation, analysis and synthesis rather than memorization.

Participation is influenced by classroom logistics, student confidence and personality, and instructors' contributions and character. Some important results from Rocca's work includes differentiation between students in upper-level courses, natural science courses, and social science courses. Rocca also identifies that inexperienced or less mature students are less likely to participate if they perceive their peers as more experienced than them. Traditional college students are more concerned with what their peers might think, but non-traditional college students are more concerned with what their instructor thinks and will work to "impress" them. Mutual respect amongst students and between students and the instructor is essential for

conducive class participation, and students are more likely to participate in student-centered classrooms. Most students in Rocca's study, regardless of class organization, feel apprehensive occasionally about participating in class; however, the likelihood of students participating increases once they get to know their peers and if they consider their peers as accepting.

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy

Gloria Ladson-Billings establishes in her work *Toward a Culturally Relevant Pedagogy* that culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) is essential in creating effective pedagogical practices that address student achievement while supporting students' acceptance and affirmation of their cultural identity in educational environments (1995). The need for CRP is grounded in research identifying an increase in students' academic performance when teachers implemented classroom practices that were similar or reflective of cultural practices and patterns of students' home environment. Thus, culturally responsive pedagogical practices should be dynamic and synergistic relationships between students' home and school cultures (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Django Paris critiques Ladson-Billings concept of culturally relevant pedagogy with the suggestion that it is not strong enough in C*ulturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice* (2012). Culturally relevant pedagogy is centered on equitable and just educational experiences of students while utilizing culture as a guide in selection of educational program elements. Ladson-Billings acknowledges a need for pedagogical practices that encourage academic achievement among students of color while allowing them to display their home and community cultures at school and establishing an understanding and ability to critique social constructs. However, cultural relevance and responsiveness, Ladson-Billings' terminology, illustrates tolerance rather than sustainability, collaborative participation, and encouragement in culturally enhanced pedagogy. Paris criticizes that it is possible to be relevant and responsive without ensuring sustainability. Thus, culturally sustaining pedagogy, Paris' framework, suggests meaningful implementation and maintenance of practices of students of color (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP) supports current and future generations of learner as it "seeks to perpetuate and cost – to sustain – linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling" (Paris, 2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy acknowledges cultures as ever-changing, accounting for cultural connectedness through cultural fluidity across time and space for people with marginalized and dominant identities (Paris, 2012).

What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward provides an extension on Paris' culturally sustaining pedagogy concept through an asset-based framework (Alim & Paris, 2014). From this perspective, we consider pedagogical practices that are beneficial for all students to promote equity, opportunity, and access. CSP goes further than CRP because CRP lays the foundation to move beyond rationalizing the need to include the culture of people of color in educational instruction and curriculum. Therefore, Alim and Paris argue, CRP is essential and CSP is the goal. Admittingly, these authors explain that culturally sustaining pedagogy is rare in practice. However, the increasingly globalized world that values diversity, multiculturalism, and multilingualism require culturally sustaining pedagogy to demand pluralist outcomes.

Learner-Centered Teaching

Learner-centered teaching (LCT) as explained by Maryellen Weimer "promotes learning by facilitating acquisition of knowledge" (2013). At its core, LCT overlaps with CRP and CSP

for their shared focus on learners. The difference is that CRP and CSP explicitly address the cultural dimensions of teaching from cultural recognition, relation, and integration to sustainability. While complementing these cultural dimensions, LCT primarily addresses teacher and learner position and their resulting classroom dynamics. In LCT, teachers must become a knowledge facilitator rather than a knowledge authority, inevitably involving transition of teacher power (Brookfield, 2013; Weimer, 2013). Teacher authority is often assumed, evading scrutiny for its enormous control over student learning. Ironically, students ultimately determine whether they will learn or not, though teachers do control the learning process. Weimer (2013) contends that changing the teacher role and power must be the first step toward LCT.

Greater student power comes with greater learner responsibility and greater motivation to learn (Weimer, 2013). Individuals are motivated for work that they believe they can successfully achieve, and people are less motivated for activities when individuals do not expect to succeed. Teachers cannot learn for students, but they can create the classroom climate that promotes responsibility to motivate learning (Ambrose et al., 2010). One important way to create a motivating learning environment is to design the teaching content that students want to retain for themselves rather than covering a breadth of content. In LCT, teachers need to reconsider "covering content" as it does not equate to "learning" (Weimer, 2013). Teachers can cover as much as they plan, but the course might end up as a surface-level conversation rather than substantive exchange. To initiate deep learning, teachers are responsible for creating learning content and evaluation that motivate learners, helping them become self-directed learners (Ambrose et al., 2010). Designing learning content and evaluation that interests students is a shared goal for LCT and CSP. This requires knowledge of students' culture, prior knowledge they carry, and how knowledge is organized; in other words, centering on student needs (Ambrose et al., 2010). In a multicultural educational environment, this also means sustaining their cultures, values and ways of learning.

LCT comprehensively reconstructs teacher role, student responsibility, learning content and evaluation. Echoing much of what CSP entails, LCT requires teachers to become more facilitative and sensitive to learner backgrounds and need; LCT also requires learners to become more autonomous and self-driven. LCT helps learners develop a stronger sense of agency and to take ownership of their learning (Ambrose et al., 2010). However, a critique to LCT is that student power is distributed in unbalanced ways, resulting in dominant and marginalized student power and representation (Brookfield, 2013). Such power unbalance is salient in today's multicultural and international classrooms in American classroom and many parts of the world. When shifting more classroom power to learners and centering the teaching on learners, it is crucial to be sensitive about their backgrounds and identities. This underlines the importance to operationalize CSP and LCT parallelly in classroom.

Technology Acceptance Model

The technology acceptance model (TAM) theorized by Fred Davis explains how people come to adopt and use innovative technology. In finding better measures to predict and explain the use of the technology through his study, Davis focused on two fundamental factors of system use, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use (1989). TAM seeks to explain and predict user behavior in information technology, and it provides the process in which the external variables effect belief, attitude, and intention to use (Park, 2009).

Previous research in the area presents two critical factors in the acceptance or rejection of information technology: first, whether the application "will help them perform their job

better", or perceived usefulness, and second: difficulty of use, or perceived ease of use (Davis, 1989). These factors relate to Weimer's challenges with LCT in that students may understand student-centered activities will help them learn more but choose to resist the teaching strategy because of the perceived difficulty of the process and increased responsibility students have for their own learning. Likewise, instructors may also resist adapting LCT strategies because of increased uncertainty, i.e., what if students don't like or take part in the activities, and decreased power, i.e., what will I do if the students choose not to take part or we don't get to all the material.

Some research on the innovation and adoption are related to the perceived ease of use. Tornatzky and Klein (1982) explain that "compatibility, relative advantage, and complexity" of innovation are correlated with adopting innovation. Rogers (1971) defines complexity as "the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and use." The role of complexity in adoption of innovation parallels that of perceived ease of use in TAM. Davis (1989) finds that perceived usefulness is "more strongly linked to usage" than perceived ease of use. People adopt innovation or technology primarily because of its functions and secondarily because of its ease of use. Likewise, Weimer acknowledges that innovative teaching strategies, such as LCT, are difficult to implement all at once; rather, innovation should be introduced to the classroom in increments to show students that teachers' care about students' overall wellbeing.

Our literature review demonstrates that LCT, CSP and TAM overlap and intersect conceptually. Given our interest in participation activities in classroom, we formulate our research question as: *how participation activities enhance or restrict pedagogies that are learner centered and culturally sustaining.* Additionally, we are interested in exploring how technology adaptation can preserve LCT and CSP while supporting the usage of participation activities during the current pandemic.

METHODOLOGY

We used three data collection methods to gather information about student participation and culturally sustaining pedagogies: a syllabi content analysis, researcher self-reflections, and an instructor survey. Each element focuses on drawing out pedagogical approaches regarding student participation in graduate-level coursework. The purpose of this mixed-methods approach is to formulate a triangulation effect. This triangulation of methodology increases the reliability and the validity of each data source, researcher collaboration, and maintains a flexible and reflective research process.

First, we conducted a content analysis of 8 graduate-level courses on higher education. This involved quantifying participation requirements, drawing out instructor expectations, and contextualizing participation within each individual course and their format. There was also a cross cultural comparison between participation in graduate level courses from the United States of America and Japan because syllabi were drawn from both Michigan State University and International Christian University. Guidelines for content analysis focused mainly on developing shared meaning units, codes, categories and themes (Erlingsson and Brysiewicz, 2017). The content analysis expands on the later instructor survey and illustrates our learner perspectives.

Next, each researcher completed an individual self-reflection. We utilized self-reflections as means to think critically about our unique positionalities as researchers and how our identities influence our learner-selves. We reflected on how our identities have and continue to shape our educational experiences to elaborate on student perspectives regarding undergraduate and graduate coursework, class participation, and pedagogical practices. This process was guided by

five major topics: 1) intersections of identity and background, 2) what attracted us to these courses, 3) convergence and divergence from our course learning objectives, 4) researcher and researched positionality, and 5) individual research and pedagogical interests. This self-reflection provides researcher background to our choice in methodology as well as why we are drawn to these particular instructors for interviewing and survey purposes.

After our syllabi analysis, we intended to interview four instructors of the syllabi we were analyzing. However, due to the limitations created by the ongoing coronavirus pandemic and project timeline, we shifted to an online Qualtrics survey. This shift allowed us to open our sample to the instructors of the syllabi we analyzed (N = 8). As a reflection of this shift, the survey questions were largely open-ended, allowing for communicative and explanatory responses about the intended purposes of participation in Japanese and American graduate courses. In total, 8 survey items were created, ranging from total years teaching, forms of participation, knowledge of culturally sustaining pedagogies, grander connections, and a brief reflection. The survey generated results that illustrated how participation is utilized in the context of culturally sustaining pedagogical practices and learner-centered strategies. This element of our methodology expands on our syllabi content analysis and provides an instructor perspective of course expectations for participation and strategies.

RESULTS
Syllabi Content Analysis
        A content analysis of 8 higher education graduate-level courses covering a variety of topics. More general courses covered history and globalization, leadership, pedagogy, and curriculum and instructional design. More focused courses covered elements of research, the Latinx experience in higher education, and growth and change in Japanese education. One half of these courses occurred during Spring 2020 (N = 4) and the other half during Fall 2020 (N = 4), meaning our sample is heavily impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. A majority of our sample courses are held online (N = 6), with half of those having a synchronous component (N = 3). Two courses that were held in person in Spring 2020 were shifted to online given adaptations to the pandemic.

        Focusing on participation, only one course had ungraded participation, showing that graduate courses rely heavily on student interaction. Expectations included collaboration (N = 1), discussion (N = 4), and group work (N = 2). Syllabi emphasized the importance of active participation to foster student learning and sustain a "nurturing" classroom environment. One in-person course laid out specific expectations, such as maintaining awareness of "air time", remaining genuine, respecting student confidentiality, and taking risks. Online courses measured participation through interaction with web-based resources, discussion forums, and collaboration with team members for group assignments.

        In graduate courses, learning is not a passive activity. Grappling with course concepts, problematizing theory, and interaction around readings provides a depth of knowledge that a simple lecture cannot provide. In smaller classrooms, teacher pedagogy becomes apparent in how instructors facilitate discussion, pose questions, and support student inquiry.

Student Self-Reflections Analysis
        Our colleagues from the United States, South Korea, and China engaged in a self-reflection exercise to show how their educational experiences intersect with their identities and

other life experiences. The two American colleagues are Katrina and Renae. Our colleague Jaehyuk is from South Korea and Guanglong is from China.

Katrina and Renae self-identify as a first-generation college students and white Americans. Although racial identity is prominent in both reflections, reflected experiences vary. While Katrina acknowledged that her whiteness played a hand in her positive undergraduate college experience, Renae occasionally feels isolated in academic groups given her racial identity. She feels the history of whiteness outweighs her personal voice, automatically labeling her as a bad person. Nonetheless, both American colleagues value participation and CSP in education. Ranae feels inspired by CSP as it reminds her that she holds power to be intentional and make changes. Katrina yearns to make change with students through youth participatory action research projects and intentional pedagogy.

Jaehyuk and Guanglong reported a dramatic change in their educational experiences in comparing between education in their home countries and education overseas. They reflected on the rigid education systems in South Korea and China. Jaehyuk mentioned the cram education where students are expected to "memorize everything that teachers wrote on the blackboard". He recalled that there was little chance for discussion with teachers or peers because he was pressured to memorize and repeat class materials for high test scores. Guanglong reflected on his Chinese education experience as being "knowledge transmission", and subsequently he conceived education as "a ladder to climb for success and the climbing was about scoring high on standardized exams".

Each researcher is very conscious of their identities and how life experiences intersect with their education. These is a high value placed on participation as a learning method and meaningful communication as part of the learning experience. For example, Jerry explores student engagement with communication technology, Katrina seeks the student perspective and involvement, Renae values connection and in-class participation activities, and after some resistance at first, Guanglong embraces participation as a teaching method.

In contrast, our American colleagues are more conscious about their racial identity and how it ties into their educational and life experiences. Meanwhile, our Chinese and Korea colleagues reflected mostly on the educational systems at their home countries. We attribute this to national context. The United States has a unique racial system compared to South Korea and China, making it an important piece of Katrina and Renae's educational experience. In contrast, the standardized exam and cram education are prevalent memories of the education experiences for Jaehyuk in South Korea and Guanglong in China. Lastly, international education experience serves different purposes. For Katrina and Renae, international education means a resume builder and an enhancement to the American education experience, whereas for Jaehyuk and Guanglong, international or study abroad education serves as a fresh start.

Instructor Survey

Of the eight professors we invited to complete the survey, only five completed it within time for this report. All professors taught for at least ten years (N = 5) and most of the instructors reported using graded participation activities "most of the time" or "always" (N = 3). One instructor noted synchronous sessions as counting for participation activity, and another noted peer tutoring and microteaching as additional participation activities.

We inquired about instructor's purpose of using graded participation activities in their courses, and the results are shown in Table 1. Answers include exposure to different experiences and perspectives; recognition of values to express oneself; interaction with peers and learning

from each other; opportunities to process course content and to consolidate learned concepts; and the establishment of self-directed learning habits for students to become "owners" of their learning. All these provided purposes resonate with what we know about LCT and CSP in the literature (Weimer, 2013; Paris, 2012; Alims & Paris, 2014; Weimer, 2013). This leads us to believe that the instructors indeed conceive graded participation activities as a teaching method for LCT and CSP. To confirm this, we asked respondents to define LCT and CSP.

Table 2 showcases the definitions of CSP and LCT provided by instructors. A vast majority of the instructors were familiar with CSP (N = 4). All instructors were familiar with learner-centered pedagogies and echo Weimer (2013) in framing LCT as encouraging students to become the "actor" responsible and conscious about constructing their learning experience. Instructors are expected to "center learner rather than subject or instructor" when practicing LCT. Their definitions on CSP reveal two key areas: using diverse cultural backgrounds and knowledge as the tool for learning and promoting equality and inclusion for diverse cultures. These two areas echo Paris's (2012) advocacy for CSP in creating an equal and just educational space. The LCT and CSP definitions overlap; surveyed instructors value the "whole student" for their important role to individual and collective learning in the classroom.

Furthermore, instructors suggest LCT as the requirement for CSP (N = 3). One instructor wrote that students' awareness of their own perspectives makes learner centered pedagogy possible. Another instructor explained that students' recognition of cultural perspectives helps them to relate their cultural understandings to their learning and to become more culturally responsive and sustaining with others. Centering the perspective development of individual students is the premise of sustaining diverse cultures in educational environments, echoing the distinction made by another instructor who framed LCT as individually focused while CSP is community focused. Culturally sustaining learning communities are built when students from diverse backgrounds are equally represented and centered in their learning experiences.

Another survey item left space for instructors to voice concerns and challenges around practicing CSP and LCT, shown in Table 3. Pros include critical thinking, inclusion, diversity and student engagement, whereas cons include preference for teacher-centered teaching and lack of knowledge and experience for designing LCT and CSP courses. Instructors explained that teacher-centered teaching is more desirable for some students considering "less" work for their students which is reflected in literature (Weimer, 2013). Students resist LCT as it requires more labor on their end, sometimes creating feelings of threat because instructor authority has been the standard routine for many years. This sudden shift of pedagogy can be frightening.

Two instructors revealed that competent instructional design for LCT and CSP requires time and skill. Neither CSP nor LCT is widely practiced nor a common topic of professional development, so instructors wishing to practice CSP and LCT must actively seek out support and knowledge. Competing teaching objectives are also a challenge, one instructor mentioning that making room for LCT and CSP practices could mean sacrificing room for other objectives. One instructor noted the institutional, cultural and nation-specific differences would expose barriers to practicing LCT and CSP. Lastly, one instructor noted that "achieving cultural diversity is logically challenging," reminding us that LCT is the premise for CSP. It is possible that the instructors consider LCT as underdeveloped in today's classroom, therefore achieving CSP remains a premature wish.

CONCLUSION

The instructors have been utilizing participation methods to complement and enhance their dynamic LCT and CSP. Our research findings through syllabi content analysis, self-reflection, and instructor survey show that participation is evaluated as positive and effective in learning by both instructors and students in the perspective of LCT and CSP. From the syllabi content analysis, we found out that most syllabi (N = 7) use participation for the course and is included in course grades as points or percentages. The self-reflection demonstrates our unique education experiences given our differences in culture and background; however, all of us valuated participation and expressed the need for learner-centered and culturally sustaining education. Most surveyed instructors (N = 4) indicated that they are familiar with both CSP and LCT. They used participation for the purposes such as learning from peers, exposure to different perspectives, and consolidation of learned knowledges. Moreover, these instructors demonstrate the linkages between participation, LCT and CSP and they have experience implementing them in their courses.

SUGGESTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

COIL, perceived necessity, and technology literacy

Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) is a teaching and learning method that provides "innovative cost-effective internationalization strategies". COIL promotes an interaction of teachers and students with peers abroad through a mixed learning environment that emphasizes multicultural online learning and student collaboration. (About COIL). COIL is learner-centered as it focuses on experiential learning and collaborative participation among students, as well as culturally sustaining since it celebrates cross-cultural engagement and promotes intercultural understanding. Though, COIL is not purely a technology, it is a "paradigm" with "shared multicultural learning environments" (Rubin, 2017). COIL can be used in whole courses or specific projects with digital technology. Instructors across the world can connect institutions, courses, and projects using online forums, email, video meetings, and shared learning management systems.

Many schools are adopting various extent of online learning due to the coronavirus pandemic. Applying the theory of TAM to the recent shift in education environment is insufficient because the pandemic pushed people to adopt new technology and ways of learning with limited time and resources. Thus, we coin a new term 'perceived necessity' to extend the application of TAM in the pandemic. The adoption of synchronous online learning or blended learning of in-person and online learning is more strongly linked to perceived usefulness than perceived ease of use. Both teachers and students had no option to continue their learning in-person during the pandemic. Although some instructors and students are experiencing user difficulties, they feel the need to use new technology and new ways of learning, such as videoconferencing and learning management systems. The usefulness of videoconferencing tools has proven effective, and more teachers and schools are adopting this new technology for education. This change made the COIL classes between MSU and ICU possible.

Besides augmenting student participation through practices centering LCT and CSP, COIL fosters technology literacy. Miranda (2020) points out that collaborating online prepares students with the skills needed for modern careers, and that more categories of jobs will require people to work in geographically dispersed locations and as virtual teams. One of silver linings of the shift in education is that students may become more experienced and disciplined in digital learning. Miranda (2020) argues that people need to know "how to collaborate efficiently,

conduct online research and analysis, master speaking and presentation skills, exercise emotional intelligence, and become more self-motivated and proactive." With the change caused by the pandemic, and the increased use of technology innovation in education, it is critical to be flexible and adaptable to this change.

REFERENCES

About COIL. (n.d.). *SUNY COIL Center.* http://coil.suny.edu/page/about-coil-0

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., Lovetts, M. C., Dipietro, M., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. D. (2013). *Powerful techniques for teaching adults*: San Francisco: Jossey- Bass

Erlingsson, C., Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine 7,* 93-99.

Ladson-Billings, G., Tate, F. W. (1995). Toward A Critical Race Theory of Education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1).

Miranda, Guille. (2020, September 21). *The unexpected benefits of virtual education*. World Economic Forum. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/09/unexpected-benefits-virtual-education/

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice. *Educational Researcher 41*(3), 93-97.

Paris, D., Alim, H. S. (2014) What Are We Seeking to Sustain Through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy? A Loving Critique Forward. *Harvard Educational Review 84*(1), 85-100.

Park, S. Y. (2009). An analysis of the technology acceptance model in understanding university students' behavioral intention to use e-learning. *Educational Technology & Society, 12*(3), 150-162.

Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. F. (1971). Communication of innovations: a cross-cultural approach. 2d ed. New York: Free Press.

Rubin, John. (2017). Embedding Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) at Higher Education Institutions. *Internationalisation of Higher Education 2,* 27-44.

Tornatzky, L. G., & Klein, K. J. (1982). Innovation characteristics and innovation adoption-implementation: A meta-analysis of findings. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 29(1), 28.

What is collaborative online international learning?. (n.d.). *University of Minnesota Duluth*. https://www.d.umn.edu/coil/

Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice* (Second Edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX

<u>1) Syllabi Content Analysis Guidelines</u>
Record findings directly from the syllabus into a separate document or work directly in the syllabus. If you choose to work within the syllabus, maintain the integrity of the data – don't mix comments, codes, or themes *within* the syllabus. Take note that the *absence* of an answer to a question or prompt below should be coded too, it's all data! Once you've completed your analysis, add your data to the Syllabus Content Analysis Excel document located in the Data folder so we all can see it and get a grand overview of our data.
Q1: Which course does this syllabus belong to?

Q2: What semester did this course take place?

Q3: Course organization – chronological or thematic?

Q4: Course format – Synchronous, asynchronous? Lecture or seminar? Was this course during the spring and switched to "online", Zoom, or "remote"?

Q5: What is the general topic of the course?

Q6: How is participation described?

Q7: What are the expectations for participation? What counts, and what doesn't?

Q8: If there is a percentage weight, what is it?

Q9: If there is a point grade, what is it and how many total points are available?

Q10: Is there feedback given on participation throughout the semester, or at certain points, or do you receive your grade at the end of the semester?

Q11: Is there anywhere else in the syllabus that mentions participation? In what ways?

Q12: Any other things of note?

<u>2) Self-Reflection Guidelines</u>
Generate a self-reflection of 500 words or one typed page. Reflect on as many questions or concepts noted below as desired, or add additional related concepts based on your experience.
- How do our identities and backgrounds intersect and shape who we are, what we care and what research we do?
- What attracted us to take the courses of which we are analyzing their syllabi?
- How do our perspectives converge or diverge from the learning objectives of the syllabi?
- Positionality, being a researcher and research subject
- Research interests
- BEVI results

Once you have wrote your own self-reflection, read through the rest of the team's self-reflections. Summarize any similarities or differences you found in the team's collaborative summarization document.

<u>3) Instructor Survey Questions</u>

Q1: How long have you taught college courses in years?

Q2: How often do you use participation-related activities that are graded in your courses?

Q3: What specific forms of participation (both graded and ungraded) do you often use in your courses? Please select all that apply.

    a. Student-led discussions
    b. Group projects
    c. Online forum
    d. Other (open-ended)

Q4: What are your main purposes and benefits of using the participation methods you employ in your courses?

Q5: Are you familiar with culturally sustaining pedagogies?

    a. If yes: how do you define culturally sustaining pedagogies?
    b. If no, prompt definition: *The term culturally sustaining requires that our pedagogies be more than responsive of or relevant to the cultural experiences and practices of young people—it requires that they support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence. ... That is, culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling (Paris, 2012).*

Q6: What connection (if any) do you see between the participation methods you use and culturally sustaining pedagogies?

Q7: What do you think are the pros and cons of integrating sustaining relevant pedagogies into your teaching in regard to participation?

Q8: Does your educational background, research and teaching experience shape your current pedagogies and interest in culturally relevant pedagogies?

Table 1: Main purpose of participation methods

-Students to learn from each other, comfortable expressing personal ideas, students to become owners of their learning -Application of teamwork, exposure to different perspectives, having to define perspectives, learning from each other -Consolidation of learned concepts, connecting experiences to class/readings (positionality) -Opportunity to process content, opportunity for teacher to assess students' learning and thinking to identity correct/incorrect understandings, student accountability for learning -Information about how students are understanding the material

Table 2: CSP and LCT Definitions Provided by Instructors

CSP	-Supporting students to use cultural practices as learning tools, examining ways of knowing from non-dominant cultures -Teaching and learning that promotes equality, diversity, inclusion, recognizes learner and learner's community -Teaching and learning that promotes and stems from student's cultural background, experience, ways of knowing -Instructional methods responsive of cultural differences to promote inclusion

LCT	-Center learner rather than subject or instructor, learner chooses what and how to learn -Promote learners as active participants and leaders of own learning -Learner as the "actor" responsible for understanding, designing learning experiences, monitoring learning -Empathically and intersubjectively anticipate learner consciousness and construction of learning (from self/experiences??) -Consider the learner when designing and facilitating, engagement of learner in meaning making

Table 3: Pros and Cons of CSP and LCT

Pros of CSP and LCT	Cons of CSP and LCT
– Deeper learning, higher order thinking (critical thinking) – Sensitivity to, acceptance of diversity and inclusion – Cultural diversity as enriching component – Learning becomes relevant for the student (profound, meaningful) – Student engagement	– Teacher-centered content is desirable for some students – Cover a lot of content – Decreased expert knowledge available – Competent instructional design requires time and skills – Cultural diversity is logistically challenging – Learners are responsible for their own learning – Limits of power-flexibility in classroom/institution – Multiple competing objectives, desires