



'An online survey is less personal whereas I actually sat with the lecturer and it felt like you actually cared about what I am saying': A pedagogy-oriented action research to improve student engagement in criminology

Journal:	<i>Educational Action Research</i>
Manuscript ID	REAC-2020-0137.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Action research, student engagement, McNiff, pedagogy, criminology, criminal justice

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

‘An online survey is less personal whereas I actually sat with the lecturer and it felt like you actually cared about what I am saying’: A pedagogy-oriented action research to improve student engagement in criminology

Student engagement plays a central role in teaching and learning, given its impact on students’ retention and ability to actively participate in the learning process. This study evaluates the impact of an Interactive Action-Oriented Learning (IAOL) and teaching style on improving students’ engagement in the Explaining Punishment module in a UK university by adopting McNiff’s model of action research. Furthermore, it aims to fill a gap in the existing literature regarding the paucity of research on improving student engagement within the Criminology and Criminal Justice discipline. Two focus group discussions, each comprising eight students, were conducted. Additional data were collated from module evaluation, end terms results, and peer-feedback. Based on the end-term results, it was found that the inclusion of the IAOL contents and teaching style improved student engagement and student performance. Hence, this study suggests a model that provides practical outcomes that inform best practices in teaching and learning.

Keywords: action research; criminology; criminal justice; student engagement; McNiff; pedagogy

Introduction

In the changing landscape of higher education (HE), student engagement has become central to the teaching and learning process for students. The socio-economic and dynamic political context of the UK’s HE system has spurred a burgeoning focus on consumer-influenced teaching adapted to suit the needs of students. The Government White Paper which focuses on ‘Students at the Heart of the System’ promotes choices that are strongly influenced by the price and quality of student experiences as the main drivers in shaping HE provision (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills 2011).

1
2
3 In fact, this view is echoed in the policy and pedagogical literatures highlighting the fact
4 that the introduction of fees for students will trigger a stronger consumerist mindset in
5 students who will nurture perceived notions of ‘value for money’ and a relatively high
6 expectation for quality education (Docherty 2011). The implications of this view are
7 reinforced by the necessity for HE providers and their staff to engage more intensively
8 with students who are the direct consumers of their educational services.
9

10
11
12 From a pedagogical standpoint, academicians from many disciplines have become
13 increasingly aware of the need to enhance students’ engagement from a subject-based
14 context-specific position (Jidong 2019; Albers 2007; Slunt and Giancarlo 2004). Some
15 disciplines increasingly appear to have explored the improvement of student engagement
16 and learning more deeply than other disciplines. The academic discipline of Criminology
17 and Criminal Justice highlights a paucity of in-depth exploration into this aspect of
18 research (Stack 2007). Instructors of Criminology and Criminal Justice acknowledge the
19 adoption of technological innovations to enhance interactive and engaging teaching
20 methods (Davis et al. 2014). However, their use has mainly focused on service learning,
21 the use of internships, and experiential learning (Davis et al. 2014). The adoption of team-
22 based learning also represents a technique that have been recognised in this discipline.
23 However, reduced resources and increased class sizes limit the frequent use of this
24 technique (Stamatel et al. 2013). The use of action research, which engages students in
25 the active action inquiry process and improvement of engagement, seems to be lacking.
26
27

28
29
30 Bradford, Mowder and Bohte (2016) argue that although many instructors may
31 be employing innovative teaching techniques, they are limited by their non-assessment in
32 a research context or the lack of publication regarding the approaches they adopted. It is
33 against this backdrop that this study intends to contribute to the growing body of literature
34 on the improvement of student engagement as well as pave the way for further
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pedagogical research, specifically through the adoption of the Jean McNiff model of
4
5 action research in the discipline of Criminology and Criminal Justice.
6
7

8 Pedagogical research is mainly aimed at identifying the best practices that
9
10 improve learning outcomes of students (Haggis 2009). This entails a definition of the
11
12 outcomes and the adoption of techniques to empirically assess their impact on those
13
14 outcomes. The growing use of student-centred learning approaches has led to the
15
16 emergence of various techniques which include those addressed in the current research:
17
18 interactive action-oriented learning (IAOL) and teaching content. Briefly defined, the
19
20 highlighted pedagogical techniques employed facilitated group-work, and an interactive
21
22 and integrative mode of teaching and learning in the classroom which involves designing
23
24 the teaching content and course delivery and assessment and improvement of the channel
25
26 of communication between the lecturer and the students.
27
28
29
30

31 As previously mentioned, the learning outcomes that the proposed techniques
32
33 hope to impact are also worth defining. An increase in students' course grades or improve
34
35 performance in examinations represent frequently used measures (Haggis 2009);
36
37 however, other modes include student engagement and other subjective and objective
38
39 measures of learning (Bradford, Mowder and Bohte 2016). The rationale for the present
40
41 research was informed by the observation that the average student of Criminology and
42
43 Criminal Justice disliked the 'Explaining Punishment' (CRI3023-N) module owing to the
44
45 theoretical and philosophical underpinning often construed as boring; this impacted
46
47 students performance and engagement. This observation is empirically tied to the concept
48
49 that from a general perspective, students are mostly apathetic towards the traditional
50
51 methods of learning (Stamatel et al. 2013). This research seeks to explore and report the
52
53 findings concerning a single research question: Is the adoption of Jean McNiff model of
54
55 action research alongside IAOL and teaching contents effective in improving student
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engagement?

4 5 **Background**

6
7 Student engagement has increasingly formed the focus of attention amongst teachers and
8 classroom practitioners with the aim of enhancing teaching and learning across the HE
9 sector. The importance of student engagement is delineated in the plethora of studies that
10 have established the link between the involvement of students in a set of purposive
11 educational activities, and the positive outcomes of student development and success,
12 including social engagement, satisfaction, and academic achievement (Astin 1984;
13 Chickering and Gamson 1987; Kuh et al. 2005; Wigfield and Eccles 2020). As Kuh
14 (2003) argues, where students study and what they bring to such HE institutions play a
15 limited role in their development and success compared to what they specifically engage
16 in during their time as students. Although, Kuh's (2003) postulations are almost two
17 decades old, they appear to be very relevant to the defining chances of success, reflecting
18 the need for enhanced student engagement in learning and teaching today.

19
20 Diverse definitions exist about the meaning of student engagement. These span the
21 extent to which students are engaged in activities (Krause and Coates 2008) to the quality
22 of effort students themselves devote to educational activities and institutional
23 involvement in improving engagement (Kuh 2009). However, as Coates (2007, 12) notes,
24 engagement entails 'a broad construct intended to encompass salient academic as well as
25 certain non-academic aspects of the student experience', including

- 26 • collaborative and active learning
- 27 • involvement in challenging academic activities
- 28 • formative communication with academic staff
- 29 • participation in enriching educational experiences
- 30 • feeling legitimate and supported by the learning communities of the university.

1
2
3 This definition is particularly useful particularly in contextualising student engagement
4 within the Criminology and Criminal Justice disciplines and in enhancing a student-
5 centred approach to improve teaching and learning through action research. Student-
6 centred Learning (SCL) highlights the need for students to play a more active role in
7 directing their own learning (Judi and Sahari 2013). Oblinger and Maruyama (1996)
8 argue the importance of developing the students' ability to seek learning resources
9 available to them actively, while the instructor employs and facilitates pedagogical
10 methods that encourage the use of the identified resources. The use of SCL often relies
11 on methods such as dedicated group structured assignments and cooperative learning
12 (Felder and Brent, 1996). Building on these foundations, the IAOL and teaching
13 interventions came to rely on a mixture of group-work learning, writing exercises and the
14 inclusion of educative video contents from real-life case studies to enhance student
15 engagement. Studies have shown that the use of approaches including group-work prove
16 to be effective as it is recognised that students who work as part of a group or team tend
17 to outperform students who work individually (Nicoll-Senft 2009; Jafari 2014).

18
19 To achieve the aim of improving student engagement, this research project also
20 adopted action research, specifically the Jean McNiff (2016; 2017) model, as an approach
21 for enhancing engagement. McNiff (2016) argues that action research encompasses a way
22 of investigating and evaluating what works and how to improve current teaching
23 practices. According to McNiff and Whitehead (2011, 7), action research also serves as a
24 means in which one produces an account of practice which shows '(1) how they are
25 trying to improve what they are doing, which involves first thinking about and learning
26 how to do it better; and (2) how they try to influence others to do the same thing. These
27 accounts stand as their own practical theories of practice, from which others can learn.'

1
2
3 Action research encompasses a liberating, distinctive and powerful form of
4 professional enquiry as it allows practitioners, including instructors, to investigate their
5 practices as they seek a direction that highlights their educational values. It allows
6 inquirers to decide on what to do to improve their practice in negotiation with others. As
7 McNiff and Whitehead (2011, 8) add, action research allows practitioners to investigate
8 and ‘put their stories of learning into the public domain’, and therefore, one’s ‘story can
9 add to this collection and strengthen it.’ In essence, a major and compelling reason for
10 adopting action research is to investigate and describe the process of inquiry into
11 addressing the impact of the adoption of McNiff model of action research on improving
12 student engagement in a discipline where there seems to be a paucity in the use of action
13 research.

14
15 Action research has been particularly useful in improving pedagogy. There is no
16 doubt that implementing evidence-based practice could help improve teaching, learning,
17 and the engagement of students in the context of HE. This is because action research
18 arguably possesses the potential to generate new and practical knowledge by
19 collaborating with the students as stakeholders in developing learning materials and
20 ensuring effective content delivery that foster engagement (Jidong 2019). Waterman et
21 al. (2001, 11) define action research as:

22
23 A period of inquiry which describes, interprets and explains
24 social situations while executing a change intervention aimed at
25 improvement and involvement. It is problem-focused, context
26 specific and future oriented. Action research is a group activity
27 with an explicit critical value basis and is founded on a
28 partnership between action researchers and participants, all of
29 whom are involved in the change process.

1
2
3 As a process, action research enables teaching staff in their respective disciplines to
4 systematically change their approach to teaching while also improving student
5 performance by facilitating an increasing in their learning and engagement with teaching
6 material (Biggs 2003). As Biggs (2003, 254) argues, action research is a ‘trial and re-try
7 cycle’, that is, ‘you try something, see if it works, then try again with a slight variation.’
8 The importance of action research is reflected more in teaching strategies, which might
9 positively impact students’ learning strategies.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Existing literature suggests that students’ learning strategies are correlated with
20 their perceptions of the teaching and learning environment created (Ramsden 2003).
21 Ramsden and Entwistle (1981) elaborate on the relationship between student perceptions
22 of an academically heavy workload and the use of a surface approach to learning. Eley
23 (1992) found in his study that to cope with set tasks when the course suggests formal
24 achievement, surface learning approaches are more likely to be employed by students
25 alongside deep approaches to understand the key principles and practices of subjects.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Thus, there is a need to engage students in the co-creative design of intervention
36 to improve active learning and engagement through the joint design of solution to the
37 problem that directly affects them. The involvement of students in in this process is
38 particularly beneficial to students’ feelings of competence, relatedness, and being part of
39 a process that addresses their needs, all of which are fundamental to human motivation,
40 psychological well-being (Ryan and Deci 2000), and educational success (Mitra 2004).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 In addition, there is the need for an enhanced pedagogical approach to be adopted
50 to engage students in learning Explaining Punishment. As such, the quality of the methods
51 aimed at students’ learning needs to include techniques that actively engage the students
52 while also encouraging in-depth learning (Albrecht and Sack 2000). In fact, Barr and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tagg (1995) advocate the need to adopt a shift from the traditionally accepted form of
4 university instruction to a more student-centred approach to teaching and learning.
5
6

7
8 The benefit accrued to students as active learners cannot be underestimated given
9 the advantage it has on them to achieve more in-depth learning and also interact with
10 peers whilst also building a sense of community within the course (Smith et al. 2005). To
11 ensure a desired level of engagement and interaction among students, there is a need to
12 redesign how CRI3023-N is delivered and taught to reflect a student-centred approach.
13 This approach is also supported by Adler and Isaacs (1982) who argue that genuine
14 learning is meant to be active and encompass a delivery process which places the student
15 as the agent and not the facilitator. Jidong (2019, 345) further argues that ‘engaging
16 students as active partners in their own learning is instrumental to active learning and
17 students’ engagement.’ As Chickering and Gamson (1987) note, it is important for
18 students to talk about their learning as a basis for improvement and engagement.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Literature review suggests the importance of adopting a student-centred,
34 interactive and collaborative pedagogy that enriches students’ learning experiences. The
35 action research reports the integration of student-informed Interactive Action-Oriented
36 Learning (IAOL) content and teaching style as a means of engaging students in CRI3023-
37 N. The research anticipates delivering a better understanding of the context within which
38 action research is employed in order to improve students’ engagement and enhance
39 teaching and learning experiences.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Methodology and Techniques for Data Collection**

52 This study adopted an action research approach from McNiff’s (2016; 2017) theoretical
53 model. McNiff (2016; 2017) highlights an action research process that involves a
54 systematic approach. This was adopted to facilitate a mode of classroom inquiry in which
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 researchers can resolve social issues affecting their lives to achieve a change (McNiff
4
5 2016; Lewin 1946; Ronen 2020).
6

7
8 Contents of two focus group discussions, students' feedback from module
9
10 evaluation, peer observation, and course grades were used to examine and improve
11
12 teaching content and the quality of teaching sessions, and monitor its impact on increasing
13
14 student engagement. The use of action research as the method of inquiry enabled a
15
16 detailed study which allowed for a problem to be diagnosed, an intervention designed and
17
18 implemented, and its impact in causing a change evaluated (McNiff 2016). An action
19
20 research methodology was utilised because it enabled not only a clear diagnosis of areas
21
22 for improvement but allowed for the depiction of teaching innovations that allows the
23
24 incorporation of the ability to reflect during the course of the entire process (Riding,
25
26 Fowell and Levy 1995).
27
28
29

30
31 In a typical process of action research, each cycle is informed and improved upon
32
33 by the activities undertaken in the previous cycles (Stringer 2004). An action research
34
35 approach, therefore, entails a systematic and cyclic spiral of activities as represented in
36
37 the Jean McNiff model (2016). McNiff (2016; 2017) identified eight cycles of research
38
39 activities including the review of current practice, identification of an aspect in need of
40
41 investigation, the imagination of a way forward, implementation of the proposed
42
43 intervention, stock-taking of what happens, modification of intervention(s) in light of
44
45 what is found whilst also continuing to try another option if a previous round of
46
47 intervention does not seem to be working, monitor actions, and review and evaluate the
48
49 modified action. This process informed the action research reported in this study which
50
51 provided a theoretical contribution by describing how the research was conducted
52
53 alongside the result derived from the process.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Techniques for data gathering

Action research as an approach provides a convenient platform for an investigation into learning scenarios within an educational setting given its adoption of a holistic approach using evidence from multiple sources (Smith, Whipp, and Willmott 1988; Yin 1994). This study utilised semi-structured focus group interviews, module evaluation and results (Yin 1994) to ensure the increased contextual validity of the study (McKinnon 1989; Patton 1987). The triangulation of the methods and sources ensured the results were balanced, broadly based and grounded in the perceptions of students of CRI3023-N stakeholders (Winter 1989).

Students of CRI3023-N participated in the two focus group interviews comprising eight students each to enable a rich flow of in-depth information from the students' perspective to be obtained (Strauss and Corbin 1990). A multiple respondent approach was used as the form of data collection to reduce the impact of any single individual's as being treated as representing the situation of the class and to limit the likelihood of a distorted approach in reconstructing events (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Moreover, before data collection, ethical approval was sought and approved by the Instructor's university Research Ethics Committee. All participants in the focus groups were given a written consent form and briefed of the purpose of the study before they were asked to sign if they wished to participate. Participation was purely voluntary and devoid of monetary payments.

It is worth acknowledging that the data have been subject to thematic analysis and interpretation through the values, assumptions and judgement I held; the product of which may differ from others perspectives and interpretations. Notwithstanding this fact, the internal validity of the project was enhanced by the consistent repetition of the action research cycle as denoted in McNiff's (2016; 2017) model of action research.

Results

The main aims of the result section are to describe the essence, objectives, and mode of delivery of CRI3023-N. This is followed by a description of activities that occurred in each stage of the research, design, and implementation of the interventions followed by an evaluation of the process. Each cycle of the action research further includes my detailed reflection of the process; a summary of the findings; and the relation of lessons learnt to the students' perspective and learning in order to further improve their engagement.

The Module

The Explaining Punishment module is taught in the third year of Criminology degree at the University I teach situated in the United Kingdom. The course is offered to students studying Criminology, Criminology with Psychology, and Criminology with Law degrees. The main aims of the module are to enable students to develop a critical understanding of the relationship between economic, political, and ideological changes in society and the institutions of punishment. This is designed to enable students to involve in a comprehensive discussion of Marxist, functionalist, institutionalist, and postmodernist approaches to the subject matter. Thus, this module offers ample opportunity for students to apply and critically evaluate the explanatory potential of such approaches with respect to specific features and functions of the modern penal system.

The course is run through a single semester commencing in September in each academic year. Approximately 59 students, including male and female and mature students were enrolled in the course. The course also comprised a 2-hour weekly lecture and a 2-hour seminar divided into three groups of 20 students in each seminar. The lectures and seminars were delivered in the university I teach located in the Town Centre of Middlesbrough, which once used to be an industrialist town. The university is situated

1
2
3 in an area that is socially and economically deprived. The university has a diverse range
4 of students comprising fulltime workers, students who are the first from their respective
5 families to go to university, international students and students from within the region.
6
7 Data from the two focus groups were collated from approximately 16 students comprising
8 eight students each of which eight were females while the other eight were males.
9

14 *Identification of the problem*

16 McNiff (2016;2017) described this stage as an important aspect where the issue for
17 improvement is identified, recorded, and analysed. Anecdotal evidence from reduced
18 student attendance and disengagement suggests that the key problem with modules such
19 as CRI3023-N, was the perceived lack of engagement with the module partly owing to
20 its historical perspective that draws on the works of Durkheim, Max Weber, Michel
21 Foucault, and Karl Marx. These problems are central to engagement, given the lack of
22 interest in learning these perspectives among students. Focus group discussions were used
23 to elicit students' views on questions such as what factors limit engagement? From the
24 Explaining Punishment (CRI3023-N) focus groups discussions conducted, four common
25 themes emerged including information overload, repetitive approach of the module as a
26 sub-component of the programme, indifference towards students' background as a
27 requisite for engagement, and the use of virtual learning environment (VLE) to enhance
28 learning.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 *Information overload*

48 Teaching to cover curriculum and content has often been a central aspect of teaching and
49 learning. Such importance is underscored by the perceived role of 'value for money'
50 which has often dominated the contemporary HE landscape. A common theme that
51 emerged from the data was a sense that 'information overload' constituted one of the
52 main barriers to engagement. Given the design of the module, which drew on lots of richly
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 detailed historical perspectives, students expressed views which seems to suggest a
4
5 negative aspect of such in their learning and active engagement. For instance, one of the
6
7 level six participants commented that:
8
9

10 I thought every now and then there is a bit too much information.

11 Sometimes, especially now like it is just easy to switch off.

12 Obviously, when you are in a big room full of people, so it is just
13
14

15 when you are finding something hard and you do not get
16
17

18 something it is easier to just switch off than actually trying to
19
20

21 understand it.
22
23

24 Here, information overload is seen to pose a challenge that inhibits the student's learning.

25 In addition, the method of delivery, especially within the context of a large class, is
26
27

28 perceived as central to improving engagement. A possible explanation for this is given
29
30

31 the students perceived difficulty in engaging in a large lecture and demystifying the
32
33

34 essence of the lecture. This, thus, brings to the fore how teaching to cover the content and
35
36

37 curriculum might have an impact on the students' learning.

38 *Perceived repetitive approach of the module as a sub-component of the programme*

39 A key theme that also emerged was the perceived repetitive approach of the module,
40
41

42 which is viewed from a less positive perspective. Talking about this, a participant said, 'I
43
44

45 think the topic is a bit dry and that is why most people do not like it. So, I think is all
46
47

48 about Durkheim that you have kind of learn about for the entire time of the year.' This
49
50

51 perceived sense of repetition which resonates in their perceptions was aptly noted by
52
53

54 another level six participant who said the following:

55 I think, not just for this specific module but the entire programme

56 where you do like a module like in the first year that is very

57 similar in third year. [...] You are basically like learning the same
58
59
60

1
2
3 stuff. [...] you might actually learn it on a basic level in the first
4
5 year and a deeper level in third year, but you are already feeling
6
7 like you know it. It can then get repetitive.
8
9

10 Here, the positive attribute of having a foundational background to a complex
11
12 sociological account of punishment is considered detrimental to engagement as it gives
13
14 students a sense of learning which does not challenge their thinking. Prior knowledge,
15
16 even if at an elementary level, is construed as being equal to in-depth knowledge. This
17
18 approach, which builds on previous knowledge, is construed as being problematic from
19
20 the student's perspective.
21
22

23 *Indifference towards students' background as a requisite for engagement*

24
25 A common pattern that emerged in the dataset was the perceived importance of the
26
27 lecturer's awareness of the students' backgrounds as a central tenet for engagement. This
28
29 importance was construed from the vantage point of how modules are and impact
30
31 students' engagement. One of the students, while elucidating on how teachers'
32
33 indifference towards students' background impact their learning, said:
34
35
36

37 I think it is just that people do not understand that we are not at
38
39 the PhD level and Masters level and when they discuss things and
40
41 touch upon a complex term like this is how it is, it may tip of
42
43 someone and as a consequence you kind of zone out [disengage].
44
45 And when you do not understand it, they are almost like not
46
47 condescending towards your understanding. Everyone does not
48
49 learn at the same level.
50
51
52

53 This perspective on the impact of the complex issues on limited engagement is central.
54
55 Such a perspective is particularly interesting given the nature of the module which draws
56
57 on the complex sociological argument for understanding punishment. A notable example
58
59
60

1
2
3 includes Weber's *verstehen* and Durkheim's mechanical and organic solidarity; all of
4 these have been perceived by the students as complex terms in the module. Designing a
5 teaching style that embraces awareness of these complexities and the challenges it poses
6 on the students' learning seems crucial in fostering engagement.
7
8
9
10
11

12 A notable point that could also be gleaned from the extract is the context of
13 'responsibility'. The impact of this is delineated in how students felt an easy route might
14 be to disengage as opposed to asking questions for clarity. Hence, suggesting a teaching
15 delivery and design that accommodate the needs of learners with diverse levels of
16 understanding by creating the opportunity for anonymous questions.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 *VLE to enhance learning and improve channel of communication*

24 A final theme that emerged from the discussions was the perceived inclusion of VLE as
25 a means of enhancing engagement. This was mostly construed from perspectives such as
26 the inclusion of technology-enhanced learning software as a means of improving
27 engagement and communication. Talking about this, a participant said: 'I think
28 communication outside like in lectures and seminars is a big thing and an online channel,
29 beside the traditional email, could help enhance student learning'. Here, this form of
30 learning environment is given considerable importance for meeting the needs of diverse
31 learners.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Imagination of a solution to the problem*

45 Given the nature of the problems identified, I consider how these may be tackled in the
46 context of the traditional model which led to the conclusion that such a procedure may
47 not serve as a useful strategy to improve and solve practical problems as not just an
48 independently thinking teacher but also one who aims to adopt a student-centred approach
49 for addressing the issue. This led to the formulation of the questions as needs.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To solve this issue, students were asked to co-engage and design solutions for the
4 challenges identified. This was done through the focus group discussion where students
5 were asked what possible solutions are feasible to solve the identified issues. After
6 considering the issues affecting their engagement, the students discussed strategies for
7 improving the same. In this light, the tutor ensured the participation of students as co-
8 researchers in designing interventions that could meet their needs. Students suggested
9 redesigning of teaching content and delivery to improve their ability to address the
10 assessment task; they also suggested improving channel of communications through
11 online media platforms to address issues of limited communication.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Their involvement was beneficial in that it helped enhance the effectiveness of the
27 intervention through a tailored-made solution (Proctor et al. 2011) and its student-centred
28 nature (Levin, 2000). However, some of the difficulties and dilemmas inherent in the
29 development process involved the inability to discard the perceived repetition of the first-
30 year module, which introduced students to sociological theories, as this was beyond the
31 tutor's control.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Nevertheless, students' involvement allowed the tutor to better understand the
41 factors that limited their engagement. The student-led communication about practical
42 solutions to the problem, including an improved channel of communication, laid the
43 groundwork for its implementation through the collective design of the IAOL
44 interventions that met their needs.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 I adopted an active teaching philosophy which encompassed an IAOL content and
52 teaching style. In this light, the IAOL intervention was seen as an episode within the
53 action research process, which is essential to the professional development necessary for
54 improving practice and generating knowledge for students in the course of the actions
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 devised. Thus, IAOL incorporated the earlier suggestions of the students and this enabled
4 students to be engaged in an interactive and integrative classroom environment (Ramsden
5 2003; Biggs 2003). An active classroom involves the integration of various means of
6 learning to promote engagement as opposed to the traditional context of students
7 passively listening to the lecture delivered by teaching staff (Paulson and Faust 2003).
8 This approach was designed as an intervention by incorporating three key facets informed
9 by the students suggested solutions including – the design of the teaching content and
10 course delivery, assessment, and an improved channel of communication between the
11 tutor and the students. The rationale behind focusing on these three specific areas was the
12 fact that while it is not possible to address all their needs of students, a small consistent
13 change in key areas may make a difference (McNiff 2016).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Teaching content and course delivery*

29
30 The teaching content and delivery were redesigned for CRI3023-N to incorporate a
31 combination of engaging interactive lectures, assigned readings, and inclusion of videos
32 including case studies that connect to real-life context. These lectures were delivered once
33 a week and tailored to address specific issues and concepts which constructively aligned
34 with the course's aims. These were done to provide the students with achievable and
35 measurable outputs during the lectures (Mladenovic 2000). Activities conducted within
36 the lectures included a recapitulation of prior lectures and a brief reminder of the
37 assessment task, brainstorming sessions, peer discussions, debates and short formative
38 quizzes to test learning. The quizzes were designed using Kahoot, which is an online
39 software that allows for the incorporation of videos where appropriate. The quizzes aimed
40 at serving as a diagnostic approach to teaching designed to examine areas that students
41 found challenging and in need of further clarity. This activity worked particularly well as
42 the students' response to the quizzes were anonymous, and it was easy to see the number
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of students that got a specific answer right or wrong. In this way, a tailored explanation
4
5 of the concept was provided.
6
7

8 The seminar was designed to expand on some of the core themes addressed in the
9
10 lecture. Prior to the seminar activities, a 10 minute-long recapitulation on the main themes
11
12 from the previous week's lecture which formed the basis of the seminar was provided to
13
14 give the students a context for the day's seminar. Besides, real-life examples were used
15
16 to give the students a sense of the importance of what was being taught. For instance,
17
18 topics such as 'Excursus on Michel Foucault's "Discipline and Punish"' were taught by
19
20 giving students the opportunity to connect how the penal machinery operates in the
21
22 modern world, shifting punishment from the body to punishment of the soul. Use of
23
24 surveillance cameras and prisons were elucidated to give the students a sense of the
25
26 importance of how scholars have enabled us to understand penal institutions and the
27
28 purpose these serve. Additional activities in the seminar included videos, opportunity to
29
30 engage in debates, peer discussions of the group task and a writing session aimed at
31
32 facilitating course assessment.
33
34
35
36

37 *Course assessment*

38
39 CRI3023 was designed to address two key components which comprised of a written
40
41 1000-word report worth 30% of the overall marks and a 3000-word essay worth 70% of
42
43 the marks. Each assessment was designed to achieve specific learning outcomes. This
44
45 suggests that the teaching strategies adopted aligned with the course assessment. For
46
47 instance, the inclusion of a writing task in the seminar enabled students to attempt the
48
49 structure of their written reports while also receiving feedback within the class from their
50
51 peers and the tutor that helped them improve. This teaching philosophy provided the
52
53 students with opportunities to build on their knowledge of key aspects of the course
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 through the formative practice of the assessment which helped them progress towards the
4
5 main summative report and essays.
6

7
8 *Improved channel of communication between the tutor and the students*
9

10 To facilitate improved channels of communication, additional drop-in sessions were
11
12 designated to allow the students the opportunity to be able to get more support in the form
13
14 of feedback from drafts for structure and clarity on areas they struggled with. To
15
16 accommodate their diverse needs and address the issue of having to be physically present
17
18 in class, a Microsoft Teams network was set up where students could ask questions and
19
20 receive support on areas relating to the course.
21
22

23
24 *Try it out and take stock of what happens*
25

26 The interventions were implemented during the 12-week-long teaching session. Data
27
28 were collected using students' feedbacks from module evaluation, end-of-term results,
29
30 and peer observation by a critical friend. These were subsequently analysed at the end of
31
32 the semester to provide me with insights and direction for improvement. [Although the](#)
33
34 [teaching sessions were observed by a critical friend who was a senior colleague, the](#)
35
36 [participating students were still construed as the experts in driving how the interventions](#)
37
38 [were designed and implemented. The critical friend and the tutor assumed the role of a](#)
39
40 [moderator by being particularly careful not to regress to the tutor-student power](#)
41
42 [relationship. For instance, after engaging students in a report writing task, students](#)
43
44 [subsequently conducted writing tasks on topics of their own choice that built upon the](#)
45
46 [knowledge gained in the previous session.](#)
47
48
49
50

51 The restructured teaching contents and mode of delivery seemed beneficial to the
52
53 level six students who found it useful. Increased level of student understanding of core
54
55 concepts in the module was demonstrated through the formative quiz and final
56
57 assessments. The use of virtual learning platforms and technologies stimulated
58
59
60

1
2
3 engagement, and activities which made students adopt a deep approach to learning which
4 drew on inter-state comparisons as a basis for discussion were advantageous. More
5 specifically, students used real-life examples of private corporations' involvement in
6 prisons in both the USA and the UK to demonstrating how their involvement tends to
7 serve a profit interest as opposed to the reduction of crime given fewer prisoners equal
8 poor business for the private firms. The impact of the interventions is delineated in the
9 module results which saw some improved performances compared to the previous year
10 as delineated in Figures 1 and 2 below.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 [Insert figure 1 and 2 here]
22

23 Using descriptive statistics and the measure of central tendencies, the data suggest that
24 there was a slight improvement in student performance in comparison with the previous
25 year. This is delineated in the mean of 64.24% for 2019 as compared to 62.75% for 2018.
26 Such result appears apparent despite the differences in the number of students which is
27 59 for 2019 and 69 for 2018.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 In addition, the inclusion of video contents which contained anonymised
36 examples of different people committing crimes such as shoplifting, drawing of graffiti
37 on a bus stand, and even murder was perceived to be effective based on follow-up
38 students' feedback. For instance, students described class activities positively when one
39 of them stated that:
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The inclusion of interactive activities is really engaging and they
47 enable us to understand the sociological debate behind
48 punishment. For instance, using video examples to illustrate
49 different crimes has really got me thinking about the rationale for
50 punishment and brought to life an otherwise abstract concept.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This response highlights one of the goals behind the activities, which was designed to test
4 students' knowledge of the guiding principles behind punishment. The ability for students
5 to communicate and engage in debates with one another during the delivery of the session
6 was also another key aim behind the activities. For instance, after the video clip was
7 viewed, when asked how they would punish the offenders, there were mixed debates in
8 the class as to the punishment, and at the end the students were supported using principles
9 of punishment such as deterrence, rehabilitation and retribution as some of the guiding
10 norms to explain punishment.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 The inclusion of writing tasks in the seminars met with a perceived positive
22 response from the students who had the opportunities to present their draft with their peers
23 and receive constructive feedback aimed at improvement. This particularly prepared them
24 in advance for, both their in-course and end-course assessment. More specifically,
25 students view from its use is captured at the end of term module evaluation where, for
26 instance, one of the students commented that:
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 The module is well led with informative lectures and seminars,
36 although feedback of assessments are not due till after Christmas,
37 the tutor has given lots of encouragement to submit essay plans
38 to herself.
39
40
41
42
43

44 This captures a sense of appreciation for an area which the students often found to be
45 difficult. The provision of tailored feedback to improve the general scope of their writing
46 highlights a student-centred approach driven by each student peculiar needs.
47
48
49
50

51 Furthermore, the intervention which included an improvised channel of
52 communication via additional hours and the setup of VLE platforms such as Microsoft
53 Teams for students proved useful as some students were able to discuss the structure of
54 their assessments and also clarify certain points they were unsure of. So far, based on the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interventions, some of the key changes I noticed included the perceived increase in
4 engagement on the part of level six students.
5
6

7 ***Modify what we did in light of changes found and monitor it***

8
9
10 Given the results from the interventions, the previous modified interventions will be
11 retained (e.g. inclusion of videos and the use of Kahoot) as some of the means of engaging
12 the students. These will be further enhanced by including other engaging content and e-
13 learning software such as Padlets and Polls everywhere to capture the diverse preferences
14 of students on the elaboration of specific case studies or areas in need of further
15 improvement.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 ***Evaluation***

24
25
26 In the evaluation cycle, I reflected on the changes caused as a result of the intervention
27 (McNiff and Whitehead, 2011). This was measured by the level of students' satisfaction
28 with the module. It also used peer observations and comments from a senior colleague,
29 follow-up focus group discussion and the module evaluation as a yardstick for
30 determining the effectiveness or impact of the intervention. Overall, the interventions
31 adopted seem perceived from a positive vantage point. For instance, the inclusion of VLE
32 enhanced learning, such as Kahoot and engaging group task within the seminar were
33 perceived as helpful in facilitating collaborative learning. Commenting on this, one of the
34 level six students opined that:
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 I like the inclusion of interactive activities including Kahoot
47 during the seminars because we can all sit together and we can all
48 discuss and we can collectively put together our own thoughts and
49 we can all get like answers [...] When it is a group conversation,
50 you are more likely to get involved in it.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This passage highlights findings of previous studies which found group-work and
4 learning to be more effective than individual learning (Nicoll-Senft 2009; Jafari 2014).
5
6 This improved engagement is seen as central as students were able to use it as a basis for
7
8 improving their knowledge in the lectures which were initially thought of as difficult.
9
10 This perceived impact is elucidated in the module evaluation where a student said, 'I have
11
12 found seminars very helpful and built more confidence throughout the weeks and this has
13
14 helped me within lectures also to focus more'. In a similar vein, another notable comment
15
16 from students in the evaluation include:
17
18
19

20
21 The lecturer provides all the information needed with [the] use of
22
23 numerous examples enabling a complete understanding of the
24
25 difficult lecture topics, also the repeated mentioning of the ICA
26
27 and ECA is perfect for my organisation of the research materials.
28
29

30
31 The preceding comments reflect the students' perceptions of the intervention, which were
32
33 construed from positive perspectives. It was also interesting to see how an improvement
34
35 in one area transition into an improvement in the students learning experience for the
36
37 module as seen with the slight improvement of the module result in comparison to the
38
39 previous year. Moreover, over 70% of respondents in the module evaluation expressed
40
41 satisfaction which suggested a positive development worthy of replication. In fact, a
42
43 student praised the intervention as 'Excellent teaching, great quality.' This comment is
44
45 also reflective of peer observation by a senior colleague about the use of the interventions
46
47 in the seminar session. Commenting on the interventions, the colleague stated that:
48
49

50
51 The seminar appeared to be well-structured with the use of slides
52
53 and some activities which split the students into two groups. The
54
55 instructions provided were very clear. and support was provided
56
57 throughout each task. [...] There was very good engagement with
58
59
60

1
2
3 the student discussion element such as summarizing points made
4
5 and, most importantly, asking further questions to harness better
6
7 understanding and clarity. The writing task was useful to embed
8
9 academic skills into the subject area at an embryonic stage of the
10
11 module.
12
13

14 This suggests how the interventions were perceived as helpful and in line with good
15
16 practice. Hence demonstrating a positive outlook on the interventions. Another notable
17
18 finding from the evaluation of the action research process was the perceived positive
19
20 views about the inclusion of students in the active action inquiry process. Talking about
21
22 this, a level six participant said, 'I think an online survey is less personal whereas I
23
24 actually sat with the lecturer and it felt like you actually cared about what I am saying'.
25
26 This comment suggests a sense of appreciation for the student-centred approach towards
27
28 addressing the students' learning needs in ways that allow them ownership of the process.
29
30 'Care' is seen as central to the approach which gives the student a sense of satisfaction
31
32 that the traditional module evaluation as used by the university seems not to provide.
33
34
35
36

37 Based on the action research conducted, I learnt that students considered the
38
39 inclusion of diverse teaching content that draws on real-life scenarios as well as the use
40
41 of VLE tools such as Kahoot as engaging and aspects that facilitated their learning. These
42
43 enable more participation, which translated to an improved student learning experience.
44
45 The provision of feedback on their drafts and the inclusion of additional hours to support
46
47 the students met with positive responses that assisted the students' improvement in their
48
49 studies. It was surmised that this level of support was essential to encourage motivation
50
51 and engagement with the course (Ramsden 2003).
52
53
54

55 **Conclusion, implications and suggestions for further research**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The main aim of this study was to address whether the adoption of Jean McNiff model of
4 action research alongside IAOL and teaching contents are effective at improving student
5 engagement. This study serves to fill an existing gap which highlights the paucity of
6 research pertaining to improving student engagement using action research within the
7 Criminology and Criminal Justice discipline. The study has presented an example of how
8 action research using McNiff's model has been implemented across an undergraduate
9 module from the context of a student-informed perspective to design teaching contents
10 and their delivery that engaged the students.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Accordingly, a significant practical contribution of the present study is that it
22 provides empirical data which serves as useful evidence that action research could be
23 used to enhance engagement, learning, and student performance. It also highlights a
24 useful point in that students' disdain for the Explaining Punishment module owing to its
25 perceived boring historical and sociological contents could be overcome via the adoption
26 of interactive action-oriented learning and teaching contents. The research showed the
27 varying impacts interventions might have on students. For instance, the inclusion of real-
28 life case studies allowed students the opportunity to connect the importance of the
29 sociological and historical accounts with the transition of the practice of punishment to
30 the modern-day understanding of the penal system. The relevance and mixture of a range
31 of teaching styles incorporating VLEs and writing tasks alongside additional hours of
32 support to students were perceived as positive interventions from students' perspectives.
33 This is more clearly delineated with the linkage of a teaching style and delivery that
34 explicitly relates theoretical concepts to real-life contexts. The adoption of the
35 interventions also highlights a slight increase in the level of performance in students'
36 results in comparison with the previous year that did not witness the adoption of such
37 interventions.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Another important implication of the present study is that it contributes to the
4 existing literature by pedagogically and methodologically advancing the field of
5 Criminology and Criminal Justice. The use of action research and its process reported
6 could serve as a useful means of enhancing teaching practices and the improvement of
7 student engagement, especially within the context of the Criminology and Criminal
8 Justice discipline where such methods appear to be lacking. The reflective practice of
9 action research which allows for a consistent trial of what works and the opportunity to
10 modify teaching and students' learning in line with evidence of efficacy represents a
11 useful method to enhance the students' learning experience and the teacher's practice.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Nevertheless, suggestions for further research might specifically consider the
25 need to further explore the evaluation stage in the research. This might be particularly
26 useful in the provision of a comprehensive understanding of the impact of each learning
27 resources and intervention on the students. To achieve this, future research should also
28 aim to adopt further action reflective cycles by evaluating the impact of interventions by
29 enabling students to understand what good and engaged learning is like using learning
30 activities, such as debates, report writing, real life scenarios culled from the news and
31 videos, and their personal experiences, co-created by students. As Joy Mounter (nd, p.2)
32 argues 'Understanding themselves, the things that make them tick, their worries and
33 strengths, the quirks that make them an individual and influence their emotional learning
34 will all identify the learner they are and the potential learner they could be.' This will help
35 students formulate personalised learning values and articulate any improvements in them.
36 Drawing on McNiff (2016/17) action research circle, future research could facilitate
37 collection of data on interventions and activities that have been introduced to enhance
38 learning. For instance, activities such as report-writing tasks may serve as useful ways to
39 judge the quality of student learning by specifically engaging students in a deeper
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reflection on their thoughts on the exercise. Informed by Mounter's (n.d) approach,
4 students could be asked to document their learning experiences through a mind map
5 which links all aspect of learning together. Students could use emotive feedback ideas
6 such as smileys showing happy, sad, confused as a means of documenting their
7 experience. This approach aims at highlighting the students' varied learning experiences
8 by providing explanation of the symbols they choose.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Other sessions could include invitations of guest speakers such as probation
18 officers to deliver talk on certain topics while giving the students the opportunity to
19 engage in debates on their thoughts about the topic. Based on these activities, data could
20 be collected to help make better judgment concerning how students think about certain
21 concepts, and probe or challenge existing narratives on how punishment is construed. In
22 this way, the quality of learning could be assessed as to whether deeper or surface learning
23 has taken place, and this could be assessed by the encouragement of students to self-
24 reflect, and record the moment in ways that they feel might express their learning
25 appropriately, and evaluate the skills they have used and developed as learners.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Acknowledgements, the author acknowledges the British International Studies Association's
4 Learning and Teaching Small Research Grant which was instrumental to supporting the
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

conduction of the study.

For Peer Review Only

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Albers, C. 2007. 'Improving Pedagogy Through Action Learning and Scholarship of
9 Teaching and Learning.' *Teaching Sociology* 36 (1): 79-86.
10
11
12 Astin, A.W. 1984. 'Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher
13 Education.' *Journal of College Student Development* 25 (4): 297-308.
14
15
16 Biggs, J. 2003. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. (2nd ed.). Buckingham:
17 Open University Press.
18
19
20
21 Bradford, J., D. Mowder, and J. Bohte. 2016. 'You Can Lead Students to Water, but
22 You Can't Make Them Think: An Assessment of Student Engagement and
23 Learning through Student-Centered Teaching.' *Journal of the Scholarship of*
24 *Teaching and Learning* 16 (4): 33-43.
25
26
27
28
29
30 Chickering, A.W., and Z.F. Gamson. 1987. Seven Principles of Good Practice in
31 Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin*. 3-7.
32
33
34
35 Coates, H. 2007. 'A Model of Online and General Campus-Based Student Engagement.'
36 *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 32 (2): 121-141.
37
38 [doi:10.1080/02602930600801878](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600801878)
39
40
41
42 Davis, J., C. Cronley, E. Madden, and Y. Kim. 2014. 'Service-Learning Use in Criminal
43 Justice Education.' *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 25 (2): 157-174.
44
45
46
47 Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2011) Students at the Heart of the
48 System. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
49
50
51 Docherty, D. 2011. Universities Need to Work Harder to Turn UK Students into Global
52 Graduates. *The Guardian* 29 November 2011. Available at
53 <http://www.theguardian.com/higher->
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

[educationnetwork/blog/2011/nov/29/universities-uk-students-global-graduates](https://www.educationnetwork.com/blog/2011/nov/29/universities-uk-students-global-graduates)

(accessed 06 August 2020).

Felder, R.M. and R. Brent. 1996. 'Navigating the Bumpy Road to Student-Centred Instruction.' *College Teaching* 44 (2): 43-47.

Haggis, T. 2009. 'What Have We Been Thinking of? A Critical Overview of 40 years of Student Learning Research in Higher Education.' *Studies in Higher Education* 34 (4): 370-390.

Jafari, Z. 2014. 'A Comparison of Conventional Lecture and Team-Based Learning Methods in Terms of Student Learning and Teaching Satisfaction.' *Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran* 28: 5.

Jidong, D. E. 2019. 'Students as Partners in Co-creation of Learning Activities in Order to Include Differentiated Instruction.' *International Journal of Social Science Education* 1 (1): 342-349.

Judi, H. M., and N. Sahari. 2013. 'Student-Centered Learning in Statistics: Analysis of Systematic Review.' *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences* 103: 844-851.

Krause, K., and H. Coates. 2008. 'Students' Engagement in First-Year University.' *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 33 (5): 493–505.
[doi:10.1080/02602930701698892](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701698892)

Kuh, G. D. 2009. 'What Student Affairs Professionals Need to Know about Student Engagement.' *Journal of College Student Development*, 50 (6): 683–706.

Kuh, G. D., J. Kinzie, J. H. Schuh, and E.J. Whitt. 2005. 'Never Let it Rest: Lessons about Student Success from High-Performing Colleges and Universities'. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 37 (4): 44–51. [doi:10.3200/CHNG.37.4.44-51](https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.37.4.44-51)

Lewin, K. 1946. 'Action Research and Minority Problems.' *Journal of Social Issues* 2 (4): 34-46. [doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1946.tb02295.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1946.tb02295.x)

- 1
2
3 McKinnon, J. 1989. 'Reliability and Validity in Field Research: Some Strategies and
4
5 Tactics.' *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 1 (1): 34-54.
6
7 [doi:10.1108/EUM0000000004619](https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004619)
8
9
10 McNiff, J. 2016. *You and Your Action Research Project*. London: Routledge.
11
12 McNiff, J. 2017. *Action Research: All you Need to Know*. London: Sage.
13
14 McNiff, J. and J. Whitehead. 2011. *All you Need to Know about Action Research*. Sage
15
16 Publications.
17
18
19 Mitra, D.L. 2004. 'The Significance of Students: Can Increasing 'Student Voice' in
20
21 Schools Lead to Gains in Youth Development?.' *Teachers College Record* 106:
22
23 651–688.
24
25
26 Mladenovic, R. 2000. 'An Investigation into Ways of Challenging Introductory
27
28 Accounting Students' Negative Perceptions of Accounting.' *Accounting*
29
30 *Education* 9 (2): 135-155.
31
32
33 Mounter, J. (n.d) 'Can Children Carry out Action Research about Learning, Creating
34
35 Their Own Learning Theory?
36
37 <https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/tuesdayma/joymounterull.pdf> (accessed
38
39 30 September 2020).
40
41
42 Nicoll-Senft, J. 2009. 'Assessing the Impact of Team-based Learning.' *Journal on*
43
44 *Excellence in College Teaching* 20 (2): 27-42.
45
46
47 Oblinger, D.G., and M. K. Maruyama. 1996. *Distributed Learning*. Boulder, CO: Cause
48
49 Professional Paper Series, 14.
50
51
52 Patton, M. Q. 1987. *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. (2nd ed). Newbury
53
54 Park, CA: Sage.
55
56 Paulson, D. and J. Faust. 2003. 'Active Learning for the College Classroom.' *Excellence*
57
58 *in College Teaching*, 9 (2): 3-24.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Proctor, E., H. Silmere., R. Raghavan., P. Hovmand., G. Aarons., A. Bunger., R. Griffey.,
4
5 and M. Hensley. 2011. 'Outcomes for Implementation Research: Conceptual
6
7 Distinctions, Measurement Challenges, and Research Agenda.' *Administration*
8
9 *and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research* 38 (2): 65–76.
- 10
11
12 Ramsden, P. 2003. *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. (2nd ed.). London:
13
14 Routledge.
- 15
16
17 Ronen, I. K. 2020. 'Action Research as a Methodology for Professional Development in
18
19 Leading an Educational Process.' *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 64: 100826.
20
21 [doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100826](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100826)
- 22
23
24 Ryan, R.M., and L.D. Edward. 2000. 'Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of
25
26 Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being.' *American*
27
28 *Psychologist* 55 (1): 68–78.
- 29
30
31 Slunt, K.M., and Giancarlo, L.C. (2004). Student-Centered Learning: A Comparison of
32
33 Two Different Methods of Instruction. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 81 (7):
34
35 985.
- 36
37
38 Smith, C., R. Whipp. and H. Willmott. 1998. 'Case Study Research in Accounting;
39
40 Methodological Breakthrough or Ideological Weapon?' *Advances in Public*
41
42 *Interest Accounting* 2: 95-120.
- 43
44
45 Stack, S. 2007. 'The Effect of Extra Credit Projects on Learning: A Research Note.'
46
47 *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 16 (2): 318-327.
- 48
49
50 Stamatel, J., S. Bushway, and W. Roberson. 2013. 'Shaking up Criminal Justice
51
52 Education with Team-Based Learning.' *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 24
53
54 (3): 417-434.
- 55
56
57 Strauss, A., and J. Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded theory*
58
59 *Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- 60

- 1
2
3 Waterman, H., D. Tillen., R. Dickson. and K. De Koning. 2001. 'Action Research: A
4
5 Systematic Review and Guidance for Assessment.' *Health Technology*
6
7 *Assessment* 5 (23): 1-157.
8
9
10 Wigfield, A., and J. S. Eccles. 2020. '35 Years of Research on Students' Subjective Task
11
12 Values and Motivation: A Look Back and a Look Forward. *Advances in*
13
14 *Motivation Science* 7: 161-198. [doi:10.1016/bs.adms.2019.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2019.05.002)
15
16
17 Winter, R. 1989. *Learning from Experience: Principles and Practice in Action Research*.
18
19 London: The Falmer Press.
20
21 Yin, R. K. 1994. *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. (2nd ed.), Newbury Park,
22
23 CA: Sage.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Showing module result for 2018 cohort




Figure 2. Showing module result for 2019 cohort

