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The goals of this study were to incorporate group and class discussions in two psychology courses to promote critical thinking and interaction among students. Throughout the courses, students engaged in discussions of an issue and wrote position papers presenting their own conclusions. Readings from Opposing Viewpoints texts (Cozic, 1996; Wekesser, 1996; Williams, 1999) were incorporated into the courses to promote discussions. Quantitative and qualitative data from student evaluations suggest that the discussions improved interaction among students, engaged them in the issues, and promoted critical thinking. The author replicated the benefits of incorporating discussions into a different course to verify the reliability of the benefits.

Among the key issues facing professors is how best to engage their students in the material. When teaching upper-level psychology courses in nonclinical areas, such as adult development and aging or behavior genetics, a primary challenge is getting college-age students involved in the issues of the course. In addition, it is beneficial to tap the knowledge and experiences of nontraditional students, allowing younger students to learn from older students, and vice versa. It also is important to improve students' comprehension of the major concepts of the courses. The pedagogical literature suggests that if students are challenged to ponder the issues presented and to apply the concepts to real-world problems, it enhances their comprehension of the material (Kraft, 1985). Group learning activities requiring student participation have been demonstrated to result in more effective learning (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1990; Kraft,
In addition, research indicates that retention is positively influenced by both student-to-student and student-to-faculty interaction (Astin, 1993). On the basis of this evidence, I incorporated group and class discussions into two upper-level elective psychology courses: Adult Development and Aging and Behavior Genetics. The goals of this project were to engage students with the issues of the courses, to increase interaction among students, to promote critical thinking, and to improve comprehension. Employing the discussion activities in two fairly different courses made it possible to investigate their general effectiveness.

The development of group and class discussions was based on integrating into the structure of the course excerpts from three texts in the Opposing Viewpoints series: An Aging Population (Cozic, 1996), Genetic Engineering (Wekesser, 1996), and Homosexuality (Williams, 1999). I assigned sections of the texts to the students every two or three days. Taken together, discussion activities accounted for 25% of the final grade in the course. Each discussion assignment required students to complete five activities, as presented in Table 1.

Course Requirements

Readings in the Opposing Viewpoints Texts

First, students read the assigned sections of the text and answered the questions that accompanied them. Readings in the Opposing Viewpoints texts consist of 3-to-5-page excerpts from speeches, newspapers, magazines, and books. Each reading is preceded by three questions highlighting important information (for instance, “Why is Alzheimer’s disease difficult to diagnose with certainty?”). To ensure that students had read the assignment and had begun to think about the material, their answers to these questions were due at the beginning of the class period for which they were assigned and constituted 20% of their grade for each discussion activity.

Group Discussion

In class, students were divided into groups of 3 or 4 to discuss the issue presented in the text for 25 to 30 minutes. I asked them to think of the issue as an either/or proposition, and the goal of group discussion was to come to an agreement about which side of the issue the group would support (for instance, “Older workers are a benefit or a liability to companies”). Groups were instructed to support unanimously only one
side of the issue in order to generate significant group discussion. During discussion, each group prepared a 5-to-10-minute statement of their position and the evidence supporting it. To maximize students’ exposure to different opinions, the composition of the groups changed each time. Working with different group members and working for a collective grade provided students with experience in group dynamics. In addition to discussing the topics, students were learning how to engage in discussions with a variety of people.

Group Presentations

Each group then presented its position to the class and chose a designated speaker to make the presentation. The designated speakers were different each time to ensure that all students had the opportunity to serve as the group representative at least once. Presentations were graded for both content and style: the quality of the supporting material presented and the coherence of the presentation. Group presentations accounted for 40% of students’ grade for each discussion activity.

Table 1
Five Components of Each Discussion Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reading assigned sections and answering questions (answers due at the</td>
<td>15-30 minutes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning of class)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group discussion of issues to reach agreement and prepare 5-10 minute</td>
<td>25-30 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group presentations</td>
<td>20-30 minutes</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Designated speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Class discussion of issues raised by presentations</td>
<td>15-30 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Position paper: Describes and defends student’s position. Due next</td>
<td>2-5 days</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group and Class Discussions
Class Discussion

The group presentations were followed by general class discussion of issues that had been raised in the presentations, during which students explored any disagreements or inconsistencies within or between groups.

Position Paper

After participating in the group and class discussions, students wrote position papers of 500 to 600 words that were due at the next class meeting. The position papers allowed students to integrate what they had learned and discussed in order to draw their own conclusions about the issue. Students could use material from lecture, held twice each week, the primary text used in the class, the *Opposing Viewpoints* text, and group and class discussions. The paper required students to craft a reasoned and coherent presentation of their position. Papers were graded on content, organization, and writing style and were worth 40% of a student’s grade for each discussion activity.

Method

Participants

Participants were students from two sections of Adult Development and Aging and two sections of Behavior Genetics courses. For each course, one section was taught with the discussion activities (discussion) and one section without (control). The control section of the aging course was taught in spring 1996 and included 22 students, 15 women and 7 men. The discussion section of the aging course was taught in spring 1998 and included 14 students, 11 women and 3 men. The control section of the behavior genetics course was taught in fall 1997 and included 15 students, 10 women and 5 men. The discussion section of the behavior genetics course was taught in fall 1999 and included 9 students, 8 women and 1 man. The majority of students in the genetics course were psychology majors (60%). In contrast, only one third of the students in the aging course were psychology majors; a variety of other majors also were represented.

Materials

Students in both sections completed a standard Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), consisting of 28 multiple-choice questions. Students could
answer each question on a Likert-type scale as follows: *strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree.* For the SET completed by the discussion sections, I added four questions designed to assess the efficacy of group and class discussions. Students in all sections were given the opportunity on the SET to answer open-ended evaluation questions about the course. Finally, students in the discussion sections were given a midterm evaluation that consisted entirely of open-ended questions about the course in general, the *Opposing Viewpoints* text(s), and the group and class discussions.

**Procedure**

Students in both sections of each course took similar exams. Students in the control section of the aging course wrote a term paper that accounted for 25% of their total grade. Students in the control section of the behavior genetics course gave individual presentations based on a single journal article that accounted for 25% of their total grade. Students in the discussion sections of both courses participated in the discussion activities (see Table 1), which accounted for 25% of their total grade. In the discussion section, either five days (aging course) or four days (behavior genetics course) were devoted entirely to discussion activities.

The issues discussed in the aging course were as follows:

- An aging population *will* or *will not* be harmful to America.
- The elderly *will* or *will not* enjoy a healthy old age.
- Older workers are a *benefit* or a *liability* to companies.
- Retirement *will* or *will not* be ideal.
- I *would* or *would not* want to be put into a nursing home.

The issues discussed in the behavior genetics course were as follows:

- DNA evidence *should* or *should not* be accepted in court.
- Genetic research *will* or *will not* improve the quality of health care.
- I *would* or *would not* advise my sister to undergo prenatal genetic testing.
- The possibility of a genetic basis for homosexuality
should or should not affect whether we think it is right or wrong.

On the last regular class day of the course, students in all sections completed the SET. Students in the discussion sections also completed a midterm evaluation.

Results

Drop-Out Rates

When I taught these courses in previous years, there had been a problem with students dropping out before the end of the semester. Clearly, the subject matter and the way it was being presented were not holding the attention of the students. For this reason, my first analysis of the data examined retention from the beginning to the end of the courses. In the aging course, the control section began with 29 students and ended with 22; 24.1% of the students dropped the course. The discussion section began with 16 students and ended with 14; only 12.5% of the students dropped the course. In the behavior genetics course, the control section began with 20 students and ended with 15; 25% of the students dropped the course. In contrast, the discussion section began with 10 students, and only 1 (10%) dropped the course. The drop rate for the discussion sections was approximately half the drop rate for the control sections, suggesting that the students in the discussion sections had, in fact, been more engaged by the material.

Quantitative Evaluations

Student responses to the SET were compared across control and discussion sections. The standard version of the SET included 28 questions; however, many questions concerned aspects of the course that were not relevant to this investigation, such as lectures (4 questions), exams (4 questions), and handouts (1 question). In addition, 10 questions involved overall ratings of the instructor, the course, or the student’s preparation and class standing. There were no significant differences across sections in students’ responses to these 19 questions. Mean responses for the nine questions most relevant to a comparison of control and discussion sections are presented in Table 2.

Multiple-choice answers to the SET questions were assigned numerical values from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Using these values, I calculated the mean response to each question as well as the overall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Aging Course</th>
<th></th>
<th>Behavior Genetics Course</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean (SD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean (SD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean (SD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean (SD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My instructor stimulates my thinking.</td>
<td>3.3 (.61)</td>
<td>3.4 (.67)</td>
<td>3.4 (.76)</td>
<td>3.8 (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My instructor recognizes when students fail to comprehend.</td>
<td>2.6 (.79)</td>
<td>3.4 (.67)*</td>
<td>3.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.6 (.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My instructor makes me feel free to ask questions in class.</td>
<td>3.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.4 (.67)</td>
<td>3.4 (.85)</td>
<td>3.8 (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching this course.</td>
<td>3.4 (.51)</td>
<td>3.6 (.67)</td>
<td>3.7 (.47)</td>
<td>4.0 (.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Comparison of Student Evaluations of Teaching From Control and Discussion Sections for Courses in Aging and Behavior Genetics (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Aging Course</th>
<th></th>
<th>Behavior Genetics Course</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Discussion Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Control Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Discussion Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My instructor makes the subject interesting.</td>
<td>3.4 (.51)</td>
<td>3.6 (.67)</td>
<td>3.3 (.61)</td>
<td>3.8 (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My instructor treats students with respect.</td>
<td>3.3 (.71)</td>
<td>3.5 (.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall, I would rate the textbook/readings as excellent.</td>
<td>2.1 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.4 (.67)*</td>
<td>2.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Course assignments help me in learning the subject matter.</td>
<td>2.8 (.88)</td>
<td>3.4 (.67)*</td>
<td>2.4 (1.0)*</td>
<td>3.5 (.53)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I learned a lot in this course.</td>
<td>3.3 (.65)</td>
<td>3.5 (.62)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.9 (.35)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>3.0 (.45)</td>
<td>3.5 (.09)*</td>
<td>3.1 (.53)</td>
<td>3.6 (.52)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference in means is significant at $p < .05$.
** Difference in means is significant at $p < .01$.

Note. Means represent mean evaluation on a scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).
mean for all nine questions. As the data in Table 2 indicate, the mean evaluation score tended to be higher in the discussion sections than in the control sections for all nine questions and for the overall mean. This pattern of difference between sections occurred for both the aging course and the behavior genetics course.

I conducted independent samples t-tests to determine whether the mean evaluation score for each question differed across the control and discussion sections of each course. In comparing the control and discussion sections of the aging course, the difference in student evaluations attained significance at the .05 level or greater for three questions. Students in the discussion section of the aging course were significantly more positive about the texts (t [27] = 4.00; p < .01) and the course assignments (t [27] = 2.06; p < .05). Students in the discussion section were more likely than students in the control section to agree with the statement “My instructor recognizes when students fail to comprehend” (t [27] = 2.76; p < .01). One interpretation of this result is that the instructor’s ability to recognize when students fail to comprehend had improved over the two-year interval between the control and discussion sections. An examination of SETs from other courses I taught during the same period fail to support this hypothesis, however. A more likely interpretation is that this SET item probes the nature of the relationship between students and instructor in the two sections. That is, class discussion generated a stronger rapport between students and instructor, giving students the perception that their instructor better understood their confusions. Finally, the overall mean course evaluation was significantly higher in the discussion section (t [16] = 2.85; p < .05).

Comparison of the control and discussion sections for the behavior genetics course indicated significant differences on two of the questions. Students in the discussion section were more positive about the course assignments (t [20] = 2.96; p < .01) and reported that they had learned more in the course (t [20] = 2.15; p < .05). In addition, they reported a marginally higher rating of the instructor’s ability to make the subject interesting (t [20] = 1.86; p < .10). Finally, the overall mean course evaluation was significantly higher in the discussion section (t [16] = 2.15; p < .05).

To provide a more thorough evaluation of the discussion activities, I added four questions to the SET used in the discussion sections. Thus, comparisons between control and discussion sections for these four questions were not possible. Mean responses to the four questions are provided in Table 3. Results indicate that most students agreed or strongly agreed with statements concerning the value and quality of discussions.
Table 3
Student Evaluations of Teaching:
Additional Questions Used for the Discussion Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Aging Course Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Behavior Genetics Course Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My instructor developed a good rapport with the class.</td>
<td>3.4 (.67)</td>
<td>3.6 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My instructor manages discussions so that they are helpful to my learning.</td>
<td>3.5 (.67)</td>
<td>3.6 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My instructor raises challenging questions for discussion.</td>
<td>3.5 (.67)</td>
<td>3.8 (.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My instructor is skillful in developing classroom discussion.</td>
<td>3.4 (.67)</td>
<td>3.7 (.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Means represent mean evaluation on a scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

In addition, students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “My instructor developed a good rapport with the class.”

Qualitative Evaluations

Open-ended questions on both the SETs and the midterm evaluations allowed students to offer their opinions about the discussion assignments, and the results were enormously positive. For the midterm evaluation, all students in both discussion sections responded positively to the following questions: “Do you feel that reading chapters in the *Opposing Viewpoints* text helps you to understand the topic?” and “Do you feel that group/class discussion of chapters in the *Opposing Viewpoints* text helps you to understand the concepts?” In addition, 95% of the students responded positively to the question “Do you like the group/class discussions, or are they a waste of time?” Several students indicated that the discussion groups were what they liked most about the course. As one student said, “It stimulates my mind.”
At the end of the semester, I again asked students in the discussion sections if they felt that the *Opposing Viewpoints* text and the discussions helped them to understand the topics. Their representative responses, organized into categories that reflect the goals of the discussions, are presented in Table 4. Many of the answers reflected a high level of interaction between students. Students stated that it was nice to get to know each other and to hear other students’ opinions. In addition, students indicated that the discussions helped them to a considerable degree to engage the material: “They get you to think about the topic.” Students acknowledged that it was beneficial to interact with nontraditional students. Finally, students’ responses suggested that the discussions were successful in promoting critical thinking: “It allows you to see both sides of an issue.” In every class, I strive to show students that there are two—or more—sides to every issue. Clearly, incorporating group and class discussion into a standard lecture course provided a concrete demonstration of this point.

**Instructor’s Evaluation**

Incorporating group and class discussion on designated days in the discussion sections also led to a noticeable increase in the level of student involvement on days that were primarily lecture. Students in the discussion sections understood that discussion was an integral part of the course, and the result was a marked improvement in the quantity and quality of participation: Students asked more questions and better questions. In addition to asking the typical questions, such as, “Will this be on the test?” they asked more content-oriented questions. Parallel to the students’ reports of good rapport with the instructor, I felt a stronger rapport with the students in the discussion sections than with those in the control sections. Both the students and I shared personal anecdotes in the course of discussion, resulting in a more human connection between us. It is difficult to compare academic performance across sections separated by two years; however, my qualitative judgment of students’ performance on exams and positions papers is that the students in the discussion sections demonstrated improved comprehension of the course material.

**Discussion**

I incorporated group and class discussions into the Adult Development and Aging and Behavior Genetics courses in order to meet four goals: to engage students with the issues of the course, to increase inter-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve interaction among students</td>
<td>It’s nice to see how the rest of the class is thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It gives the class time to get to know each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It helps to hear other ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This helps to see how other people in the class think and to see others’ views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students involved in issues of course</td>
<td>They get you to think about the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I get “food for thought.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I really enjoy them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find the discussions interesting and informational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The issues pertain to society today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It also helps us to feel more involved/interested in the topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap experiences of nontraditional students</td>
<td>The different input by different people is interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It helps that we have different age ranges in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote critical thinking</td>
<td>It allows you to see both sides of an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It gives students a chance to think and recognize others’ opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been conducive to helping me think more deeply on the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It helps me see others point of view that I might not have thought about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It allows us to think of topics in different views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It does help me understand topics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actions among students, to promote critical thinking, and to improve comprehension. To determine the efficacy of this application, I compared control and discussion sections of each course to examine the general effect of the discussion activities. Evidence from both quantitative and qualitative evaluations of the courses suggests that the project was a success. The primary goal was to interest students in the issues of the courses. The significantly lower number of students in the discussion sections who dropped the courses midway through the semester indicated that these students were more engaged by the material. Qualitative responses to open-ended evaluation questions both at midterm and the end of the semester also demonstrated that the students found the material compelling. Instead of being abstract processes that concern other people, issues of aging and behavior genetics became concepts that were important in students’ lives. One student in the discussion section observed that “the issues pertain to society today.”

Breaking the classes into smaller groups increased not only interactions among students but also student-instructor interactions. Students in the discussion section reported that they enjoyed and benefited from the opportunity to interact with their fellow students. In the aging course, students appreciated having the chance to discuss issues of aging with individuals of different ages. In the behavior genetics course, every group had a student with some experience relevant to the issue at hand. Evidence from both quantitative and qualitative course evaluations indicated that a stronger rapport developed between students and me in the discussion sections than in the control sections. Students in the discussion sections were significantly more likely to report that their instructor recognized their failure to comprehend. They agreed or strongly agreed that the instructor had developed a good rapport with the class. I too felt this way.

I collected qualitative evidence in support of improved critical thinking by students. Student responses to open-ended evaluation questions indicated that they had been made aware of evidence supporting both sides of the issues. As a result, they gained experience in critically evaluating the evidence in order to draw their own conclusions about the issues. Qualitative evidence based primarily on the instructor’s evaluation of student performance supported improved comprehension as well. Overall, students’ opinions of the discussion activities were overwhelmingly positive. In both quantitative and qualitative evaluations of teaching, they reported that the discussions were interesting, informative, and helped them to comprehend the material.

Frederick (1981) states that generating and leading class discussion is
a major source of frustration among faculty members. The method I de-
scribe here has been quite successful in generating both group and class
discussions. One reason for its success is the incorporation of a few of
the qualities that can foster productive discussions, as summarized by
Ballantine (1998). If students are not prepared for class, discussion is not
likely to be productive. Having students answer questions about the read-
ing assignment beforehand ensured that they came to class with some
background information and were prepared to begin discussing the is-

In a few cases, the group could not agree on the side of the issue they
would support. Group members who did not agree with the group’s
position were instructed to play devil’s advocate during the preparation
of the group presentation. They would have a chance to present their
own position during class discussion and in their individual position
papers. This solution highlights the interdependence of individual and
group effort within a group discussion or project. The group presenta-
tion was the product of group effort, whereas the position paper provided
students with the opportunity to demonstrate individual effort. Students
who had not participated fully in the group and class discussions were
unlikely to produce good position papers.

This study demonstrated the success of incorporating discussions into
two different upper-level psychology courses. Results from the original
implementation in the aging course were replicated in the behavior ge-
netics course. To generate further support for the efficacy of this method
of incorporating discussion into the classroom, in future sections I will
-assess critical thinking quantitatively rather than qualitatively, as rec-
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I devoted entire class sessions to discussing the issues, the activities could
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Group and Class Discussions

Meacham, 1994). Setting up online discussions requires technological knowledge on the part of the instructor and technological access on the part of the students. It is a useful method, however, for incorporating discussions into a course without sacrificing class time. Additionally, it may provide a forum in which more students feel comfortable presenting their views than in class (Meacham, 1994). Regardless of the method employed, providing students with the opportunity to discuss and debate opposing sides of the issues is beneficial in any course.
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