

TABLES

Table 1  
ANOVAs of Course Experience Questionnaire by condition ( $N_{Lect}=114$ ;  $N_{Act}=494$ ).

Source	Lectures M(SD)	Activating M(SD)	Df	F	p <sup>(a)</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	d <sup>(b)</sup>
General	4.01(0.61)	2.90(0.95)	(1,606)	143.61	<.0001*	.1916	1.39
Good teaching	3.84(0.64)	3.33(0.77)	(1,605)	43.07	<.0001*	.0665	0.72
Clear Goals	3.72(0.67)	2.74(0.81)	(1,605)	143.69	<.0001*	.1919	1.32
Generic Skills	2.86(0.70)	2.72(0.80)	(1,605)	3.31	.0694	.0054	0.19
Appropriate Workload	3.58(0.67)	2.84(0.74)	(1,605)	94.50	<.0001*	.1351	1.05
Independence	3.18(0.57)	2.87(0.59)	(1,605)	26.04	<.0001*	.0413	0.53

(a) p<.05=\*

(b) Cohen's d: d>.50=medium; d>.80=large

Table 2  
Percentages (%) of responses to the item 'how do you assess the instructional setting that you have experienced during the course on Child Development?'

Condition	++	+	+/-	-	--	%	N
Lectures	12.39	46.90	30.09	9.73	0.88	100	113
Student-activating teaching	14.81	34.98	26.82	15.02	8.23	100	466

Legend: ++=very good to --=very weak.

CMH-statistics of association:  $df=4$ ,  $GA=13.3578$ ,  $p=.0097$

Table 3  
Frequencies (N) and percentages (%) of students' comments categorised in pro- and contra-arguments and subcategorised by meaning.

Pro-arguments	Activating		Lectures	
	N	%	N	%
Variety of teaching methods	55	38,19	9	42,86
Challenging/fun/great	23	15,97	1	4,76
Collaboration/team-work	14	9,72		
OK/interesting/good/informative	11	7,64	6	28,57
Learning about teaching (methods)	11	7,64		
Applicability for own teaching	8	5,56		
New/innovative value of teaching (methods)	8	5,56		
Interesting/challenging/real life assignments	7	4,86		
Particular teaching method	3	2,08		
Learning about Child Development	2	1,39	3	14,29
No lecturing by the teacher	1	0,69		
Other pro-arguments	1	0,69	2	9,52
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100,00</b>
Contra-arguments	N	%	N	%
Poor learning gains	24	16,11		
Lack of variety in methods	21	14,09	14	63,64
Too much team-work/collaboration	16	10,74		
Difficulties with time management	15	10,07		
No lecturing/insufficient feedback	14	9,40		
Chaotic/always different/new	14	9,40		
Unstructured/confusing/unclear	8	5,37		
Group difficulties and free-riding	7	4,70		
Particular teaching method	6	4,03		
Too difficult	4	2,68		
Tasks were divided between students	3	2,01		
Complex/No cohesion	3	2,01		
Inappropriate for course on Child Development	2	1,34		

Not fun	2	1,34		
Dislike of collaborative teaching	2	1,34		
Large group size/disturbing noise			4	18,18
Too little (learner/learner) interaction			2	9,09
Other contra-arguments	8	5,37	2	9,09
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100,00</b>

## REFERENCES

- Billar, J. (1996). *Reduction of Mathematics Anxiety*. Paper presented at the Annual National Conference on Liberal Arts and Education of Artists (10th, New York(NY), October 16-18, 1996).
- De Corte, E. (2000). Marrying theory building and the improvement of school practice: a permanent challenge for instructional psychology. *Learning and Instruction, 10*(3), 249-266.
- Entwistle, N.J. (1991). Approaches to learning and perceptions of the learning environment. Introduction to the special issue. *Higher Education, 22*, 201-204.
- Fraser, B.J. & Fisher, D.L. (1983). Student Achievement as a Function of Person-Environment Fit: A Regression Surface Analysis. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 53* (1), 89-99.
- Konings, K.D., Brand-Gruwel, S. & van Merriënboer, J.J.G. (2005). Towards More Powerful Learning Environments through Combining the Perspectives of Designers, Teachers, and Students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 75* (4), 645-660.
- Oxford, R.L. (1997). Constructivism: shape-shifting, substance and teacher education applications. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(1), 35-66.
- Ramsden, P. (1991). A performance indicator of teaching quality in higher education: the course experience questionnaire. *Studies in Higher Education, 16*(2), 129-150.
- Sivan, A., Wong Leung, R., Woon, C. & Kember, D. (2000). An implementation of active learning and its effects on the quality of student learning. *Innovations in Education and Training International, 37*(4), 381- 389.
- Trigwell, K. & Prosser, M. (1991). Improving the Quality of Student Learning: The Influence of Learning Context and Student Approaches to Learning on Learning Outcomes. *Higher Education, 22* (3), 251-266.
- Vermunt, J.D. (1998). The regulation of constructive learning processes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*(2), 149-171.
- Von Glasersfeld, E. (1988). Constructivism as a scientific method. *Scientific Reasoning Research Institute Newsletter, 3* (2), 8-9.