

Peer evaluation and teaching medical physics using remote response devices (clickers)



Alberto Nájera¹, Enrique Arribas², Augusto Beléndez³, José Manuel Villalba¹, Jorge Francés³, María José García-Meseguer⁴

¹*Departamento de Ciencias Médicas, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. C/ Almansa, 14. E02006 Albacete, Spain.*

²*Departamento de Física Aplicada, Escuela Superior de Ingeniería Informática, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. Avenida de España s/n, Campus Universitario, E02071 Albacete, Spain.*

³*Departamento de Física, Ingeniería de Sistemas y Teoría de la Señal, Escuela Politécnica Superior, Universidad de Alicante, Apartado 99. E03080 Alicante, Spain.*

⁴*Departamento de Enfermería, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. Avenida de España s/n, Campus Universitario, E02071 Albacete, Spain.*

E-mail: alberto.najera@uclm.es

(Received 12 September 2011; accepted 20 June 2012)

Abstract

The Faculty of Medicine at University of Castilla-La Mancha (UCLM) started in 1998 an innovative method of teaching and learning. Students are divided into groups of 25 people maximum, and they are told to teach their classmates all concepts suggested by their teachers, generally using multimedia presentations. During these sessions, the teachers have to observe and assess the activity. Medical Physics is a four-month long subject taught during the first year of the degree. In this context, we used personal response systems (clickers) not only to increase participation but also to allow students to evaluate their classmates. A total of 95 students participated in the survey. 98% considered that clickers made sessions more enjoyable, 84% considered that clickers helped them to stay engaged in class, and 87% thought that their participation increased. Our experience shows some differences between groups when peer evaluation was analyzed. Most students (45%) tried to be objective when they assessed their classmates. At the beginning, some students (32%) refused to make this assessment, and they graded very good marks independently of the quality of works. After a few sessions, the audience demanded better oral presentations and they gave them more objective marks (18%). Students made a satisfactory progress and they were very interested in the response devices, and they even suggested using them in other subjects as a new method to increase their own motivation.

Keywords: Personal response systems, clickers, physics, medicine.

Resumen

La Facultad de Medicina de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha comenzó en 1998 un innovador método de enseñanza y aprendizaje. Los estudiantes se dividen en grupos de 25 personas como máximo y ellos deben contar a sus propios compañeros los conceptos proporcionados por los profesores, generalmente usando presentaciones multimedia. Durante estas sesiones, el profesor tiene que observar y evaluar la actividad. Dentro de la Física Médica usamos los sistemas de respuesta personal (clickers) no sólo para incrementar la participación sino que también se usan para permitir que los estudiantes evalúen a sus compañeros. Participaron un total de 95 alumnos en el estudio. Un 98% consideraron que los clickers hacen las sesiones más entretenidas, un 84% consideraron que les permitía estar más atentos en clase y un 87% creyeron que su participación había aumentado. Nuestra experiencia nos muestra algunas diferencias entre los grupos cuando se evaluaban por pares. Muchos estudiantes (45%) intentaron ser objetivos cuando ellos evaluaban a sus compañeros. Al principio algunos estudiantes (32%) rechazaban el evaluar y puntuaban con muy buenas notas independientemente de la calidad del trabajo. Después de unas pocas sesiones, la audiencia demandaba mejores presentaciones orales y puntuaban de una manera más objetiva (18%). Los estudiantes hicieron un progreso satisfactorio y se mostraron muy interesados en los dispositivos de respuesta e incluso se sugirió utilizarlos en otras asignaturas temas como un nuevo método para aumentar su propia motivación.

Palabras clave: Sistemas de respuesta personal, clickers, Física, Medicina.

PACS: 01.40.-d, 01.40.gb

ISSN 1870-9095

I. INTRODUCTION

Several studies in literature, from a variety of fields, have studied the effectiveness on student learning of using personal response systems (PRS), also called interactive electronic devices, class response systems, personal response units or simply “clickers” since these devices were first used in 1960s; find a review in Judson and Sawada, 2002 [1]. Also there is a large body of literature on the student and professor perceptions when using these devices [2, 3, 4, 5, 6].

Clickers were first used in the University of Castilla-La Mancha in the course 2009-10, in the Faculty of Medicine by the professors of Radiology and Medical Physics. Despite of several demonstration sessions to other colleagues, these devices have been used only in two subjects: Informatics and Physical Basis of Medicine, both are taken during the first year and taught by the professors mentioned above.

The aim of this study was to evaluate students’ perceptions, participation and attention when using clickers.

II. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

In this study we used Turningpoint® (Turning Technologies, LLC, Youngstown, OH, USA). Radiofrequency response cards. This system allows faculty to pose multiple choice questions to the class. The system records individual responses from students through small personal response units and a small USB receiver (Fig. 1). It provides immediate feedback on the screen through histograms and other graphics (Fig. 2) completely integrated with Microsoft PowerPoint. Responses can be recorded anonymously, but during the sessions we recorded individual information to check the evolution of each student, and to use that information in their marks. Firstly, we used infrared clickers (they are cheaper) but we changed them for radiofrequency devices because of students have to point their clickers at an infrared receiver and the system did not registered all responses in large classes.



FIGURE 1. Personal Response Card and the USB receiver
Screenshot of PowerPoint showing an automatically generated histogram.

The system also allows generating automatic reports by student, question, session, etc. The software can be freely downloaded from Turningpoint web page.




FIGURE 2. Screenshot of PowerPoint showing an automatically generated histogram.

All response cards must be configured (joined) in the same channel, and if there is another session in a nearby class, the channels must be different to avoid interferences. Configuration of channel is extremely easy, and this problem can be immediately solved.

III. TEACHING METHOD

Teaching method in the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Castilla – La Mancha is developed in five stages: introduction of objectives, autolearning, expositions by students, tutorship learning and evaluation. These five stages period is called a module that takes 3 weeks. A four-month subject has normally six modules. To develop this method, students are divided into five groups, no more of 25 students in each group.

During the first stage, the teacher, using a PowerPoint presentation, presents the objectives that students have to learn in the module. All concepts have to be clear, and clickers were used to evaluate previous knowing and to emphasize more important aspects. Students use to read notes and documentation before this session. This material is offered to students through Moodle two or three days before the module starts.

In the second stage, students have to work by themselves and to prepare oral presentations to explain the proposed objectives to their classmates during the stage 3. In this third stage we used clickers to allow students to assess their classmates. To do so, we provided a slide through Moodle that students had to copy and paste at the end of their oral presentations. Ten marks from 1 to 10 were available on that slide. Fourth stage is designed to solve problems and questions guided by faculty. Finally,

the fifth stage is the evaluation of the module. No clickers were used during these two sessions.

We only have one set of 30 response cards. Each card is registered to one single student in each group, so list of each group have to be loaded before each session. Results are saved at the end of every session.

A more detailed description of this method can be found at <http://www.med-ab.uclm.es>.

IV. SURVEY METHOD

The aim of this study was to determine student satisfaction when using clickers. After using these devices in three completed modules in Physical Basis of Medicine (approximately 2 months), we developed a 12 question opinion poll divided in 4 categories that students answered using the clickers anonymously. The survey was conducted during stage 1 of module 6, in January 2010.

A total of 95 students (N=95), that is all assisting students in the five groups answered the survey and percentages of responses in each category and group were calculated. Groups 1 (N=20) and 4 (N=18) are taught by the same professor, groups 2 (N=21), 3 (N=18) and 5 (N=18) are taught by different professors. Students were given a list from which to choose, so they might not have to write about a particular factor in the opinion they were expressing. At the end of the survey, they were asked to add any comment or experience about this new technology-base intervention introduced in the class.

The survey was divided into four categories with a total of 12 questions. In questions 4 and 12 up to five options could be selected:

Category 1: General satisfaction.

Question 1: What is your satisfaction using the clickers? A. Very satisfied. B. Satisfied. C. Neutral. D. Dissatisfied. E. Very dissatisfied.

Question 2: Do you think that clickers have improved or deteriorate the sessions? A. Improve. B. Neutral. C. Deteriorate.

Question 3: Would you recommend clickers to be used in other subjects? A. Yes, to all of them. B. Depends on the subject. C. No.

Question 4: Which uses do you think that have been more fruitful? Select up to 5 options. A. To keep attention. B. To mark our classmates. C. To facilitate our participation. D. To check our understanding. E. To evaluate previous knowledge. F. Clickers are useless.

Category 2: Attention and participation.

Question 5: Do you think that clickers have made sessions more enjoyable? A. Yes. B. No. C. Don't know.

Question 6: Do you think that clickers have made you to pay more attention? A. Yes. B. No. C. Don't know.

Question 7: Do you think that clickers have improved your participation during the sessions? A. Yes. B. No. C. Don't know.

Category 3: Evaluation.

Question 8: Do you think that clickers have been useful for peer evaluation? A. Yes. B. No. C. Don't know.

Question 9: What was your attitude when you assessed your classmates' activities? A. I always tried to be objective. B. I always gave good marks. C. At the beginning I gave good marks, but at the end I was objective. D. I marked randomly. E. Don't know.

Question 10: To be assessed by your classmates, have made you to improve your works? A. Yes. B. No. C. Don't know.

Question 11: Have you made a pact to assess your classmates? A. Yes. B. No. C. Don't know.

Category 4: Problems.

Question 12: Which possible problems do you think that have to be solved or improved? Select up to 5 options. A. It is an unnecessary waste of time. B. Some questions were useless. C. Don't pay attention, I answered randomly. D. Clickers are difficult to use. E. More practising in needed.

V. RESULTS

The present data shows that student perceptions were positive. 48 students were satisfied or very satisfied (50.5%), 44 students (46.3%) qualified their satisfaction using clickers as neutral, and only 3 students (3.2%) were dissatisfied (Fig. 3A). 53.7% consider that using clickers has improved the sessions, and 41.1% were neutral; only 5.3% (5 students) considered that clickers have deteriorate the sessions (Fig. 3B).




FIGURE 3. Answers to Category 1: Satisfaction.

They were asked about if they would recommend clickers to other subjects (Fig. 3C), 19 students (20%) will recommend them to all subjects, 70.6% (67 students) would recommend clickers depending on the subject; 9 students would not recommend clickers. They were asked to say why they do not recommend clickers to all subjects and they, majority, said that clickers could be used in all subjects, but the main reason to select only some subjects was because of the attitude of some teachers, that should condition its use. After analyze every subject, only one

A. Nájera et al.

subject was eliminated because of the teacher who does not develop teaching method described above and teacher does not promote participation.

Six main uses were proposed to student and they could select those that they considered more fruitful: to keep attention (27.1%), to mark classmates (11.4%), to facilitate participation (27.1%), to check understanding (21.2%), to evaluate previous knowledge (11.4%) and an option to indicate if they thought that clickers are useless (2.0%). A total of 255 answers were registered because students could select up to five options (Fig. 3D).

Question 5 about if they consider that clickers have made sessions more enjoyable was answered positively by 97.9%, and only 2.1% answered negatively (Fig. 4).




FIGURE 4. Answers to question 5.

Category 2 of questions was designed to measure if students consider that clickers improved attention, participation (Fig. 5) and peer evaluation (Fig. 6). Only 10 and 11 students (10.5% and 11.6%) considered that clickers have not improved attention or participation, respectively, against 80 and 83 students (84.2% and 87.4%) that answered positively (Fig. 5).




FIGURE 5. Answers to questions 6 (A) and 7 (B).

Questions of category 3 analyzed peer evaluation using clickers. In Fig. 6 are shown results about this item distinguishing between groups, because some differences were observed.

Most of students considered that clickers were useful to evaluate their classmates (65.3%) against 31.6% of students

that answered negatively (Fig. 6A). Main differences between groups were observed when asking about their attitude when assessing their classmates. 45.3% said that they tried to be objective, but normally they marked better than teacher did, 17.9% at the beginning gave good marks but at the end they tried to be objective. 31.6% always gave good marks independently of the quality of works (Fig. 6C). But students of group 3 mainly answered that always gave good marks and also answered positively to question 10, they made a pact (Fig. 6D).

Fig. 6C shows results about if being assessed by their classmates, conditioned their dedication. 62.1% tried to improve their oral presentations during stage 3 against 33.7% that answered negatively.




FIGURE 6. Answers to questions 8 (A), 9 (B), 10 (C) and 11 (D) in different groups.

Finally, Fig. 7 shows main possible problems that have to be solved or improved when using clickers. Students could select up to 5 options and a total of 150 responses were recorded. No student found clickers difficult to use. Most students (14) of group 1 considered that clickers are an unnecessary waste of time.

In that group the teacher reported technical problems with the computer and the projector, not with clickers, that delayed the sessions during 30 minutes in two occasions. Despite students were told not to consider those situations, results are completely different to other groups in this aspect. Only 3 students of that group considered that more practising is needed, compared to a total of 66 students of groups 2, 3, 4 and 5 that selected this option.

Other problems are that some multiple-choice-questions were useless (20.0%) and some students answered randomly to question proposed during the classes (12.3%).




FIGURE 7. Answers to question 12 in different groups.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This study is one of many showing that active learning using clickers increases student performance in science courses [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. For a good discussion about if clickers are useful or not, see Bugeja (2008) [12] and Hake (2008) [13].

Classes are more enjoyable and most of students believe that clickers have improved their attention and participation. This was the first time that this technology was used in the University of Castilla-La Mancha but only during two months. No support was provided by the Institution, so teachers had to solve any problem that could appear, and also prepare questions and design possible uses. This was the first contact not only to students but also to teachers, so we believe that in next courses the main problems, such as to design more useful questions or to control random answering, could be solved, probably, registering answers and taking them into account in global marks.

Using clickers for peer evaluation have to be improved. A possible solution could be to consider classmates marks in global qualification and also to assess how classmates evaluate their colleges.

Recent studies have shown no difference between clicker use compared to discussion with hand raising [14], supporting the notion that this technology may not be necessary in some circumstances. A recent review of 56 studies related to clickers in college-level science education [15], found mixed support for enhanced student learning associated with clickers use.

We have to analyse final marks in this subject, but in the time this paper is written, final examination does not take place yet, so we are not able to evaluate impact of clickers. Poirier and Feldman (2007) [16] found that grades were higher for students using clickers, contrarily to Freeman *et al.*, (2007) [17] findings. We did not evaluate if using clickers helped with understanding course material or to prepare examinations [18].

One limitation of the study is the absence of experimental control. Instructor enthusiasm about clickers

may have contributed to more positive impressions among the students.

Some students suggested the possibility of including questions in their oral presentations in stage 3 and allowing their classmates to participate and to control their comprehension; not only to use clickers for peer evaluation or during stage 1. Some students also suggested that we have to offer more different uses. But teachers must be careful about gimmicky use of technology without specifically tailoring use of the devices to clear learning objectives.

Additional comments were that some multi-choice questions did not make students think, that clickers were good to test their understanding of a topic and that lecturer needs to allow the students time to think about the questions.

In conclusion, these data suggest that teaching with the clickers was effective in terms of student satisfaction with the technology. Effective use of clickers has the potential to increase student engagement, participation and may serve to facilitate student learning. The present study clearly illustrates students' positive views about clickers, particularly with regard to the perceived usefulness of clickers in terms of making more enjoyable classes.

In order to facilitate future usage of this powerful technological innovation, more research that compares different pedagogical techniques in different settings is an objective that researchers should strive for.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been partially supported by grants from Fundación Cajasol.

We are also deeply grateful to the students in Physical Basis of Medicine for their advice on ways to improve the course and for their participation and support of this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Judson, E. & Sawada, D., *Learning from past and present: Electronic response systems in college lecture halls*, Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching **21**, 167-182 (2002).
- [2] Barnett, J., *Implementation of personal response units in very large lecture classes: Student perceptions*, Australasian Journal of Educational Technology **22**, 474-494 (2006).
- [3] Graham, C. R., Tripp, T. R., Seawright, L. & Joeckel, G. L., *Empowering or compelling reluctant participators using audience response systems*, Active Learning in Higher Education **8**, 233-258 (2007).
- [4] MacGeorge, E. L. *et al.*, *Student evaluation of audience response technology in large lecture classes*, Educational Technology Research and Development **56**, 125-145 (2007).

A. Nájera et al.

- [5] Trees, A. R. & Jackson, M. H., *The learning environment in clicker classrooms: Student processes of learning and involvement in large university-level courses using student response systems*, Learning, Media, and Technology **32**, 21-40 (2007).
- [6] Nagy-Shadman, E. & Desrochers, C., *Student response technology: Empirically grounded or just a gimmick?*, International Journal of Science Education **30**, 2023-2066 (2008).
- [7] Ebert-May, D., Brewer, C. A. and Allred, S., *Innovation in large lectures-teaching for active learning*, BioScience **47**, 601–607 (1997).
- [8] Mazur, E., *Peer Instruction: A User's Manual*, (Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1997).
- [9] Crouch, C. H. and Mazur, E., *Peer instruction: Ten years of experience and results*, Am. J. Phys. **69**, 970–977 (2001).
- [10] Draper, S. W. & Brown, M. I., *Increasing interactivity in lectures using an electronic voting system*, Journal of Computer Assisted Learning **20**, 81-94 (2004).
- [11] Wiemann, C. & Perkins, K., *Transforming physics education*, Physics Today **58**, 36-41 (2005).
- [12] Bugeja, M., (2008), *Classroom clickers and the cost of technology*, 26 Jan. 2010. <<http://chronicle.com/free/v55/i15/15a03101.htm>>.
- [13] Hake, R. R., (2008), *The case for classrooms clickers – A response to Bugeja*, 26 Jan. 2010. <<http://www.physics.indiana.edu/~hake>>.
- [14] Stowell, J. R. & Nelson, J. M., *Benefits of electronic audience response systems on student participation, learning and emotion*, Teaching of psychology **34**, 253-258 (2007).
- [15] MacArthur, J. R. & Jones, L. L., *A review of literature reports of clickers applicable to college chemistry classrooms*, Chemistry Education Research and Practice **9**, 187-195 (2008).
- [16] Poirier, C. R. & Feldman, R. S., *Promoting active learning using individual response technology in large introductory psychology classes*, Teaching of psychology **34**, 194-96 (2007).
- [17] Freeman, S., O'Connor, E., Parks, J. W., Cunningham, M., Hurley, D., Haak, D., Dirks, C., Wenderoth, M. P., *Prescribed active learning increases performance in Introductory Biology*, CBE-Life Science Education **6**, 132-139 (2007).
- [18] Patry, M., *Clickers in large classes: from student perceptions towards an understanding of best practices*, International Journal for Scholarship of Teaching and Learning **3**(2), (2009). <http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstol/v3n2/articles/PDFs/Article_Patry.pdf>.