An Investigation into the Use of Clickers in Groups for Teaching Data Structures and Algorithms

Phil Maguire

NUI Maynooth

Rebecca Maguire

Dublin Business School

Abstract

In this study we describe the use of clickers in a second year data structures and algorithms module. In recent years instructors in higher education have begun introducing classroom technology that allows students to respond to questions during lectures. Studies have shown considerable benefits in terms of attendance, classroom engagement and allowing instructors to gain instant feedback (Caldwell, 2007; Kay & LeSage, 2009). In this study students were assigned to self-selected groups of three. 20% of the final module grade was earned by answering questions during lectures in competition with other teams. We found that the use of clickers had a dramatic effect on both attendance and engagement in the class. Students were far more likely to ask questions and defend their points of view, both before and after lectures. At the end of the semester the majority of students rated the clickers positively. However, the final module grade was lower than previous years. An anonymous survey suggested that although students enjoyed working in groups, they were less likely to take personal responsibility for their own learning when there were others on the team that could do the work. In light of this, we recommend allowing students to discuss questions together during lectures, but awarding marks individually.

1. Introduction

Many students taking introductory computer science (CS) find programming very challenging, with the result that up to a quarter of students drop out and many others perform poorly (Williams & Upchurch, 2001). One problem is that introductory CS modules often involve large classes with minimal interaction between lecturer and students. Textbooks and lecture material are often heavy on declarative knowledge, with particular emphasis on the features of a programming language (Robins, Rountree & Rountree, 2003). However, given that the skill of programming requires procedural knowledge, it is best learned through practice, experience and engagement with peers and instructors (Traynor & Gibson, 2004).

Research has shown that students must be active participants in the learning process in order for deep learning to occur (Mayer et al., 2009). Knowledge must be put into practice in order for misunderstandings to rise to the surface where they can be challenged and corrected (McKeachie, 1999). The ideal learning environment should involve mastery-oriented feedback, choice-making opportunities, interpersonal involvement and opportunities for students to evaluate their own and others' learning (Trees & Jackson, 2007). Unfortunately, the traditional lecture limits students' opportunities to practice activities that encourage higher-order learning (Trees & Jackson, 2007). In large classes it is simply not feasible for the lecturer to interact with each student. Perceived anonymity makes students more reluctant to participate in class (Wulff et al., 1987), with the result that many become passive recipients, as opposed to active participants (Mayer et al., 2009).

While large lectures can be effective in presenting new material, passive transmission fails to engage students in application, analysis, synthesis or problem-solving, all of which are essential for any CS graduate. What is required for teaching large CS classes is an instructional method that can motivate learners to process conceptual knowledge deeply, as well as supporting interaction with the instructor and other students.

2. Overview of Clickers

The last decade has seen the introduction of classroom technology that allows students to respond to questions via a small hand-held device. These devices, often known as 'clickers', typically have several buttons which allow students to reply to a multiple choice question, in the style of game shows such as *"Who Wants to be A Millionaire"*. The answers can be immediately aggregated, analysed, displayed and subsequently discussed in the lecture. Clickers were first introduced at Stanford and Cornell in the 1960s, but only became commercially available in 1992 (Abrahamson, 2006). In 1999 a new generation of more affordable clickers was launched, with widespread use emerging in 2003 (Kay & LeSage, 2009). The most recent models have a 10-digit numeric keypad and keys for permitting text entry (Caldwell, 2007).

Clickers have been used in classes ranging from just 11 students (Smith, Trujillo & Su, 2010) up to 300 and beyond (Draper & Brown, 2004), and have been used to teach courses ranging from nursing to engineering to philosophy. They have also been employed in a variety of settings from optional tutorials to co-operative learning through peer-instruction (Caldwell,

2007). Clickers can successfully compensate for the passive, one-way communication that is inherent in large classes. They can motivate students to learn by focusing attention, facilitating feedback, providing challenges and encouraging active involvement (Trees & Jackson, 2007).

Students in larger classes are often reluctant to respond to questions because of fear of embarrassment, public speaking or peer disapproval (Caldwell, 2007). Solutions such as calling on student volunteers, or selecting students randomly from a list are not popular strategies, and typically only elicit responses from a small fraction of the class. This small vocal minority can give the false impression that the larger silent majority understands a topic (Caldwell, 2007). These issues are directly addressed by clicker systems, which allow students to respond anonymously, and provide lecturers with instant feedback which can be used to clarify misunderstandings. Clickers can also change the atmosphere of lectures, with students more likely to become visibly active participants (Beekes, 2006). The act of committing to an answer causes students to become emotionally invested in the question, focusing their attention on the discussion that follows, and motivating them to defend their viewpoint (Beatty, 2004).

Studies have shown that the longest an uninterrupted lecture can be comfortably endured is only 20 minutes (MacManaway, 1970). Clicker questions serve to break up a lecture, allowing students to refocus their attention and improve their concentration. Students generally report a positive attitude towards the use of clickers, citing the benefits of anonymous contribution, and the possibility of comparing answers immediately with the rest of the class as positive aspects (Bunce et al., 2006). Martyn (2007) investigated whether students' appreciation of clickers was due to the technology itself or due to the active learning pedagogy. In a direct comparison of clickers with class discussion, clickers were consistently rated more positively, suggesting that it is the dynamics of clicker use *per se* that students enjoy.

The use of clickers has also been found to lead to dramatic increases in attendance. For example, Burnstein and Lederman (2001) found that when clickers scores accounted for 15% or more of the course grade, attendance levels rose to 80-90%, with students noticeably more alert during lectures. Caldwell (2007) reports that attendance can be increased by assigning only 10% of the overall grade to clicker participation, though when this is reduced below 5%, the effect on attendance remains negligible. Clickers also appear to reduce student attrition, more than halving the number of students dropping out in some studies (Caldwell, 2007).

Another advantage of clickers is that they can be used to facilitate peer learning by encouraging students to discuss questions (Levesque, 2011). For example, one strategy is to ask students for an initial individual response, display the results, and then get them to discuss the question among themselves before voting again (Caldwell, 2007). When students make a mistake and see that many others voted for it, there is less stigma discussing what made that answer seem plausible (Simon et al., 2010). Previous studies have shown that peer learning can result in superior learning gains and exam scores than the more traditional content based approaches to course material (MacManaway, 1970; Pollock, 2006). In surveys on peer learning, Nichol and Boyle (2003) found that 92% of students felt that discussing with others helped them to learn, with 82% agreeing that hearing other students' explanations helped them to develop their own understanding. Because of their common ages, language and mastery of the subject, students can be better than the lecturer at clarifying each other's mistakes and misconceptions (Caldwell, 2007). Communication can occur on an equal level, and information can be presented in a format which more closely matches the learner's immediate experience, leading to deeper processing (Assiter, 1995). In addition, when a student explains a concept to other students, it serves to reinforce their own understanding (Coleman, 1998).

In our study, we expand on this idea, by examining how clickers can be used in a team-based scenario. Several studies have noted positive effects of team competition in a classroom setting. Lasserre (2009) found that team-based learning resulted in a significant change of ambiance in the class, with increased participation leading to enhanced student confidence and lower dropping rates. Jones et al. (2001) also noted that students became more involved with clickers when they were used in groups as opposed to individually. We hypothesised that using clickers competitively in teams would enhance both engagement and peer learning in the class.

3. Method

This study was carried out involving 120 students from a wide range of disciplines taking two consecutive modules in data structures and algorithms in NUI Maynooth. Clickers were used in the first semester module but not the second semester module. In previous years teaching the same module interaction during lectures was minimal, with few questions posed and few students responding.

Each student was provided with a clicker which they were told they would have to hand

back at the end of the semester. Students marked down the code on the back of their clicker so that their responses could be identified in lectures. A total of 20% of the module grade was awarded for participation. Given the large portion of marks going towards clicker questions, we were concerned about lectures becoming too much like exams, raising the possibility of student anxiety and also cheating. For example, Caldwell (2007) found that up to 58% of students had observed their peers bringing multiple remote devices to class to record marks for missing classmates. Given the high stakes, students might end up focusing on communicating the right answers to each other rather than on trying to think about the question themselves. For example, CS students with laptops could potentially devise a system for broadcasting answers to the whole class, ensuring maximum marks for everyone while also misleading the lecturer on the class's mastery of the material. In light of these possibilities, it was decided to assign students to groups and have all of the groups compete against each other for marks.

We hypothesised that dividing marks among teams in a zero sum game would eliminate the motivation for broadcasting answers between teams, while promoting constructive collaboration within teams. Teams were awarded marks based on their ranking of correct answers relative to the rest of the class. For cases involving a tie in the number of questions answered correctly, response times were used to decide the ranking. No matter how many or how few questions were answered correctly, the same amount of CA marks was always distributed among the class. Caldwell (2007) recommends giving partial credit for any answer to keep the pressure off students during lectures and reduce anxiety. In light of this, we awarded 50% to the weakest team each week and 100% to the strongest, with graded levels in between. An individual on an average team, attending all lectures, could therefore expect to earn 75% of the CA marks available for clicker participation.

Based on our previous experience with team-based programming (see Maguire, Maguire & Marshall, 2011), it was decided that the optimal size for a team was three students. Students were invited to select their own groups, though some remaining students without groups had to be matched randomly. Inevitably this resulted in some students expressing dissatisfaction with the commitment and ability of the people on their team. Some students had poor attendance during the semester and others dropped out, leaving their teams short of members. The scoring system was thus designed so that teams missing members would not be penalised. This was achieved by always selecting one answer at random from all responses provided by team

members for a particular clicker question. Given that it would be unfair for all members of the team to gain equal marks regardless of contribution, individual marks were adjusted by taking the team mark and multiplying it by the proportion of questions answered by the individual. For example, if a team earned 80% overall, a team member responding to only half of the clicker questions for that week would earn 40%. It was hoped that the system would encourage team members to sit together in lectures so as to ensure consistency of responses and avoid losing marks.

There are many guidelines in the literature about designing good clicker questions. Beatty et al. (2006) state that the critical challenge is creating questions that cultivate productive classroom interaction and discourse. Kay and LeSage (2009) recommend that questions should be ill-defined and vague so that students are required to think and debate to find the correct answer. They also recommend that questions should focus on deep reasoning rather than on the memorisation of factual content and that they should identify and help to resolve misconceptions. Designing a batch of questions to match these criteria each week was challenging. Several forms of questioning were employed. One type involved a series of five statements about data structures and algorithms, one of which was false. Another type of question involved a piece of code with some calculations and options for possible outputs. Other questions presented students with a piece of code and challenged them to count the number of errors within it. This was particularly conducive to discussion because different students would spot different errors, and the question could only be answered successfully by pooling all of the information. Another type of question would present a real-world problem (e.g. a set of items to be sorted by height) and a range of options for how this would be processed using a particular algorithm. All of the questions were based around deep conceptual issues so that answers could only be identified with confidence given a comprehensive understanding of the concept. We also aimed to highlight common misperceptions by deliberately creating 'trap' responses and then discussing them afterwards.

Kay and LeSage (2009) recommend that questions should be sprinkled throughout a lecture at a rate of two to five questions per 50 minute class, with no more than 20 minutes in between each question. The average number of questions we presented per lecture was 3.75. As team rankings were time dependent, this motivated students to respond as quickly as possible, providing a clear picture of the difficulty of each question. Once the majority of students had

responded, an additional 30 seconds of time was allowed before closing the voting. To reduce student anxiety about marks not being properly recorded (Caldwell, 2007), all results were posted online later that day.

4. Results

In the first week of clicker use students were questioned (using the clickers) on their attitude towards clickers, and their beliefs about how it would affect their attendance and attention. In the last week students again responded to the same questions. Table 1 shows that the majority of students remained positive towards clickers throughout the semester. In addition, students expected and found that the clickers had a positive effect on attendance and attention paid during lectures.

Table 1. Average student responses to questions on a 5 point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

	First Week	Last Week
How enthusiastic are you about using clickers?	3.62	3.67
Will/did clickers enhance your attendance?	4.16	4.01
Will/did clickers make you pay more attention?	3.75	3.50

In week 5 students were questioned regarding their team interactions. 63% said that they already knew both of the people on their team, while another 22% knew at least one. 58% said they were sitting beside both of their team members in that lecture, with 26% sitting on their own. 68% of students reported that they were very happy with their team.

The use of clickers produced a clear increase in attendance. Figure 1 shows that the lecture attendances in the first semester, when clickers were used, exceeded all of the lecture attendances in the second semester, when clickers were not used.

Figure 1. Class attendance in Semester 1 (clickers used) and Semester 2 (no clickers)

The use of clickers also had a dramatic effect on the dynamics of the class. Students were very vocal in defending their choices and would argue extensively to communicate their opinions, spurred on by other students who shared the same view. The presence of ambiguities or mistakes in the questions themselves also created a significant amount of debate. In line with Beatty (2004), through the act of selecting a particular answer, students developed an emotional involvement in the question. They would raise their hands to reveal errors in the code. They would type the code into a laptop to check if it worked, or surf the web to find information supporting a point. At one stage, students refused to leave the lecture hall until the answer to a 'cliff-hanger' clicker question was revealed. Students would email the lecturer corrections to the lecture slides which at times had gone unnoticed, or unmentioned, for years.

The amount of discussion the clicker questions generated was also evidenced by the activity on the Moodle news forum. Table 2 shows that, in the second semester, when clickers were not used, the volume of activity dropped markedly. Without emotional involvement, students became more reluctant to commit themselves and engage in discussion.

Table 2. Activity on the Moodle news forum by semester

	Semester 1 (clickers)	Semester 2
Threads started by lecturer	12	10
Threads started by students	16	8
Replies by lecturer	24	21
Replies by students	73	40

Another advantage of using clickers was that it allowed the lecturer to monitor how each of the students was performing throughout the year. Any sustained absences were noticed by fellow team members and reported to the lecturer, as well as being revealed each week by the grading system. This meant that the lecturer had an enhanced awareness of which students were at risk of disengagement, allowing any problems to be tackled early on. Table 3 shows a decrease in the number of students failing to take the final exam when clickers were used, relative to the two previous years.

Table 3. Number of students completing by year

Year	Students enrolling	Students completing	Dropping rate
2012 (clickers)	133	128	3.75%
2011	121	114	5.79%
2010	97	90	7.21%

In the final week students were asked whether they felt that the use of clickers would have a positive effect on their exam performance. The average response on a 5-point Likert scale was 3.03, indicating that students overall did not feel clickers would have any impact. Indeed, the marks achieved in the exam were lower than previous years, dropping from an average of 52.8% to only 43.8%. The exam failure rate, which averaged 21.7% in previous years, more than doubled to 44.4%. From correcting exam scripts, the students seemed to have a very poor grasp

of programming and appeared to have put less effort than usual into studying. These outcomes undermined the assumption that clickers would be beneficial to the class.

The literature on the relationship between clicker use and learning outcomes is mixed. Martyn (2007) found that although clickers were consistently rated more positively than class discussion, the test scores of students using clickers were actually lower than those involved in class discussion. Fitzpatrick, Finn and Campisi (2011) concluded that although clickers enhanced engagement, their hypothesis of increased student performance was not supported. In contrast, several other studies have demonstrated beneficial effects (e.g. Preszler et al., 2007; Crossgrove & Curran, 2008; Reay et al., 2008). For example, Mayer et al. (2009) carried out a study involving three groups, one using clickers, another exposed to the exact same questions but without clickers, and a control group. They found that the clicker group had a significant gain of approximately one third of a grade point over the other two groups. In light of these mixed findings, Kay and LeSage (2009) conclude that no firm link between clicker use and learning performance has been established. Rather, they suggest that it is the implementation of appropriate pedagogical strategies in combination with clickers that influences student success.

Questionnaires were handed out at the beginning of the subsequent semester to investigate what had led to the poor performance. Students were invited to provide anonymous feedback on their experience of clickers. The general feedback was that working in prescribed teams had disincentivised many students from trying to understand the concepts for themselves. Many teams featured one strong programmer who would end up making most of the decisions. Rather than benefitting from the opportunity to engage in peer learning, students were instead availing of the opportunity to take a back seat, as opposed to taking responsibility for their learning. Students also reported that the marks awarded for clicker participation were too high, with many ending up doing less study for the exam because fewer marks were needed to achieve a pass grade overall.

On the whole students reported enjoying clickers and the majority were in favour of using them again in other modules. Many were of the opinion that clickers had improved their attention in class and they enjoyed the competitive element, though some admitted simply clicking random buttons. Students reported self-organising into informal groups outside their officially recognised group and regarded the scoring system where one answer was selected at random from the pool of team responses as unfair and demotivating. The following quote is

representative of the feedback received: *"I liked the clickers. They made me focus during lectures, and gave me motivation to turn up…I learned better by myself. Having groups helped me out, but I think I relied on my group too much."*

5. Conclusion

The feedback suggests that it was the group-based paradigm that was responsible for the decrease in exam performance, rather than the use of clickers *per se*. It appears that imposing complex structures for motivating participation, such as competitive group-based questions, actually encourages students to delegate responsibility rather than enhancing peer learning. Learning how to work in a team is an important skill, especially in computer science where large scale software projects are necessarily collaborative. Nevertheless, the current study suggests that, for modules where the learning outcomes are centred on the development of individual skills, the advantages of group work are outweighed by the reduction in students' levels of engagement.

Attempting to promote a peer-learning environment by controlling how students interact may be unconstructive. A more pragmatic approach might be to allow students to make their own choices about how to organise themselves, allowing them to take responsibility for their own learning. Students naturally organise themselves into dynamic groups within the class, where peer learning can take place. In future we intend to facilitate this natural interaction by allowing students to discuss questions freely with those around them. However, marks will be awarded individually so that all students are incentivised to participate.

Group work aside, the introduction of clickers was certainly successful as regards enhancing attendance, attention and engagement. Anecdotally, the positive effects on the overall dynamics on the class, in terms of assertiveness, confidence and engagement persisted beyond the study. In light of this, we intend to continue using clickers to teach data structures and algorithms in future years, albeit without the group-based element.

References

Abrahamson, L. (2006). A brief history of networked classrooms: Effects, cases, pedagogy, and implications. In D. A. Banks (Ed.), *Audience Response Systems in Higher Education*, (pp. 1-25). Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.

Assiter, A. (Ed.) (1995). *Transferable Skills in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.

Beatty I. (2004). Transforming student learning with classroom communication systems. *EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR) Research Bulletin*, *3*, 1-13.

Beatty I. D., Gerace W. J., Leonar W. J. & Dufresne R. J. (2006). Designing effective questions for classroom response system teaching. *American Journal of Physics*, *74*(1), 31-39.

Beekes W. (2006). The "Millionaire" method for encouraging participation. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *7*(1), 25-36.

Bunce D. M., Van den Plas J. R., Havanki K. L. (2006). Comparing the effectiveness on student achievement of a student response system versus online WebCT quizzes. *Journal of Chemical Education*, *83*(3), 488-493.

Burnstein R. A. & Lederman L. M. (2001). Using wireless keypads in lecture classes. *The Physics Teacher*, *39*, 8-11.

Caldwell, J. E. (2007). Clickers in the large classroom: Current research and best-practice tips. *Life Sciences Education*, *6*(1), 9-20.

Carver, J.C., Henderson, L., He, L., Hodges, J.E. & Reese, D.S. (2007). Increased retention of early computer science and software engineering students using pair programming. *Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training*, 115-122.

Coleman, E.B. (1998). Using explanatory knowledge during collaborative problem solving in science. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *7*, 387–427.

Crossgrove, K. & Curran, K.L. (2008). Using clickers in non-majors and majors-level biology courses: student opinion, learning, and long-term retention of course material. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, *7,* 146–154.

Draper, S. W. & Brown, M. I. (2004). Increasing interactivity in lectures using an electronic voting system. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *20*(2), 81-94.

Fitzpatrick K.A., Finn K., & Campisi, J. (2011). Effect of personal response systems on student perception and academic performance in courses in a health sciences curriculum. *Advances in Physiology Education*, *35*, 280-289.

Kay, R.H. & LeSage, A. (2009). A strategic assessment of audience response systems used in higher education. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, *25*(2), 235-249.

Jones, C., Connolly, M., Gear, A. & Read, M. (2001). Group integrative learning with group process support technology. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *32*(5), 571-581.

Lasserre, P. (2009). Adaptation of team-based learning on a first term programming class. *Proceedings of ITiCSE '09*.

Levesque, A.A. (2011). Using clickers to facilitate development of problem-solving skills. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, *10*, 406-417.

MacManaway L. A. (1970). Teaching methods in higher education: innovation and research. *Universities Quarterly*, *24*(3), 321-329.

Maguire, P., Maguire, R & Marshall, P. (2011). Investigating the application of paired programming to the teaching of algorithms and data structures. In L.Carey, J. Dallat, H. Guerin, S. Huntley-Moore, S. Magennis & B. McMullin (Eds.), *Proceedings of AISHE-C 2011: The Challenge for Graduates in a Changed World*.

Martyn, M. (2007). Clickers in the classroom: An Active learning approach. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, *2*, 71-74.

Mayer, R., Stull, A., DeLeeuw, K., Almeroth, K., Bimber, B., et al. (2009). Clickers in college classrooms: Fostering learning with questioning methods in large lecture classes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *34*, 51-57.

McKeachie, W. J. (1999). *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers (10th Ed)*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Nichol D. J. & Boyle J. T. (2003). Peer instruction versus class-wide discussion in large classes: a comparison of two interaction methods in the wired classroom. *Studies in Higher Education*, *28*(4), 457-473.

Pollock S. J. (2006). Transferring transformations: learning gains, student attitudes, and the impacts of multiple instructors in large lecture courses. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, *818*(1), 141-144.

Preszler, R. W., Dawe, A., Shuster, C. B. & Shuster, M. (2007). Assessment of the effects of student response systems on student learning and attitudes over a broad range of biology courses. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, *6*(1), 29-41.

Robins, A., Rountree, J., & Rountree, N. (2003). Learning and teaching programming: A review and discussion. *Computer Science Education 13*(2), 137-172.

Reay, N.W., Li P. & Bao L. (2008). Testing a new voting machine question methodology. *American Journal of Physics*, *76*, 171–178.

Simon, B., Kohanfars, M., Lee, J. & Tamayo, K. (2010). Experience report: peer instruction in introductory computing. In *SIGCSE '10 Proceedings of the 41st ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science education*.

Smith, M.K., Trujillo, C. & Su, T.T. (2011). The benefits of using clickers in small-enrollment seminar-style biology courses. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, *10*, 14-17.

Traynor, D. & Gibson, P. (2004). Towards the development of a cognitive model of programming: a software engineering approach. In *Proceedings of the 16th Workshop of Psychology of Programming Interest Group*.

Trees, A. R. & Jackson, M. H. (2007). The learning environment in clicker classrooms: student processes of learning and involvement in large university course using student response systems. *Learning, Media, and Technology*, *32*(1), 21-40.

Williams, L. & Upchurch, R. (2001) In support of student pair programming, *SIGCSE Conference on Computer Science Education*, 327-331.

Wulff, D. H., Nyquist, J. D. & Abbott, R. D. (1987) Students' perceptions of large classes. In M.Weimer (Ed.) *New directions for teaching and learning: teaching large classes well*, (pp. 17–30). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.