

Designing Engaging Instruction for the Adult Learners

Karen Swanson

Mercer University, USA

Geri Collins

Mercer University, USA

INTRODUCTION

Instruction in higher education continues to follow a traditional model of instructor delivery and content focus. In a study by Nunn (1996), he found that less than six percent of class time involves student participation. There was no evidence of any instance in which students spoke for more than 23% of the total class time. A teacher-centered instructional method has received significant rebuke in the last decade, the stereotypical image is one of instructors droning on to a captive audience of undergraduates taking feverish notes for the sole purpose of reciting the information on a subsequent test. Hoyt and Perera (2000) surveyed faculty as to which type of instruction approach they incorporated into their practice. Forty-five percent identify some combination which used lecture as a primary approach. So the question then becomes what are the best practices for an engaging course design that benefits both faculty and adult learners?

Instructional design for the adult learner is a growing field of study in higher education. Engaging instruction for adult learners will be defined in this chapter in two ways: designing courses using the significant learning taxonomy, and a paradigm shift to support faculty to involve student participation.

Adult education is defined as “activities intentionally designed for the purpose of bringing about learning among those whose age, social

roles, or self-perceptions, define them as adults” (Merriam & Brockett, 2014, p. 8). The adult learner can also include those who are parents, working full time or older and more experienced than the traditional college student. Adults are motivated by learning that has a practical application and personal significance. In addition, the growing abundance of information makes covering a discipline almost impossible. So the alternative or anecdote to teaching a volume of information is to design the learning for significance in a complex and rich way. Here again the need to address student motivation becomes an issue to examine.

BACKGROUND

When planning instruction for adult learners it is important to examine their motivation for being in the classroom. They have chosen to pursue a higher education degree and the faculty’s challenge is to plan and execute engaging, relevant learning experiences. The traditional model of instruction in higher education, such as lecture and testing, while possibly engaging, is limited. If the goal is to be able to explicitly assess how students are making the connections among theory, content, and personal experience there needs to be a master course design. Fink (2007) explains that “our current instructional procedures are not working very well. Students are not learning even basic general knowledge, they are not developing higher-level

cognitive skills, and they are not retaining their knowledge very well. In fact there is no significant difference between student who take courses and students who do not” (Fink, 2013, p. 4).

Learner-Centered Instruction

Teaching adult learners should be focused on the learning process of the students. Teacher-directed instruction, such as lecture and rote memorization can be transformed to be more engaging through activities such as discussion and application.

Huba and Freed (2000) contrast teacher and learner-centered instruction as a model or paradigm. Their research shifts the focus from what faculty teach (content) to how students learn. They acknowledge that a teacher-centered methodology is not ineffective, but a shift from solely lecturing to a teaching style that incorporates more student interaction and a demonstration of learning beyond rote memorization which supports long-term retention. Huba and Freed (2000) characterize a teacher-centered paradigm in several ways:

1. Content is primarily delivered by the instructor and students are solely learners.
2. Content is not contextualized but rather students passively receive the information.
3. Assessment is the responsibility of the instructor, requires only rote memorization and is summative in nature.
4. Learning is the responsibility of the individual and courses can be constructed in a competitive nature (p. 5).

These characteristics may be more evident in large, lecture style courses where individual interaction is more cumbersome. However, the challenge is for faculty to begin to consider a possible paradigm shift towards learning centered instruction. Fink (2013) states, “...a major change already taking place in American higher education.....is a paradigm shift in which institutions are thinking less about providing instruction (the teaching paradigm) and more about producing

learning (the learning paradigm)” (p. 20). The following sections will explore this paradigm shift, how it impacts instructional design and how to engage students in this new perspective of learning.

Three Models: Transmission, Generative, and Transformative

As faculty, we design courses with a myriad of assumptions about teaching and learning. Those assumptions influence the decisions we make about how course time is used, assignments are structured and assessments are designed. Therefore, a theoretical background may provide a framework to place assumptions into a context for examination. Some assumptions that may be present include the student’s lack of prior content knowledge; more content is equivalent to increased rigor and time constraints (it’s faster to lecture). It may be assumed that teacher directed instruction requires less planning over time and is the format most appropriate in higher education. The objective of this section is to provide three general models to examine how moving towards learning centered instruction can produce rich educational experiences for the students.

Wink (2000) identifies three perspective models on teaching: the transmission model, the generative model and the transformative model. The transmission model has instructors filling students with information through primarily lecture and the students passively receiving information. The instructor controls the scope and sequence of information and evaluation is typically an examination which requires students to repeat information in the form they were given it (p. 121).

Researchers have come to know that students must construct knowledge from information which defines the generative model of teaching. This model provides a space for students to engage in the learning using groups to build on their own knowledge. Learning is no longer passive. The role of the instructor is to structure the course activities to guide students toward learning outcomes (p. 122).

7 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/designing-engaging-instruction-for-the-adult-learners/183858

Related Content

Identification of Wireless Devices From Their Physical Layer Radio-Frequency Fingerprints

Gianmarco Baldini, Gary Steriand Raimondo Giuliani (2018). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition* (pp. 6136-6146).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/identification-of-wireless-devices-from-their-physical-layer-radio-frequency-fingerprints/184312

Reflections on the Interview Process in Evocative Settings

Kay M. Nelson (2005). *Causal Mapping for Research in Information Technology* (pp. 195-202).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/reflections-interview-process-evocative-settings/6519

Change Management: The Need for a Systems Approach

Harry Kogetsidis (2013). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 1-12).

www.irma-international.org/article/change-management/78903

Personalized Education Resource Recommendation Method Based on Deep Learning in Intelligent Educational Robot Environments

Sisi Liand Bo Yang (2023). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 1-15).

www.irma-international.org/article/personalized-education-resource-recommendation-method-based-on-deep-learning-in-intelligent-educational-robot-environments/321133

An Optimal Routing Algorithm for Internet of Things Enabling Technologies

Amol V. Dhumane, Rajesh S. Prasadand Jayashree R. Prasad (2017). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis* (pp. 1-16).

www.irma-international.org/article/an-optimal-routing-algorithm-for-internet-of-things-enabling-technologies/182288