# Chapter 26 STEM Teaching and Learning via Technology–Enhanced Inquiry

Michael L. Connell

University of Houston - Downtown, USA

#### Sergei Abramovich

State University of New York at Potsdam, USA

#### ABSTRACT

This chapter aims to address several limitations of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) – a theoretical model used in the application of technology when teaching STEM disciplines. To this end, a supplement to TPACK drawn from the Action on Objects (AO) framework (Connell, 2001) is suggested. To illustrate the value of the proposed enhancement of TPACK, an example integrating science, technology, and mathematics is provided. The Texas College and Career Readiness Standards are used to demonstrate the relationship between the proposed theoretical modification of the leading model and the current teaching practice involving such scientific activities as measuring, record keeping, analyzing, conjecturing and evaluating. Additional suggestions and applications of the TPACK/AO model are provided.

#### INTRODUCTION

STEM Education has undergone changes regarding the manner in which core foundational understandings of content are best developed (Breiner, Harkness, Johnson, & Koehler, 2012; National Research Council, 2003). These changes have contributed to a growing need for revision of existing pedagogy (Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2009; Labov, Reid, & Yamamoto, 2010). The need for such pedagogical changes in many cases have been both enabled and exacerbated by the application of increasingly powerful educational technology in the K-16 schools (e.g., Abramovich & Cho, 2009; Bodzin, Fu, Bressler, & Vallera, 2015; Hall & Chamblee, 2013; Jang, 2012; Lyons & Tredwell, 2015; So & Ching, 2011; Valanides & Angeli, 2008; Winkel, 2013; Yu & Yu, 2002).

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-5631-2.ch026

If we take a view of pedagogy as an intersection of student need, teacher ability, and content requirements, the addition of educational technology into the STEM classroom creates new problematics which need to be addressed. In particular, when the teacher is unsure how to apply technology, the content being taught can be diluted or misinterpreted. This is a natural consequence resulting from an increased focus on the development of procedural skills needed to use the technology itself, something that leads to decreased time available for the content. In these cases, students often develop either a broad superficial understanding of a few independent content areas or a small set of procedures only useful for a select set of problems.

Attempts to address such problems may lead to an adoption of a teacher replacement model which incorporates an integrated learning system (ILS) to bypass teachers completely and standardize content delivery. Such efforts to "teacher-proof" content lead to the creation of pre-programmed instructional modules which fall back on a behavioral view of the content (Williams, 1999; Martens, Daly Begeny, & VanDerHeyden, 2011) where each learning objective devolves to an isolated item to be memorized.

Once this viewpoint is adopted, notions of efficiency come into play, in particular, "faster is better" and become the instructional focus. Within this orientation the ILS is designed to take advantage of the computer's speed in enabling a student to "produce" the end product as quickly as possible using immediate feedback to simply posed memory recall items. This "faster is better" belief is then applied using the tremendous speed of the computer, making it possible for the student to know within milliseconds whether or not the memory prompt was addressed correctly. In fairness, it should be noted that such on-the-spot responses may be appropriate for learning in STEM content domains that are very restricted and require a high degree of memorization. For example, development of initial terminology could be well addressed by such methods.

However, outside of such special cases, the immediate feedback produced by implementing this model of instruction does not develop higher order thinking skills. Although the student knows whether or not the answer provided was right or wrong nearly instantaneously, the reason for this answer is not addressed. At a foundational level, the computer in this case does not provide sufficient time for the student to think about the implications of the problem or to perform basic self-confirmations. To put it bluntly, the computer's speed has done away with the time necessary for the student to think and internalize.

#### BACKGROUND

If a student is to internalize and construct meanings from experiences as required in STEM education, then there must be time to reflect upon the experiences and how they connect with the students' existing knowledge base. When students know within a split-second if a given answer is correct there is no need for further reflection concerning their beliefs, intuitions, prior experiences, relation to other units of knowledge, and so forth. Effective STEM teaching, with its focus on critical analysis and problem solving, should not be reinforcing student beliefs that all that counts is the correct answer. Yet this viewpoint is even planned for and presented literally millions of times each day in numerous Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) programs. Despite this, immediate feedback is the approach taken in many general computer assisted instruction models. In other words, the computer, rather than enabling problem solving, just makes it "easy" for students to solve problems, replacing their thinking skills by purely artificial intelligence of a computer (Abramovich, 2016).

23 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/stem-teaching-and-learning-via-technologyenhanced-inquiry/203195

#### **Related Content**

### Digital Badging at Scale at Penn State University: A Case Study Within the Libraries and Engineering

Victoria Raish, Andrea Greggand Cathy Holsing (2022). Handbook of Research on Credential Innovations for Inclusive Pathways to Professions (pp. 375-395).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/digital-badging-at-scale-at-penn-state-university/288586

### Chinese Pre-University Teachers' Foreign Language Anxiety, Teaching Anxiety, and Teacher Self-Efficacy

Tianhao Li, Meihua Liuand Kaixuan Gong (2024). International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development (pp. 1-19).

www.irma-international.org/article/chinese-pre-university-teachers-foreign-language-anxiety-teaching-anxiety-and-teacher-self-efficacy/343516

## The Outcomes of Collaborative Whole-School Professional Development on Teachers' Inclusive Practices in a Mainstream Secondary School

Margaret Floodand Anna Logan (2024). International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development (pp. 1-19).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-outcomes-of-collaborative-whole-school-professional-development-on-teachersinclusive-practices-in-a-mainstream-secondary-school/341267

### Pre-Service Teachers' and Instructors' Reflections on Virtually Afforded Feedback During a Distant Teaching Practicum Experience

Stella Hadjistassou, Maria Iosifina Avgoustiand Christopher Allen (2020). International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development (pp. 42-59).

www.irma-international.org/article/pre-service-teachers-and-instructors-reflections-on-virtually-afforded-feedback-duringa-distant-teaching-practicum-experience/243390

### Assessment of Diversity Through Student Isolation: Qualitative Investigation of Academic, Social, and Emotional Isolation

S. Vighnarajahand Lim Shing Yu Jolene (2018). *International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development (pp. 1-13).* 

www.irma-international.org/article/assessment-of-diversity-through-student-isolation/204530