Teaching–Learning Methods and Their Effectiveness in Bachelor-Level

Bishnu Prasad Sapkota
Lecturer, Jana Adarsha Multiple Campus
Email: bsapkota062@gmail.com

Krishna Prasad Kandel
Asst. lecturer, Jana Adarsha Multiple Campus
Email: krishnattau@gmail.com

Sagun Rimal
Student, BBS 4th year

Rita Sedhai
Student, B. Ed. 4th year

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the teaching-learning method and its effectiveness at the bachelor's level, focusing on BBS and B. Ed. programs in community campuses of the Chitwan district, Nepal. It adopts an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design: survey of 100 students and interviews with 24 faculty members, to explore current teaching practices, perceptions and challenges.

Findings indicate that traditional class teaching is more prevalent in BBS program, while student-centered approaches like group discussions, project work, and group tasks are more common in B. Ed. program. B. Ed. students perceived that such approaches are more effective than BBS students on aspects of participation, understanding, critical thinking, application, and motivation, which is highly significant at ($p < 0.01$). Interviews with faculty members of BBS point out the limitations of class size, resources, and time constraint, which do not permit much student activity. In B. Ed. program, the faculty adopts constructivist, experiential learning pedagogy, which is facilitated by smaller class size, greater alignment with the curriculum, and greater use of technology.

Based on the conclusion of the study, the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process depends on pedagogical practices and contexts. Encouraging student-centric learning activities, participation in education, use of technologies in the learning process, and capacity building of faculty members could enhance academic performance and lifelong learning skills of the students in the Nepalese community campuses at bachelor level.

Keywords: Bachelor-level of education, teaching–learning methods, student-centered learning, instructional effectiveness, active learning, faculty perspectives.

Introduction

The role of bachelor-level education is extremely important in shaping and developing students' foundational knowledge and skills of lifelong learning. In today's era of rapid changes in knowledge requirements, labor markets, and technological development, the effectiveness of teaching-learning processes has emerged as a major concern for all educational institution. Teaching-learning processes encompass practices and strategies employed by lecturers to support and facilitate learning, from conventional lecture methods to more technology-integrated and student-focused teaching methods. The impact of teaching-learning processes on learning outcomes has a vital role in shaping and ensuring improved bachelor-level educational quality.

Traditionally, bachelor-level education largely depends on teacher-centered methods such as lectures, note-taking, and examinations. Although these methods are effective for delivering content to large groups, they are often criticized for encouraging passive learning and limited student engagement (Biggs & Tang, 2011). In response, contemporary educational theories emphasize learner-centered and constructivist approaches, where students actively participate through discussion, collaboration, problem-solving, and reflection. Instructional strategies such as problem-based learning, project-based learning, case studies, flipped classrooms, and blended learning have gained prominence for enhancing critical thinking and practical application of knowledge (Prince,

2004).

Teaching-learning processes have generally been evaluated for their effectiveness by using various parameters such as performance, participation, motivation, skill acquisition, and satisfaction of learning. At the undergraduate level of education, which demands the development of independence in learning, the teaching process has shown considerable impact on the analytical skill and skill acquisition of professionals. Along with the adoption of digital technologies in the teaching- learning process in an online platform, the teaching- learning practices have varied in the learning process of the students (Means et al., 2013).

Although the adoption of modern approaches to teaching is increasing, the same effectiveness cannot be guaranteed across disciplines, institutional contexts, and student populations. Class size, the nature of the subject being taught, instructor competence, institutional support, and student learning traits can act as moderating variables in learning achievement. Thus, a focused attempt through systematic research is required to review the current status of the effectiveness of various methods of teaching–learning at the bachelor's level and to identify best practices in line of educational goals.

This study is designed to explore the prevailing teaching–learning methods in bachelor-level education and their effectiveness for enhanced learning outcomes among the students. The findings are expected to provide insights to support educators in selecting and implementing instructional strategies that promote meaningful, effective, and inclusive learning experiences.

Statement of the Problem

Effective teaching–learning methods are widely recognized as a key determinant of quality in higher education, influencing student engagement, comprehension, and academic achievement (Biggs & Tang, 2011). In bachelor-level programs such as Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS) and Bachelor of Education (B. Ed.), the selection and application of instructional strategies significantly influence students' learning experiences and skill development. However, research suggests that higher education classrooms continue to be dominated by traditional, teacher-centered approaches, which may not adequately respond to the learning needs of contemporary students or the demands of a changing academic and professional context (Trigwell et al., 1999; Prince, 2004).

Studies further indicate that a mismatch between teaching methods and students' learning preferences can negatively affect motivation, engagement, and learning outcomes (Felder & Brent, 2005). Although learner-centered and technology-supported approaches are increasingly advocated, their implementation varies across programs and is often constrained by institutional and pedagogical challenges faced by faculty members (Kember & Kwan, 2000; Means et al., 2013).

While existing literature has explored teaching–learning practices in higher education, limited attention has been given to comparative analyses of students' perceptions across different academic programs, such as BBS and B. Ed., along with faculty perspectives on the challenges of implementing effective teaching strategies. Understanding both student and faculty perceptions is essential for identifying instructional practices that promote deeper learning, critical thinking, and practical application of knowledge (Entwistle & Peterson, 2004).

Therefore, this study aims to examine the teaching–learning methods used in BBS and B. Ed. programs, assess students' perceptions of their effectiveness, and explore faculty experiences and challenges in instructional practice. By comparing perceptions across the two programs, the study seeks to identify program-specific trends and areas for improvement, contributing to the enhancement of bachelor-level education quality. This study focuses on following research issues/questions.

* What teaching–learning methods are commonly used in BBS and B. Ed. programs?
* How do students perceive the effectiveness of different teaching–learning methods?
* Are there differences in perceptions of teaching–learning effectiveness between BBS and B. Ed. students?
* What are faculty members' perceptions regarding teaching–learning practices and the challenges they face?

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to assess teaching–learning methods and their effectiveness in bachelor-level education. The specific objectives are:

* To identify the commonly used teaching–learning methods in BBS and B. Ed. programs.
* To assess students' perceptions of the effectiveness of different teaching–learning methods in enhancing learning outcomes.
* To compare the perceptions of teaching–learning effectiveness between BBS and B. Ed. students.
* To explore faculty members' perspectives on teaching–learning practices and the challenges they face in implementing them.

Theoretical Framework

This study is guided primarily by constructivist learning theory, supported by student-centered learning and experiential learning theories, to explain how teaching–learning methods influence student engagement and learning outcomes at the bachelor level.

Constructivist theory emphasizes that learners actively construct knowledge through interaction, discussion, and reflection rather than passive reception (Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978). Teaching strategies such as group discussions, project work, and collaborative learning—commonly practiced in B. Ed. programs—reflect constructivist principles and support deeper understanding and meaningful learning (Biggs & Tang, 2011). The higher perceived effectiveness reported by B. Ed. students in this study aligns with this perspective.

Student-centered learning theory highlights learners' active participation and autonomy, with teachers acting as facilitators (Felder & Brent, 2005). Research suggests that such approaches enhance motivation, engagement, and academic achievement in higher education (Entwistle & Peterson, 2004). The study's findings confirm that participatory methods are perceived as more effective than lecture-based instruction.

Experiential learning theory further explains the effectiveness of methods that connect theory with practice through experience and reflection (Kolb, 1984). The emphasis by students and faculty on practical application supports the relevance of this theory. Additionally, technology-enhanced learning is recognized as a supportive mechanism for active learning, though infrastructural constraints limit its full use (Means et al., 2013).

Overall, the framework assumes that teaching–learning methods, influenced by institutional conditions, shape students' engagement, understanding, and perceived learning effectiveness.

Significance of the Study

This study has important **theoretical, practical, and policy implications** for bachelor-level education in Nepalese community campuses.

Theoretically, it contributes to higher education research by validating constructivist and student-centered learning theories in the Nepalese context and by comparing perceptions across BBS and B. Ed. programs. Practically, the findings provide evidence for faculty and administrators to promote student-centered, participatory, and experiential teaching methods, particularly in BBS programs where lecture-based teaching dominates.

At the institutional and policy levels, the study offers insights for curriculum improvement, faculty professional development, and infrastructure enhancement, supporting quality assurance initiatives by universities and regulatory bodies such as the UGC. For students, improved teaching–learning practices can enhance engagement, critical thinking, and lifelong learning skills.

Overall, the study supports pedagogical reform aimed at improving the quality and relevance of undergraduate education in community campuses

Research Methodology

This study adopted a mixed-methods approach using an explanatory sequential design to examine teaching–learning methods and their effectiveness in bachelor-level education. The research was conducted in two phases: first, a quantitative survey of students assessed their perceptions of different teaching–learning methods and compared responses between BBS and B. Ed. students. Second, qualitative semi-structured interviews with faculty members explored teaching practices, challenges in implementation, and perceived effectiveness. This design enabled the study to identify trends in student perceptions while gaining deeper insights from faculty experiences, providing a comprehensive understanding of teaching–learning effectiveness.

The population of this study comprised bachelor-level students enrolled in BBS and B. Ed. programs and faculty members teaching these programs in community campuses of Chitwan district. The sample included 100 students selected from six community campuses, consisting of 65 students from BBS programs and 35 students from B. Ed. programs. In addition, 24 faculty members were selected for interviews, with three faculty members from each campus. Of these, 13 were from management faculties (BBS) and 11 were from education faculties (B. Ed.). The selected students and faculty members represented the study population and were considered appropriate for providing reliable insights into teaching–learning practices and their effectiveness.

Stratified random sampling was used to select student participants to ensure proportional representation from both BBS and B. Ed. programs. The BBS stratum included 65 students randomly selected across the six campuses, while the B. Ed. stratum included 35 students randomly selected from the same campuses. For faculty members, purposive sampling was employed, focusing on instructors with adequate teaching experience in their respective programs and the ability to provide informed insights regarding instructional practices.

Quantitative data from students were collected through a structured questionnaire, which included items on demographic information, types of teaching–learning methods experienced, and perceptions of the

effectiveness of these methods in promoting engagement, understanding, skill development, and overall learning satisfaction. Responses regarding effectiveness were measured using a five-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 5 indicating strong agreement. Qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with faculty members, which focused on teaching–learning practices implemented in their classrooms, challenges in adopting or implementing instructional methods, perceptions of the effectiveness of various teaching strategies, and suggestions for improving teaching and learning at the bachelor level.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods including mean, frequency, and percentage. Inferential statistical tests, such as the independent samples t-test or Mann–Whitney U test, were used to compare perceptions between BBS and B. Ed. students. Cross-tabulation and chi-square tests were conducted to examine the relationships between demographic variables and students' perceptions. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS. Qualitative data obtained from faculty interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis. Interviews were transcribed and coded to identify recurrent themes related to teaching strategies, challenges, and recommendations. Thematic findings were then triangulated with quantitative results to provide a comprehensive understanding of teaching–learning effectiveness.

This section presents the analysis of data collected from 100 bachelor-level students (65 BBS, 35 B. Ed.) and 24 faculty members from six community campuses in Chitwan district. The analysis follows the research methodology outlined earlier, with quantitative analysis of student questionnaire responses and qualitative thematic analysis of faculty interviews.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The student respondents included 54% male and 46% female participants. The majority (70%) were aged 19–22 years, while 20% were 23–25 years, and 10% were above 25 years. Program-wise, 65% were enrolled in BBS and 35% in B. Ed. programs. Most students (60%) were in their third year, consistent with the study's focus on students transitioning to independent learning.

Of the 24 faculty members, 13 were from management faculties (BBS) and 11 from education faculties (B. Ed.). All faculty had more than five years of teaching experience, with responsibilities across undergraduate courses at their respective campuses.

Teaching–Learning Methods Experienced by Students

Using the structured questionnaire, students reported their experiences with various teaching–learning methods on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Never, 5 = Always).

Table 1: Student Responses on Teaching Methods

Method	BBS Mean	BEd Mean	Overall Mean
Traditional Lectures	4.2	4.0	4.1
Group Discussions	3.6	4.2	3.9
Case Studies	3.8	3.9	3.85
Project-Based Learning	3.5	4.1	3.7
Problem-Based Learning	3.3	3.8	3.5
Flipped Classroom	3.0	3.4	3.15
Blended Learning	3.1	3.5	3.25
Student Presentations	3.7	4.0	3.8
Collaborative Learning	3.4	3.9	3.55

Traditional lectures are the most frequently used method across both programs. However, student-centered methods such as group discussions, project-based learning, and collaborative learning are more prominent in B. Ed programs, aligning with the constructivist teaching approach emphasized in education faculties.

Perceived Effectiveness of Teaching–Learning Methods

Students rated the effectiveness of teaching–learning methods using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) across engagement, understanding, skill development, and learning satisfaction.

Table 2: Effectiveness of Teaching Method

Statement	BBS Mean	B. Ed. Mean	Overall Mean
Methods help me understand subject content	4.0	4.2	4.1
Methods encourage active participation	3.6	4.1	3.8
Enhance critical thinking and problem-solving	3.7	4.2	3.9
Help apply theory to practical situations	3.5	4.0	3.7
Use of technology improves learning	3.2	3.5	3.3
Methods motivate me to learn	3.7	4.0	3.8
Overall effectiveness of methods	3.8	4.1	3.9

B. Ed students generally perceive teaching–learning methods as more effective than BBS students. Student-centered methods and interactive activities are rated higher by B. Ed. students, consistent with the program's focus on experiential and participatory learning.

Comparison between BBS and B. Ed. Students (t-test and U test)

An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine differences in students' perceptions of teaching–learning effectiveness between the two programs.

- Mean score (BBS) = 3.75, SD = 0.45
- Mean score (B. Ed.) = 4.05, SD = 0.42
- $t(98) = -2.75$, $p = 0.007$

The difference is statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), indicating that B. Ed. students perceive teaching–learning methods as more effective than BBS students, likely due to the greater use of interactive, participatory, and student-centered methods in the education program.

A Mann–Whitney U test was also conducted to examine differences in students' perceptions of teaching–learning effectiveness between the two programs. The results shows same results as t-tests.

- Median score (BBS) = 3.75
- Median score (B. Ed.) = 4.05
- $U = 812.5$, $p = 0.007$

The difference is statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), indicating that B. Ed. students perceive teaching–learning methods as more effective than BBS students. This may be due to the greater emphasis on interactive, participatory, and student-centered methods in the B. Ed. program.

Faculty Perspectives

This section presents an in-depth analysis of the qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews with 24 faculty members from six community campuses in Chitwan district. The interviews were conducted with faculty from two programs: Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS) and Bachelor of Education (B. Ed.), comprising 13 and 11 participants respectively. Faculty participants were selected purposively, ensuring that they had substantial teaching experience (more than five years) and were actively engaged in undergraduate teaching. The primary objective of the faculty interviews was to explore teaching–learning practices, perceived effectiveness of these methods, challenges faced in implementation, and suggestions for improvement. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the interview transcripts, coding recurring patterns, and identifying key themes.

Faculty members reported a variety of instructional strategies, reflecting both traditional and contemporary teaching methods. Across BBS programs, faculty primarily relied on lecture-based instruction, complemented occasionally by case studies and presentations. Lectures were considered efficient for covering the syllabus within time constraints, especially given the larger class sizes typical in BBS programs. One BBS faculty member explained:

"In our management classes, we have to cover a lot of content, and the large class size makes group activities difficult. Lectures are the easiest way to ensure that students get the required knowledge on time."

Despite this, some BBS faculty noted attempts to incorporate active learning strategies, such as problem-based discussions or small group activities, but acknowledged that these were often limited by institutional and logistical factors.

In contrast, B. Ed. faculty emphasized student-centered approaches and experiential learning. Methods such as group discussions, project-based assignments, peer teaching, collaborative learning, and case-based instruction were reported as routine. These practices aligned with the constructivist philosophy of education, which prioritizes student engagement, critical thinking, and application of knowledge. One B. Ed. faculty noted:

"In education classes, students are encouraged to work in groups, analyze case studies, and present their findings. This approach develops their critical thinking and prepares them for real classroom situations."

Faculty across both programs recognized the potential of technology to enhance learning outcomes. B. Ed. faculty reported frequent use of PowerPoint, online resources, and educational videos, integrating them with classroom activities to create a blended learning environment. BBS faculty, although aware of technology's benefits, faced challenges in adopting it fully due to limited infrastructure and insufficient technical support.

Faculty members evaluated effectiveness based on student engagement, understanding, skill development, and overall learning outcomes. Across programs, faculty emphasized that interactive and student-centered methods were generally more effective than traditional lectures. B. Ed. faculties particularly highlighted that methods like group discussions, project work, and student presentations promoted active participation, analytical thinking, and practical application of theoretical knowledge. One participant remarked:

"When students work in groups or present projects, they not only understand the topic better but also develop communication and collaboration skills that are crucial for their future teaching profession."

In BBS programs, faculty acknowledged that traditional lectures were effective for transmitting content but less effective in fostering deep understanding or critical thinking. They noted that case studies and project work could enhance learning, but time constraints and large class sizes often prevented their widespread use. Some faculty observed that student motivation was higher when teaching included active learning components:

"Even in BBS, when I give small problem-solving tasks or group activities, students become more engaged and curious, compared to just listening to lectures."

Faculty highlighted that methods connecting theory with real-world applications were particularly valuable. B. Ed. faculty consistently cited classroom teaching practicums, and micro-teaching exercises as highly effective. BBS faculty reported that case studies, market analysis exercises, and group projects helped students bridging theory and practical applications in real world business contexts.

Faculty reported several challenges affecting the implementation of innovative teaching–learning methods, which were consistent with trends observed in the quantitative survey. These challenges were grouped into the following sub-themes:

a. **Large Class Sizes:** A recurring issue in BBS programs was large class sizes, which limited opportunities for interactive or participatory teaching. Faculty indicated that managing group activities or project-based tasks for 60–70 students per class was logistically challenging. This constraint often forced them to depend on traditional lecture-based methods to maintain control and efficiency.

b. **Limited Infrastructure and Resources:** Faculty highlighted the lack of adequate classroom infrastructure, such as projectors, audio-visual aids, and internet access. Many campuses in Chitwan faced limited digital resources, making it difficult to implement blended learning or online instructional methods effectively.

c. **Time Constraints:** BBS faculty emphasized that strict syllabus and insufficient teaching hours restricted the adoption of active learning strategies. Covering the curriculum often took precedence over pedagogical innovation. One faculty member explained:

"We want to involve students in group activities and projects, but there's simply not enough time. We are under pressure to finish the syllabus before exams."

d. **Student Resistance:** Some faculty noted that students, particularly in BBS programs, were initially reluctant to participate in participatory methods. Traditional passive learning habits and exam-oriented mindsets sometimes hindered engagement in collaborative or discussion-based activities.

e. **Faculty Training:** Lack of training in modern instructional strategies was another constraint. Faculty expressed a need for professional development programs to enhance their ability to implement active learning, flipped classrooms, and digital teaching tools effectively.

The faculty perspectives align closely with student survey results. Quantitative analysis indicated that B. Ed. students rated interactive and student-centered methods higher than BBS students. Faculty interviews provide explanatory depth: B. Ed. programs systematically employ participatory methods, whereas BBS programs rely predominantly on lectures due to structural and logistical constraints. Challenges identified by faculty—such as large class sizes, lack of resources, and time pressures—corroborate student-reported difficulties in engagement and application of knowledge.

Moreover, faculty suggestions for improving teaching practices resonate with students' recommendations for more interactive, technology-supported, and applied learning experiences. This triangulation strengthens the validity of the findings and highlights context-specific factors that shape teaching–learning effectiveness in Nepalese community campuses.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal clear differences in teaching–learning practices and perceptions of their effectiveness between BBS and B. Ed. programs, aligning with existing research in higher education pedagogy. Quantitative results show that traditional lecture-based instruction remains the dominant method, particularly in BBS programs. This reliance on teacher-centered approaches is consistent with earlier studies suggesting that content-heavy and examination-oriented programs often favor lectures for efficiency (Trigwell et al., 1999). In contrast, B. Ed. programs demonstrated greater use of student-centered strategies such as group discussions, project-based learning, and collaborative activities, reflecting constructivist teaching orientations commonly associated with teacher education programs (Biggs & Tang, 2011).

Correspondingly, B. Ed. students reported significantly higher perceptions of teaching–learning effectiveness. This finding supports the argument that active and experiential learning approaches enhance student engagement, conceptual understanding, and skill development more effectively than passive learning methods (Prince, 2004). The statistically significant difference confirmed by the independent samples t-test further reinforces the view that instructional methods play a crucial role in shaping students' learning outcomes and satisfaction (Entwistle & Peterson, 2004).

Qualitative insights from faculty interviews provide contextual explanations for these differences. BBS faculty highlighted structural and logistical constraints, including large class sizes, limited instructional time, and inadequate resources, which restrict the use of participatory teaching methods. Similar challenges have been documented in previous studies, where institutional conditions strongly influenced faculty teaching practices (Kember & Kwan, 2000). In contrast, B. Ed. faculty reported greater flexibility in adopting constructivist and experiential approaches, supported by program objectives that emphasize pedagogical skills and classroom practice.

Both faculty and students emphasized the importance of linking theoretical knowledge with practical application, underscoring the relevance of applied learning in bachelor-level education. The role of technology in facilitating blended and interactive learning was also acknowledged, although infrastructural limitations were identified as barriers to its effective integration. This finding is consistent with research indicating that while technology can enhance learning experiences, its impact depends heavily on institutional readiness and support systems (Means et al., 2013).

Overall, the study highlights that teaching–learning effectiveness is highly context-dependent, shaped by program goals, institutional resources, and classroom conditions. The findings suggest that strengthening student-centered approaches, enhancing faculty professional development, and improving instructional infrastructure can help bridge the gap between traditional and innovative teaching practices. Promoting active learning, participatory methods, and appropriate technology integration is therefore essential for improving the quality of undergraduate education and fostering critical thinking, problem-solving, and lifelong learning skills.

Conclusion

This study examined teaching–learning methods and their effectiveness in bachelor-level education, focusing on BBS and B. Ed. programs in community campuses of Chitwan district. The findings reveal a clear distinction between traditional and student-centered approaches across the two programs. While traditional lectures remain the dominant method in BBS programs, B. Ed. programs place greater emphasis on interactive, participatory, and experiential strategies such as group discussions, project-based learning, collaborative activities, and classroom practicums. Correspondingly, B. Ed. students reported higher perceptions of teaching–learning effectiveness, reflecting greater engagement, understanding, skill development, and motivation. This result is consistent with constructivist learning theory, which emphasizes active student involvement as a foundation for meaningful learning (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Statistical analysis confirmed that these differences are significant, underscoring the influence of instructional methods on student learning outcomes.

Faculty perspectives provided further insights, indicating that structural constraints—including large class sizes, limited infrastructure, insufficient teaching hours, and lack of pedagogical training—restrict the adoption of student-centered methods in BBS programs. Similar institutional barriers to innovative teaching have been documented in higher education contexts (Kember & Kwan, 2000). In contrast, B. Ed. faculty were able to implement constructivist and experiential strategies more consistently, supported by smaller class sizes and curricula aligned with practical applications. Both students and faculty emphasized the importance of connecting theoretical knowledge with real-world practice and integrating technology to enhance learning.

Overall, the study suggests that teaching–learning effectiveness at the bachelor level is strongly shaped by pedagogical approaches, institutional resources, and classroom conditions. Promoting active learning, participatory methods, blended learning, and faculty professional development can help bridge the gap between

traditional and innovative practices. Strengthening these areas can enhance academic achievement while fostering critical thinking, problem-solving, and lifelong learning skills, thereby improving the quality of undergraduate education in Nepalese community campuses.

REFERENCES

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Entwistle, N., & Peterson, E. R. (2004). Conceptions of learning and knowledge in higher education: Relationships with study behaviour and influences of learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Research, 41*(6), 407–428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2005.08.009

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2005). Understanding student differences. *Journal of Engineering Education, 94*(1), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00829.x

Kember, D., & Kwan, K. (2000). Lecturers' approaches to teaching and their relationship to conceptions of good teaching. *Instructional Science, 28*(5), 469–490. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026569608656

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Prentice Hall.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record, 115*(3), 1–47.

Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of the child.* Basic Books.

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x

Trigwell, K., Prosser, M., & Waterhouse, F. (1999). Relations between teachers' approaches to teaching and students' approaches to learning. *Higher Education, 37*(1), 57–70. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003548313194

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.