Teaching portfolio

Herbjørn Nysveen (herbjorn.nysveen@nhh.no)

Professor in Marketing, Norwegian School of Economics, Department of Strategy and Management

Purpose and audience of the teaching portfolio

The *purpose* of this teaching portfolio is merittering for the status of Excellent Teacher Practitioner at Norwegian School of Economics (NHH).

The *audience* for this teaching portfolio is the committee evaluating applications for the status of Excellent Teacher Practitioner at Norwegian School of Economics (NHH).

Biography

Background:

I have a Dr. Oecon degree from NHH (2000). From 2000 to 2005 I had various positions as a researcher (SNF), associate professor (NHH), and post doc (NHH). From 2005 I have been a professor in Marketing at NHH.

Teaching experience:

Throughout the years I have been responsible for and taught a variety of courses at the bachelor level and master level. I have also held PhD lectures and contributed with lectures at executive programs (please see attachment 1 for an overview of teaching experience).

Supervisor experience:

The students at NHH do not write a thesis at the bachelor level at NHH. However, I have supervised a bachelor thesis at what used to be The University College of Sogn & Fjordane (Campus Sogndal). At NHH I supervise about six master theses every year. At the PhD level I have been a co-supervisor for three candidates and main supervisor for two candidates. Unfortunately, these two candidates did not make it through the PhD program.

Pedagogical courses:

NHH-PED3: Course in Pedagogy – Elective Module: Teaching Portfolio (Spring, 2019). Held by Robert Gray jr. (please see attachment 2).

NHH-PED2: Course in Pedagogy – Elective Module: Assessment methods (Fall, 2019). Held by Arild Raaheim (please see attachment 3).

NHH-course in Online Teaching (Fall 2020). Held by Crina Damsa, UIO (please see attachment 4).

NHH course in Basic course in pedagogy, teaching and learning (Fall 2020). Held by Arild Raaheim (please see attachment 5).

I participated in many of the seminars in "Pedagogisk uke" (uke 39 in 2014) held by Torben K. Jensen (Aarhus University).

Teaching awards:

Teaching award for the course "MIE428 Design og utvikling av produkter og tjenester" (assigned by Department of Strategy and Management, Norwegian School of Economics) (Please see attachment 6).

Teaching philosophy

Before I present my teaching philosophy I want to clarify the background for my philosophy. In my opinion, *active learning* is the guide to good teaching (e.g. Chikering and Gamson, 1987; Freeman et al., 2014). It is my belief that students learn by doing. It is my belief that students learn by talking about, writing about, and solve concrete problems based on what they are supposed to learn. This is also based on thoughts from Konfuciuc, saying that "I hear and I forget. I see and I remember. I do, and I understand https://www.ordtak.no/sitat.php?id=2645).

Active learning is defined in many ways. Prince (2004) includes labels such as active learning, collaborative/cooperative learning, and problem-based learning when conceptualizing active learning. The main elements emphasized by Prince (2004) is that active learning engages students in the learning process to do meaningful activities in the classroom. The conceptualization also emphasize that the activities are conducted in small student groups (working towards a common goal). The problems that the student groups work with are typically introduced at the beginning of the course and provide the context for the learning (Prince, 2004, p. 223)[1]. So based on this, I have extracted the following key words guiding my teaching philosophy; 1)student engagement, 2)active participation in problem solving, and 3)group work with focus on dialogue (both between the students and the teacher and between the students). In addition, I have included 4)flexibility and

---

[1] Mascolo (2009) also includes experiential learning and participative learning as method-categories of active learning.

adaptability in the definition, and I will get back to why I have included this fourth dimension later in the discussion. To summarize, my definition of active learning can be presented as;

Active learning = f(student engagement, active participation in problem solving, group work focusing dialogue, flexibility and adaptability)

Let me specify the four dimensions that I have included to form active learning a bit more. Several studies point to the relevance of *student engagement* (e.g. Gilboy et al., 2015; Reeve, et al., 2004; Carini et al., 2006). According to Reeve et al. (2004, p. 147), engagement refers to "the behavioral intensity and emotional quality of a person's active involvement during a task". Engagement is characterized by enthusiasm, motivation, involvement, initiative, interest, and persistency (Reeve et al., 2004, p. 147). The relevance of engagement is underlined by Carini et al. (2006, p. 2) stating that "Student engagement is generally considered to be among the better predictors of learning and personal development". *Active participation in problem solving* means that students work with relevant problems for the course during the course. Problem-based learning is always active and often (usually) collaborative (Prince, 2004). More specifically, problem-based learning is characterized by facilitated problem solving, work in collaborative groups, application of knowledge to problems, and focus on learning process facilitation rather than knowledge provision only (Hmelo-Silver, 235). A meta-analysis by Dochy et al. (2003) shows positive influences of problem-based learning on student skills and some more ambiguous influences on student knowledge - for example that problem-based learning led to slightly less knowledge but that they remembered more of the acquired knowledge. Regarding *group work with focus on dialogue*, the dialogue element is the key. Many perspectives and views on dialogue exist in learning and teaching theory (Burbules and Bruce, 2001). I embrace the perspective where the teacher is a partner in inquiry and that the students learn together with the teacher (facilitator) and other students through questions and answers (discussions) (Burbules and Bruce, 2001). Building on Felman (1982), Game and Metcalf (2009, p. 3) argue that "Real learning, like real teaching, occurs in the dialogue that constitutes the meeting of teacher and student". Finally, I have included *flexibility and adaptability* as a dimension of active learning. Flexibility is pointed out as an element of good teaching (Raaheim, 2013), and adaptive teaching is pointed out as important by Randi and Corno (2005). The main issue here is to adapt to the need of individual students and student groups. This dimension is emphasized based on the belief that students learn in different ways. Also, with a lot of exchange students in class (which we have at NHH), the heterogeneity of students is high. Having a flexible and adaptive teaching method increases the chance of fulfilling the learning goals for all students in a class.

As can be seen from the description of the four dimensions of active learning, they are not independent but rather interlinked. This makes sense as the four dimensions are elements of the same construct – active learning. Although influences of active learning on learning outcomes can vary across student characteristics, course types, professors' motivation and skills, etc., a fair part of the research indicates that the four dimensions (and through that; active learning) has positive influences on learning (ref. my prior discussion of the four dimensions).

Reflections on own development

So how do I operationalize my teaching philosophy? Taking a short look back to when I started to teach in 1998, I started with the one-way traditional teaching approach that I had experienced when I was a student. However, after only a year or two I implemented the *flexibility and adaptability* element in my teaching. The main motivation for this was to avoid the monotony of lectures (both for the students and for me as a lecturer). Although I still mainly taught one-way traditional lectures in auditoriums, I included one or two lectures in the courses where the lecture material was pre-developed so that – rather than showing up in the auditorium at a specific time – the students could take these lectures anytime and anywhere (*flexibility*). In addition to the articles, I also developed full text lecture notes that the students had to read, reflecting on the main points in the lectures, linking the various lecture articles together to show the full picture of the lecture, and illustrating the theory with practical examples. Although course evaluations were not systemized the way they are today at that time, I made sure that I got systematic student feed-back on my courses. Comments in the feed-back from the students were in general good and indicated that they liked the lectures based on pre-developed material. Building on this I continued this practice, but also included as a course requirement that the students had to submit answers to some tasks related to the lectures building on pre-developed course material. This *activated the students in problem solving*, and it also gave me the opportunity to have what we can call an initial *dialogue* (at a very simple level) with the students. Hence, gradually, I developed traditional one-way lectures with elements of flexibility and adaptability, active participation in problem solving, and some initial efforts of dialogue (all of which are specified above as elements of my active learning teaching philosophy).

In 2014 I decided to revise my way of teaching rather radically. The motivation for this was not that my teaching was evaluated badly (students' scores on my courses were good). Rather, through the gradual increase in interaction with my students, I realized that the students liked this way of learning, that they liked to get feed-back from me, and that they liked to discuss with me. At the same time, I also became aware of the flipped –classroom method, and I realized that this was a

suitable method for implementing a teaching philosophy (active learning) that years as a teacher had learned me to believe in. In line with Jensen et al. (2015) and Roehl et al. (2013) I consider flipped classroom to be a method for implementing the philosophy of active learning. Flipped classroom builds on a dialogue based learning model where feed-back from the teacher is important (Butt, 2014) and where the goal is "…to create a more collaborative learning environment where students are focused on working through problems with both the guidance of their teacher and the support of their peers" (Findlay-Thompson and Mombourquette, 2014, p. 64). This resonates well with the four dimensions forming my understanding of active learning.

Let me give you a short description on how I organize flipped-classroom in MBM428 – a course on product development and design. When I meet the students in the first lecture I inform them about the flipped classroom approach that I use. Students self-select themselves to groups, and some groups start to work with the course paper already in lecture 1. From lecture 2 to lecture 10 all student groups work with the course paper. The course paper should be solidly anchored in theory and is designed with three main parts where students have to use more or less all of the curriculum in the course – a curriculum that is pre-prepared and accessible for the students from day one of the course (articles and full text lecture notes explaining the articles and linking article topics to relevant business examples). In all the lectures I circulate between the groups and facilitate the groups' work with the course paper through dialogue (online in 2021). The groups hand in the paper three times throughout the course and get thorough written feed-back. All groups present their course paper at the last lecture to all classmates and receive feed-back both on the paper (by me) and on the presentation (by a professor in pedagogy) (in 2021 the students will hand in an online presentation and get feed-back from me). A more detailed description of the course can be found in Raaheim and Nysveen (2019).

Through this teaching approach in MBM428 students are *engaged* in several ways. First, in the course paper, students have to design their own company, which I hope creates some ownership to the company. Also, I try to be an enthusiastic facilitator motivating them to take various initiatives and be persistent. Also, I tell the students that they are responsible to the group (not me), and my experience is also that this motivate the students to work hard to satisfy expectations from the other group members. Also, the students are evaluated based on the quality of the course paper that they work on throughout the course, which also makes them engage in the course paper activities. The course paper is the platform for *problem solving* in the course. The task for the course paper is comprehensive, and all of the group members have to *participate actively* to develop a good paper (for an overview of the tasks for the course paper, please see attachments 7). The students organize the group work independently of me and share tasks between the group members. At the end of the

paper each group also write an evaluation of how their group work has been (please see <u>attachment 7</u>). Based on this group work evaluation part of the course paper, I have the understanding that all members work actively in most of the groups. Even though the groups organize the work themselves, I also discuss and give advice about different ways of organizing the group work to increase the chance that all members participate actively. *Dialogue* is critical for the success of the course. When writing up the course paper, the groups have to make several choices. Making these choices can make students unsure and frustrated. Also, there may be divergent views within the groups on which choice to make. The dialogue between the students is of course the key here – the students have to discuss various solutions and possible consequences of the various solutions. Also, they often use me as a discussion partner. My policy is not to tell them which choice to make, but rather to point them to various theories and conceptual models (from articles in the curriculum) that can help them to make a good choice. In a way, I look at my role as an active (senior) team member (for all of the groups) trying to infuse both good ideas and energy into the groups when I interact with them. Finally, *flexibility and adaptability* is important to make the courses work well. I tell the groups that it is not mandatory to show up in the lectures. They have all the necessary material available from day one of the course and can work independently from me. I point out that this gives them a lot of flexibility on how and when they can work, but also that it implicitly means that they get a lot of responsibility for their own learning. Most of the groups show up in more or less all of the lectures. For various reasons, some of the students cannot be present for the presentation (last lecture). The student still have to participate in the presentation (for example through a video integrated in the presentation), although not being physically present. The student groups find solutions on this – usually good solutions.

Teaching repertoire

I have tried out various types of teaching throughout the more than 20 years I have practiced as a teacher. The first few years I mainly used traditional one-way lectures where it was a lot up to the students to ask questions to establish a dialogue. In this pedagogical format, I was very focused on giving "practical" examples to illustrate the more abstract theories. I gradually invited students more and more into dialogue within this pedagogical approach. I did this by giving the students small tasks for discussion, asked them to give practical examples of theories I presented, etc. Teaching executive students, the format I used was typically to teach before lunch. After lunch the students were divided into groups and given tasks where they could discuss theories lectured on before lunch related to

their own company. I facilitated the group discussions. For the last hour or so, we typically gathered again in class and the groups could share their experiences/discussions with the other groups.

As described in the section "Reflections on own development", I have moved gradually towards an active learning approach in my teaching. In MBM428 Product development and design I have used flipped classroom as a method for active learning since 2014. Although both the students and I have been happy with that, I have received feed-back from a few students that they would like some regular lectures in combination with flipped classroom. In 2018 I started a new course (MBM432 Sustainable marketing), a course that I teach together with my colleague professor Sven Haugland. As a response to this student feed-back I wanted to try out a combination of flipped classroom and regular lectures. The format in this course is that I teach on the curriculum for about one hour at the beginning of a lecture. Then the students work in their groups for the rest of the lecture (about three hours), group work facilitated by me. My experience with this format is that the students do not seem to take the same responsibility for preparing for the group work when they know I will teach on the articles before the group work. Hence, they are not as well prepared for working with the course paper in the groups as in MBM428 where the pedagogical approach is 100 percent flipped (and there is a very explicit expectation that they have to prepare before they meet in groups). Hence, I will move to a 100 percent flipped classroom approach also in MBM432 from 2020.

MBM428 and MBM432 are the main courses that I am responsible for now. In both of these courses the students present their projects (the course papers that they are working on throughout the course) for the other students in the class. So in addition to a lot of group work, the students also have to make three oral presentations in these courses (one in MBM428 and two in MBM432) (in 2021 their presentations are online). I believe that development of skills in group work and oral presentations is important. In addition, including group work and student presentations as part of the teaching method is in line with recommendations from accreditation institutions such as NOKUT and EQUIS.

So through the last 20 years, my teaching philosophy has developed from traditional one-way classroom teaching to an active learning approach where flipped classroom is the method for stimulating active learning. I make smaller adjustments in the teaching method from year to year based on experience and student feed-back. Although active learning and flipped classroom may not be the answer to good learning in all type of courses and for all type of students or teachers, for me, with my courses and students, it has worked pretty well for several years. Still, I am always looking for better pedagogical solutions. To get an impression on students perceptions of the two courses, please find attached student comments for the spring semester 2019 on "What worked best in the

course?" and "How can the course be improved?" for MBM428 (<u>attachment 8</u>) and MBM432 (<u>attachment 9</u>). (I had a sabbatical in 2019/2020, so these are the latest course evaluations I have).

I had a sabbatical from August 2019 – July 2020. During this sabbatical I made thorough revisions of both MBM428 and MBM432. I will keep on using flipped classroom as the teaching method in both courses. There is an enormous development in technological opportunities today, and our students are at the forefront of this development. In addition, the covid-19 pandemic has pushed teaching to online platforms such as Teams and Zoom. Hence, spring 2021, both MBM428 and MBM432 will be taught digitally. This will be a challenge for me as a teacher. Although I see some opportunities with the digitalization, I am a bit worried particularly about the *dialogue* element of my teaching. What is for sure, is that it will be a "steep" learning experience for me. We have a section for quality assurance in education at NHH with very competent and helpful people. They have access to (and know how to use) a variety of education technology and learning management systems. I have attended a few short seminar given by them on technological opportunities. I also have good colleagues that have helped me with organizing the courses in Teams. Overall, I consider the digitalization of teaching an opportunity, and will use more modern and contemporary technological solution when teaching the courses in the future.

Assessment repertoire

During my first years of teaching (more than 20 years ago), a written exam was the typical assessment form. The written exam counted 100 percent of the course evaluation. This was kind of the standard type of assessment at that time. As I introduced more and more active learning elements in my teaching, the students started to work more in groups. Typically, the groups handed in written discussions to smaller tasks, but also larger works – such as course papers that they work on throughout the course. As a result of this, I started to assess the students based on a combination of a written exam and assessment of the students works throughout the course (e.g. course papers). I have also included students' oral presentations (in groups) as an assessment component in courses some years. Typically, this assessment component has been weighted rather low (and hence, not really influenced the students' final grade in the course).

The last year I have changed the assessment form to include the course paper only. The reason for this is that in a flipped classroom course, the students work on their course paper throughout the course. It is through their work with the course paper (in dialogue with the other students in their group and me) that they learn. Hence, it is fair that this is a significant component of the assessment in the course. Students have also told me that they believe it is most relevant to be graded based on

the course paper in a flipped classroom course where most of the time is used on working with the course paper. Also, working intensively with the course paper for 11 weeks, and then have an individual written exam six or seven weeks after the course is finished (which was the case a few years) does not make sense. During the years, I have also become more and more skeptical to written exams where a student has three hours to answer questions about some (random) parts of the curriculum. Although course assessment based only on group work may open up for free-riders, I have a close dialogue with the groups in the flipped classroom courses, and my impression is that free-riding is a minor problem. The students still make oral presentations (in group) of their group work to the whole class. But rather than including the presentations as a part of the course assessment, it is now a requirement for course approval.

As can be seen from the description of assessment, main focus is on formative assessment (Biggs and Tang 2011), during the course, while the students are graded (summative assessment) on the final version of their course paper.

In the course description for the courses (MBM428 and MBM432), I specify topics and learning goals for the courses. The task for the course paper that the students work on throughout the courses focus on the specified topics. Both the topics for the course paper, and the way we work in groups facilitated by me (formative assessment) throughout the courses, support the learning goals. The students are also graded (summative assessment) based on the course paper. In this way, I believe there is a good fit between the learning goals, the task for the course paper that the students work on throughout the course, and what the students are graded based on (the course paper). Hence, I believe that the constructive alignment (Biggs and Tang, 2011) is satisfactory in both courses.

Supervision

Bachelor: The students at NHH do not write a bachelor thesis. However, I had a part time position at the University College in Sogn and Fjordane (HISF) from 2005 – 2010 (Campus Sogndal). Although my main responsibility was to teach a course in Brand management, I also supervised a bachelor thesis at HISF.

Master: The students at NHH write a master thesis (30 ECTs). I supervise about six theses a year. A thesis typically include an introduction, discussion of theory, hypotheses, a method chapter, presentation of empirical results, and a final discussion chapter. It is a comprehensive piece of work, and the students are often in need of a lot of support. I try to follow up the students very closely and meet with them quite often. The main purpose of writing a thesis is learning. And I believe (and

hope) the students learn something through their dialogue with me in this process. However, I am aware that they should also train their skills as independent workers. I try to strike a balance here.

PhD: From August 1, 2013 to December 31, 2017 I was responsible for the PhD recruitment at the Department of Strategy and Management. I used a lot of time to think through PhD recruitment, and (together with professor Paul Gooderham – the chair of the department), I designed a recruitment process that is still being used at the department. The first stage in this process is that professors that are motivated to supervise a PhD candidate write up a short text describing the relevant topic for a PhD thesis. Applicant then apply to one or more of these topics. Through this process we make sure that the candidate has an interest in the topic, and that the supervisor is intrinsically motivated to supervise a PhD candidate on this topic (before, people interested in a PhD position sent a general application to the department and were assigned a supervisor after a while). Relevant applicants are interviewed at least two times. We have more and more research groups at our department, and we try to make sure that the PhD scholars that we hire are associate with at least one research group (meaning: a network of relevant professors and other PhD scholars). I believe that this, all together, increases the chance that our PhD scholars get well anchored at the department and that they are being followed up seriously (often by many professors). We have also implemented a pre-defence (after 3 semesters), and the deputy manager has appraisal meetings with all of the PhD scholars twice a year (this is a policy implemented at all/most of the departments). I believe this is important. Being a PhD scholar is different from being a student (where you have exams after every semester). So it can be difficult to keep up a good progression for some of the PhD scholars. Through a practice as described above, we reduce the chance that our PhD scholars are lagging behind their schedule.

Pedagogical development

As described in some of the sections above, I have had a journey from traditional one-way lecturing to an active learning approach based on flipped classroom.

Please also see "Reflections on own development", "Teaching repertoire", and "Assessment repertoire" above for a more thorough description of my pedagogical development.

Teaching planning and contributions in own environment/Dissemination

I usually plan and design my courses alone. I do of course discuss the courses with my colleagues (to make sure overlap between courses are low), but I do not typically plan the courses in cooperation

with my colleagues. An exception is the course MBM432 Sustainable marketing, a course that I teach together with my colleague professor Sven Haugland. We planned this course together. We had several meetings and coordinated the planning of the course closely. We also cooperate closely in the execution of this course.

Formally, I have contributed to my environment several times on pedagogical issues:

1 I have made a presentation about flipped classroom at a department seminar (Department of Strategy and Management).

2 Bergen University's yearly learning conference, October 20, 2016: "Motivasjon for læring i høyere utdanning" (with professor Arild Raaheim) (Please see attachment 10): Presentation of flipped classroom as a method for active learning and a description of the specific teaching method that I use.

3 NHH: Pedagogical seminar on student-active learning, April 19, 2017: Experiences from flipping the classroom (Master course MBM428 - Product Development and Design) (Please see attachment 11)

4 I have also written an article published in UNIPED to share my flipped classroom experiences with other teachers;

> Raaheim, A. and Nysveen, H. (2019): Student active learning: Experiences from a course in product development and design (in Norwegian), *Uniped*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 215-234.

5 Kristiania, Campus Bergen: Seminar on Active learning and flipped classroom, November 4, 2019. Contact person: Alexander Sivertsen or Morten Ågnes.

6 I have also written a manuscript (together with Per E. Pedersen and Ove Oklevik). In short, the manuscript compares how different methods of active learning (collaborative, problem-based, experiential, participative) influence student performance satisfaction, and how student well-being (eudaimonic, hedonic, social) may mediate these influences. The full manuscript is available in attachment 12.

7 I have planned a new article in the area of active learning (work in progress). Please see attachment 13 for description of this project.

I addition, I discuss pedagogical formats with my colleagues informally. More and more of my colleagues are implementing various forms of active learning elements in their teaching. To me it seems like this is a trend. And I have been kind of a pioneer.

I have developed various types of learning material, material such as lecture notes in power point, cases (or tasks) for course papers, and book chapters. For example, in the text book that is used in SOL 2 at NHH, I have contributed to two of the chapters; Produkt- og innovasjonsbeslutninger (with Per E. Pedersen) and Bærekraftig markedsføring (with Sven Haugland and Siv Skard).

Education management

From August 1, 2013 to December 31, 2017 I served as a deputy manager at the Department of Strategy and Management. During this period we hired many new faculties to the department. Earlier, applicants' pedagogical abilities were "tested" through some kind of faculty seminar. What we did in this period, was to introduce a "trial lecture" for the most relevant applicants for the position. Typically, the applicants taught a 45 minutes lecture on a given topic in one course relevant for the position. The evaluation committee followed this trial presentation. Also, representatives from student organizations at NHH followed the trial lecture, and the evaluation committee met with the student representatives after the trial lecture to learn the students' views on the trial lecture. The trial lecture counted as part of the evaluation of the applicants. My point is that we put more weight on the pedagogical competence of the applicants by making a trial lecture mandatory for relevant applicants. And I contributed to this change at the department.

I am aware that pedagogical competence has become more important the last year. Some level of formal pedagogical courses (education) is today a mandatory requirement for applicants to positions at NHH. Also, a well-developed teaching portfolio documenting pedagogical philosophy, experiences, and competences is (will be) mandatory. I believe this is a development in the right direction.

Evidence of student learning/Opinions of others

Some comments regarding evidence of learning can be found in students' comments on MBM428 and MBM432 spring semester 2019 (please see attachment 8 and attachment 9) (because I have had a sabbatical for a year, I do not have more "updated" student evaluations).

I teach MBM432 Sustainable marketing together with professor Sven Haugland. I teach the first business to consumer part while professor Haugland teach the second business to business part. Please find a description by professor Haugland of our cooperation in this course attached (attachment 14).

Literature

Burbules, N. C. and Bruce, B. C. (2001): Theory and research on teaching as dialogue, In Richardson, V. (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, 4th edition, Washington DC: American Educational Research Association, pp. 1102-1121.

Biggs, J. and Tang, C. (2011): *Teaching for quality learning at university*, 4th edition, McGraw Hill, Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, , NY, USA.

Butt, A. (2014): Student views on the use of a flipped classroom approach: Evidence from Australia, *Business Education & Accreditation*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 33-43.

Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., and Klein, S. P. (2006): Student engagement and student learning: Testing and linkages, Research in Higher Education, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 1 – 32.

Dochy, F., Segers, M., Bossche, P. V. den, Gijbels, D. (2003): Effects of problem-based learning: A meta-analysis, *Learning and Instructions*, vol. 13, pp. 533-568.

Felman, S. (1982): Psychoanalysis and education, *Yale French Studies*, vol. 63, pp. 21-44.

Findlay-Thompson, S. and Mombourquette, P. (2014): Evaluation of a flipped classroom in an undergraduate business course, *Business Education and Accreditation*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 63-71.

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *PNAS*, *111*, 8410–8415.

Game, A. and Metcalfe, A. (2009): Dialogue and team teaching, Higher Education Research & Development, Taylor & Francis, Working Paper Accessed April 4., 2019, from http://www.livinginrelation.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/dialogue-and-teamteaching.pdf

Gilboy, M. B., Heinerichs, S., & Pazzaglia, G. (2015). Enhancing student engagement using flipped classroom. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 47* (1), 109–114.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004): Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn?, *Educational Psychological Review*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 235-266.

Jensen, J. L., Kummer, T. A., Godoy, P. D. d. M. (2015): Improvements from a flipped classroom may simply be the fruits of active learning, *CBE-Life Science Education*, vol. 14, pp. 1-12.

Mascolo, M. F. (2009): Beyond student-centered and teacher centered pedagogy: Teaching and learning as guided participation, *Pedagogy and the Human Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 1, Article 6, pp. 1-25.

Prince, M. (2004): Does active learning work? A review of the research, *Journal of Engineering Education*, July, pp. 223-231.

Raaheim, A. (2013): Lehren und lernen – Variation der vorlesungen und versuch einer typologie von lehrenden, *Das Hochschulwesen*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 74-81.

Raaheim, A. and Nysveen, H. (2019): Student active learning: Experiences from a course in product development and design (in Norwegian), *Uniped*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 215-234.

Randi, J. and Corno, L. (2005): Teaching and learner variation, *Pedagogy-Learning for Teaching*, BJEP Monograph Series II, 3, pp. 47-69.

Reeve, J., Jang, H., Carrell, D., Jeon, S., and Barch, J. (2004): Enhancing students' engagement by increasing teachers' autonomy support, Motivation and Emotion, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 147-169).

Roehl, A., Reddy, S. L., and Shannon, G. J. (2013): The flipped classroom: An opportunity to engage millennial students through active learning strategies, JFCS, vol. 105, no. 2, pp. 44-49.

Attachments are not included in this online version.