

Reimagining Assessment in the Age of AI: A Scenario-Based Debate Approach to Authentic Learning

Asya Harrison, PhD
California State University, Fullerton

ABSTRACT : As generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools become increasingly integrated into higher education, educators are being challenged to reconsider how assessment can provide meaningful evidence of student learning. This paper presents an instructional innovation implemented in an undergraduate Educational Psychology course: a scenario-based “Debate Day” assignment designed to promote authentic learning through theory-to-practice application, collaborative reasoning, and structured dialogue. Across two class sessions, students work in teams to analyze a realistic classroom dilemma, apply educational psychology theories, evaluate competing interpretations, and develop evidence-informed intervention recommendations. Grounded in principles of authentic assessment, situated learning, and dialogic pedagogy, the assignment moves beyond knowledge reproduction and creates opportunities for students to demonstrate how they use disciplinary knowledge in context. Using student feedback, instructor observations, and analysis of student artifacts collected across two semesters, this paper examines patterns of engagement, collaborative reasoning, and theory-to-practice transfer. Findings suggest that scenario-based debate may provide one pathway for reimagining assessment while remaining grounded in principles of teaching and learning. Implications are discussed for instructors seeking authentic and AI-responsive assessment practices in higher education.

KEYWORDS: *authentic assessment, generative artificial intelligence, scenario-based learning, debate-based learning, assessment redesign*

I. INTRODUCTION

On the first day of the Spring 2023 semester, many faculty members opened their inboxes to urgent messages from deans, faculty development centers, and curriculum committees warning of a rapidly emerging instructional challenge: generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). GenAI tools such as ChatGPT could now produce essays, summaries, and structured responses within seconds, raising immediate concerns about academic integrity and the future of written assessment [1][2]. What initially felt like a disruptive shock soon revealed itself to be something more enduring. Just as calculators reshaped expectations in mathematics and the internet transformed access to information, generative AI is redefining the cognitive landscape of higher education [3][4][5][6].

Three years later, faculty responses continue to vary widely. Some instructors have embraced AI as a pedagogical tool—integrating it into coursework, attending professional development workshops, and teaching students ethical and reflective use [7][8]. Institutions have increasingly shifted from debating whether AI should be used to determining how it can be responsibly integrated into teaching and learning, with many universities now providing formal guidance, curricular resources, and AI-related support for faculty and students [9]. As AI becomes more deeply embedded within higher education, however, the central challenge is no longer whether students have access to these tools, but how educators should respond.

Beyond concerns about cheating or academic integrity, the emergence of GenAI has renewed attention to a more fundamental question: What should assessments actually measure? If AI can increasingly perform tasks centered on recall, summarization, and structured explanation, then educators must reconsider how students demonstrate understanding, apply knowledge, and engage in meaningful learning. While the technologies are new, the underlying educational questions are not. Long before the emergence of GenAI, scholars argued that learning is strengthened when students actively apply knowledge, engage in dialogue, connect theory to practice, and participate in authentic learning experiences [10][11][12]. In this sense, the rise of AI may not require entirely new pedagogical approaches so much as a renewed commitment to foundational principles of teaching and learning.

This paper describes one such approach. Specifically, it presents a scenario-based “Debate Day” assignment developed for an undergraduate Educational Psychology course. Drawing upon principles of authentic assessment, situated learning, collaborative reasoning, and student engagement, the assignment was

designed to help students apply educational psychology theories to realistic classroom dilemmas through dialogue, argumentation, and problem-solving. By revisiting enduring pedagogical principles in response to contemporary technological challenges, the activity offers one example of how assessment can be redesigned to support meaningful learning in this era of widespread GenAI use.

II. GENERATIVE AI AND THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF ASSESSMENT

The rapid adoption of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools has introduced both new opportunities and new tensions within higher education [3]. Students increasingly incorporate AI into academic workflows for tasks such as summarization, drafting, brainstorming, and idea generation [5]. At the same time, institutions and instructors continue to grapple with questions regarding academic integrity, student learning, and the role of human judgment in an increasingly AI-mediated educational environment.

Research suggests that the educational impact of GenAI is complex and highly dependent on how these tools are used. Some studies indicate that AI can support problem-solving, knowledge exploration, and learning when integrated intentionally and accompanied by appropriate guidance [13][14]. However, scholars have also raised concerns regarding cognitive offloading, a process in which individuals defer cognitive effort to external tools rather than engaging directly in problem-solving, evaluation, or knowledge construction [15]. Recent evidence suggests that increased trust in AI may reduce the amount of mental effort students invest in academic tasks, particularly among those with lower task confidence or less developed critical thinking skills [15]. Similarly, Yueh [16] argues that overreliance on AI may bypass the reflective struggle and metacognitive processes that contribute to deeper learning and intellectual development.

Empirical findings further suggest that AI tools are particularly effective at supporting lower-order cognitive processes, such as remembering, understanding, summarizing, and generating structured responses, while demonstrating more limited capacity to support higher-order skills such as evaluation, judgment, and creation [17]. Xu [18] similarly found that GPT-4 performed strongly on many traditional assessment tasks, including quizzes, short essays, and research-related activities, raising questions about the extent to which such assignments continue to provide meaningful evidence of student learning. Importantly, the challenge is not simply that AI can generate answers, but that many traditional assessments have historically emphasized the reproduction of knowledge rather than its application.

As a result, the conversation surrounding GenAI has gradually shifted from detecting AI-generated work toward redesigning learning and assessment practices that remain meaningful [9]. Early institutional responses focused heavily on concerns about academic misconduct and the identification of AI-generated work. More recently, however, scholars and institutions have increasingly emphasized the need to reconsider assessment practices themselves, recognizing that technological advances require educators to revisit what constitutes meaningful evidence of learning [9][16]. This shift redirects attention away from whether students are using AI and toward how students demonstrate understanding, apply knowledge, exercise judgment, and transfer learning across contexts. While these questions have long been central to educational theory, they have taken on renewed urgency in today's higher education landscape.

III. PURPOSE, PEDAGOGICAL GOALS, AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The purpose of this paper is to describe the rationale, design, implementation, and iterative refinement of a scenario-based "Debate Day" assignment developed for an undergraduate Educational Psychology course. The assignment emerged in response to a growing instructional challenge in higher education: how to design learning experiences that promote meaningful engagement, critical thinking, and application of course concepts in an era when generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools can increasingly perform tasks traditionally associated with written coursework. Rather than positioning AI as a problem to be detected, the assignment reflects an effort to redesign assessment around the cognitive processes instructors most value, including analysis, evaluation, synthesis, communication, and collaborative problem-solving.

The Debate Day activity was intentionally designed to align with the core learning objectives of Educational Psychology. These objectives include understanding foundational theories of learning and development, examining the influence of cultural and contextual factors on educational experiences, and applying research-informed perspectives to authentic educational challenges. To accomplish these goals, students work in teams to analyze a fictional classroom scenario involving a middle school student, identify key concerns and contextual influences, evaluate multiple theoretical perspectives, and develop evidence-informed intervention recommendations.

The assignment unfolds across two class sessions (75 minutes each). During the first session, students analyze the scenario, select theoretical frameworks, and prepare a collaborative argument. During the second session, groups present and defend their proposed solutions, engage in structured rebuttal and discussion, and respond to critiques posed by their peers. Throughout the process, students are encouraged to draw upon course

readings, lecture content, and prior knowledge while considering how different theoretical perspectives may lead to different interpretations of the same educational problem.

Several pedagogical goals guided the design of the assignment. First, the activity encourages students to move beyond memorization and demonstrate their ability to apply psychological theories to complex and often ambiguous academic situations. Second, it promotes collaborative reasoning by requiring students to negotiate ideas, evaluate evidence, and construct shared arguments. Third, it provides opportunities for students to communicate and defend their thinking in real time, mirroring the kinds of professional conversations that educators, counselors, and other helping professionals routinely engage in when discussing student needs and intervention strategies. Finally, the activity invites students to reflect on their learning process and contribute feedback that informs future iterations of the assignment.

By centering authentic problem-solving, collaborative dialogue, and theory-to-practice application, Debate Day seeks to position students as active participants in the learning process. The assignment was designed not only to assess what students know, but also how they reason, communicate, and apply knowledge in context. As such, it offers one example of how assessment practices can be adapted to support meaningful learning and higher-order thinking within contemporary higher education environments.

IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

1. AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENT, SITUATED LEARNING, AND THE TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE

Questions surrounding assessment have become increasingly important in the age of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). While traditional assessments often emphasize the reproduction of factual and procedural knowledge, authentic assessment focuses on students' ability to apply knowledge and skills to meaningful problems and situations [19][20][12]. Rather than asking students to recall information or reproduce previously learned content, authentic assessments require learners to exercise judgment, evaluate alternatives, and develop solutions that demonstrate their understanding of course content in context. According to Wiggins [12], authentic assessments are characterized by realism, the requirement for judgment and innovation, and opportunities for students to apply disciplinary knowledge to complex tasks that may have multiple defensible solutions.

The emphasis on application is closely aligned with the concept of transfer—the ability to use knowledge and skills learned in one context to address problems in another [21]. Situated Learning Theory provides additional support for this approach by emphasizing that learning is most meaningful when it occurs within contexts that resemble the environments in which knowledge will ultimately be used [11]. Although students in higher education are not always able to participate directly in professional settings, instructors can create situated approximations of practice through realistic scenarios and problem-based activities that require learners to apply disciplinary knowledge to authentic challenges.

Together, authentic assessment and situated learning encourage students to move beyond simply knowing about a concept toward applying that knowledge appropriately in context. This distinction has become increasingly relevant as GenAI tools demonstrate growing proficiency in tasks centered on recall, summarization, and structured explanation [18][16]. In response, educators have called for assessments that foreground application, judgment, contextual reasoning, and the ability to transfer knowledge across situations [18][16]. Such approaches provide opportunities for students to demonstrate not only what they know, but how they use what they know when confronted with realistic problems.

The Debate Day assignment was designed with these principles in mind. Students are presented with a realistic classroom dilemma and asked to apply educational psychology theories to analyze the situation, evaluate competing explanations, and develop evidence-informed recommendations. In doing so, the assignment seeks to create a situated approximation of the professional decision-making processes educators engage in while encouraging students to transfer theoretical knowledge into applied practice.

2. DIALOGIC LEARNING/ DEBATE PEDAGOGY

The Debate Day assignment also draws upon principles of dialogic learning, which emphasize the role of discussion, argumentation, and social interaction in the development of understanding. Through dialogue, students are challenged to articulate their thinking, consider alternative perspectives, and refine their reasoning in response to others. Debate represents a structured form of dialogic learning that has been associated with the development of critical thinking, communication, and analytical reasoning skills across a variety of disciplines [10][22][23]. Participation in debate requires students to analyze information, evaluate evidence, construct arguments, and defend positions while remaining open to competing perspectives. These processes promote higher-order cognitive skills such as interpretation, evaluation, synthesis, and reasoned judgment [22][24].

Beyond content mastery, debate also develops skills that are increasingly valued in professional settings, including communication, collaboration, problem-solving, and the ability to justify decisions using evidence [10][25]. Preparing for debate requires students to organize information, critically assess alternative

viewpoints, and articulate arguments clearly and persuasively [25][23]. In this way, debate shifts students from simply learning about concepts to actively using those concepts to engage in disciplinary reasoning.

Within the Debate Day assignment, dialogue serves as more than a method of participation; it functions as a mechanism for learning. Students must not only develop and defend their own recommendations, but also evaluate competing interpretations and respond to critiques from their peers. Through this process, the assignment encourages students to engage in collaborative reasoning and evidence-based argumentation while refining their understanding of educational psychology theories and their practical implications.

3. SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY

While authentic, scenario-based debate activities may promote higher-order thinking, students must also be motivated to engage in the cognitive effort such tasks require. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) proposes that individuals are more likely to demonstrate intrinsic motivation and sustained engagement when three basic psychological needs are supported: autonomy, competence, and relatedness [26].

The Debate Day assignment was intentionally designed to support each of these psychological needs. Competence is fostered through opportunities to apply educational psychology theories to realistic classroom dilemmas, evaluate alternative interpretations, and develop evidence-informed recommendations. Students exercise autonomy through the flexibility afforded in how they analyze the scenario, apply assigned theoretical perspectives, incorporate supporting evidence, and justify their proposed solutions. Relatedness is supported through collaborative preparation, discussion, and debate, positioning learning as a shared intellectual endeavor rather than an isolated academic task.

By supporting students' needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, the assignment encourages active participation and sustained engagement with complex course material. Rather than positioning students as passive recipients of information, Debate Day invites them to become active contributors to the learning process, increasing the likelihood that they will invest effort in the analysis, evaluation, and application of educational psychology concepts.

4. BUILDING THE CONDITIONS FOR DIALOGIC LEARNING

The effectiveness of dialogic, higher-order learning activities depends heavily on the relationships, norms, and sense of community established within the classroom long before the activity itself begins. Equitable and inclusive teaching practices provide the structural foundation necessary for sustained participation, intellectual risk-taking, and collaborative reasoning. Principles such as transparency in expectations, structured interaction, academic belonging, and critical engagement with diverse perspectives help create environments in which students feel comfortable contributing ideas, questioning assumptions, and engaging in meaningful dialogue [27].

Importantly, these conditions cannot be established through a single assignment. Activities such as Debate Day rely upon a foundation of trust, community, and shared expectations that is developed throughout the semester. Students are more likely to participate in public discussions, defend their ideas, and engage with competing viewpoints when they perceive the classroom as a space where their perspectives are valued and respected. Consequently, the success of debate-based learning depends not only on assignment design, but also on the broader instructional practices that cultivate belonging and psychological safety over time.

Within the Debate Day framework, structured speaking opportunities, collaborative preparation, and clearly communicated expectations provide multiple entry points for participation while reducing barriers that may otherwise limit whose voices shape academic discourse. In this way, equitable teaching practices function as classroom infrastructure. They do not simply support inclusion; they create the conditions under which authentic assessment, collaborative reasoning, and dialogic learning can occur.

V. METHODS

1. PARTICIPANTS AND CONTEXT

Participants were undergraduate students enrolled in a 300-level upper-division general education Educational Psychology course at a large public university in Southern California designated as both a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) and an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution (AANAPISI). A total of 40 students were enrolled in one course in Spring 2024, and 47 students were enrolled in one course in Spring 2025. All students completed the Debate Day assignment as part of their regular coursework. This study was reviewed and approved as exempt by the California State University, Fullerton Institutional Review Board (IRB), Application No. HSR-25-26-30.

The university enrolls approximately 43,662 students. As of Fall 2024, 54.3% of students identify as Hispanic/Latine, 20.3% as Asian, 14.2% as White, 7% as multiracial, and 2.6% as Black, with smaller percentages identifying as Pacific Islander or Native American. Approximately 57.4% of students identify as female, 59.2% receive financial aid, and 32.2% are first-generation college students. The average age of

enrolled students is approximately 24 years, with upper-division students averaging 23.3 years. The psychology department enrolls approximately 3,500 students, nearly half of whom are transfer students, which may contribute to a slightly broader age range among majors compared to programs with predominantly first-year cohorts.

Because student opinion questionnaires (SOQs) were administered anonymously and demographic data were not collected at the course level for research purposes, participant-level demographic characteristics are not available. Students self-selected into groups based on classroom relationships and interactions developed throughout the semester. This approach aligned with intentional community-building practices designed to support collaborative learning and dialogue.

2. ASSIGNMENT DESIGN

The Debate Day assignment was designed as a two-part, scenario-based assessment implemented near the end of the semester in an undergraduate Educational Psychology course. The activity requires students to apply theories of learning and development to a realistic classroom dilemma, develop evidence-informed recommendations, and defend their reasoning through structured debate and discussion. By engaging students in collaborative analysis, theory-to-practice application, and peer dialogue, the assignment provides an opportunity to demonstrate learning in a context that mirrors the complexity of real educational decision-making.

2.1 DEBATE DAY ASSIGNMENT SUMMARY

The “Debate Day” assignment is an interactive, multi-day learning experience designed to help students apply core theories of educational psychology to real-world classroom dilemmas. The scenario, titled *Teaching in the Age of Technology*, follows Dana Callaghan, a new sixth-grade teacher navigating challenges related to student motivation, academic integrity, and responsible technology use. The narrative incorporates perspectives from students, teachers, colleagues, and parents, encouraging students to consider the complexity of educational decision-making. Rather than asking students to summarize theories in isolation, the assignment requires them to apply theoretical perspectives to a realistic educational dilemma and defend their reasoning through collaborative dialogue and debate.

The scenario was adapted from Case Study #4, “Cheating in the Technology Age” (pp. 23–29) in Willems and Gonzalez-DeHass’s [28] book, *Case Studies in Educational Psychology: Elementary School Grades* and modified to align with the course objectives and contemporary issues surrounding technology use in schools. The full scenario can be found in Box 1, and the theoretical perspectives assigned to student groups are provided in Table 1.

2.2 PRE-DEBATE PREPARATION

Students are placed into collaborative groups and assigned a theoretical lens using a random number generator. They complete a guided reading annotation activity on Canvas, identifying connections between the scenario and concepts studied throughout the semester. Each group also locates an additional empirical source published between 2010 and the present to support its position and begins constructing a poster that synthesizes theory, evidence, and proposed classroom strategies. The goal is to prepare a defensible stance that incorporates research, developmental insights, and equity considerations.

2.3 DEBATE DAY PART 1

The first in-class session begins with small-group discussion using prompts to explore initial reactions to the case. Groups then collaborate to develop recommendations for how Dana might address issues such as plagiarism, cheating, peer norms, and technology misuse. Their analysis is grounded in an assigned theoretical framework and supported by empirical research. Across the class, students represent a range of theoretical perspectives, including Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Theory, Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development, Self-Determination Theory, and Peer Influence frameworks (see Table 1). These perspectives guide students’ interpretations of the scenario and their proposed interventions. During this session, groups finalize their posters and assign roles such as speakers, note-takers, and researchers in preparation for the formal debate.

2.4 OPENING REMARKS ASSIGNMENT

Following the first debate session, each group submits a brief “Opening Remarks” assignment written in a persuasive and performative style. The submission outlines the group’s theoretical position, summarizes supporting evidence, and presents its recommended solutions for Dana’s classroom. One submission is required per group and includes the names of all participating members.

2.5 DEBATE DAY PART 2

The second in-class session consists of a structured, multi-round debate. Each group begins with a four-minute presentation outlining their theoretical perspective and proposed intervention strategy. During the rebuttal round, groups respectfully challenge one another's arguments using a structured card system, while the instructor facilitates discussion to ensure equitable participation. Creative, evidence-based critiques and strong applications of theory may earn additional credit. In the final round, groups have two minutes to deliver closing remarks summarizing their recommendations and key points. The class then votes on the argument they found most compelling and well-supported, with the winning group receiving bonus points.

BOX 1. SCENARIO FOR DEBATE DAY: "TEACHING IN THE AGE OF TECHNOLOGY"

Age range described: Middle School (Grades 6–8)

Dana Callaghan is a new 6th grade teacher at Washington Middle School. As she gets ready for her students to arrive, she runs into Gary Howard, a retired teacher who now works in the school's after-school tutoring program.

"Good morning, Dana. Do you have a few minutes?" Gary asks.

"Sure, Gary!" Dana replies warmly.

Gary smiles. "I wanted to share some things I've noticed happening in after-school tutoring with a few of your students. While I don't know the exact details of your assignments or your classroom expectations, it seems like a lot of them are sharing answers on homework."

He continues, "Especially when they're in the computer lab, I've noticed students copying and pasting full sections of information. When I asked them about it, most say they're just 'helping each other,' not cheating. Some even get help from older students who end up doing the work for them. I've found myself stepping back a bit because I'm concerned they're relying on adults or older kids to complete the work so they can say it's done and go hang out."

Dana's eyes widen. "Wow, I didn't realize that was happening—thank you for letting me know."

"Well, middle schoolers are at that age where they're exploring boundaries—what's right, what's wrong," Gary says. "But the number of students doing this and how frequently it happens made me think I should bring it to your attention."

As Gary walks off and Dana's students begin entering the room, she reflects on his comments.

Later that day, Dana reviews students' progress on their independent research projects about Native American tribes, and she notices that one student's summary includes unusually sophisticated language. She doubts the student wrote it herself and suspects the content may have been lifted from one of the sources.

She asks the student to come up for a private conversation.

"Adriana, some of this language is very advanced. For example, here you wrote that the tribe is a 'cognate group loosely aligned with neighboring bands.' Can you tell me what that means?" Dana asks.

"Umm... I think it means they, like, work together?" Adriana says uncertainly.

Dana gently continues, "Can you show me your notes from when you were researching? Maybe that will help jog your memory?"

"I didn't take notes. I just used what I found and put it in my summary," Adriana replies.

"Adriana, remember we talked about putting research into your own words. You'll need to present this, and the goal is to show that you understand the information," Dana explains as she walks Adriana through the rubric again, highlighting the criteria about paraphrasing and original thought.

Adriana responds, "I mean... I didn't think it was a big deal. My mom copies and pastes recipes from blogs all the time, and my dad does the same thing with parts and orders for work."

As Dana continues reviewing other students' projects, she realizes Adriana isn't alone. Several summaries have phrases and vocabulary that don't match students' typical writing.

Dana begins to wonder—do her students even understand that this is plagiarism? In a world where efficiency and productivity are praised, are they too young to distinguish between harmless shortcuts and academic dishonesty? Is it possible they don't yet grasp why authorship and attribution matter?

That afternoon, Dana overhears a nearby group of girls whispering while playing an educational game on their school iPads. To her dismay, she realizes they're sharing answers. While the app does provide individualized diagnostics to her as a teacher, Dana now questions how accurate those assessments are if students are working together—or even passing along answers outside of class.

Lacey says, "My babysitter showed me how to open two browser windows—one with the questions and another with all the answers saved from my little brother's login from last year. We flew through the homework and swam all afternoon. Best day ever!"

Ashley laughs. "Wait—can she help us tonight, too?"

"Totally! We can FaceTime her. My sister's iPad is unlocked—I know her passcode," Lacey says.

Just then, Octavia, who's been listening quietly, interjects: "Wait, does your sister know you're using her iPad?"

Lacey shrugs and giggles. “Nope. She’s got no clue.”

“But... wouldn’t she be mad? Wouldn’t your parents be upset if they knew your brother’s not really doing his work?” Octavia asks.

Lacey rolls her eyes. “Whatever, no one’s going to tell them. We’re all friends, right?”

Ashley chimes in, “Yeah. You’re not gonna be uncool, right? You wanna come over tomorrow?”

Octavia hesitates. “No, I’m your friend. I wanna come. It’s just... I don’t know. I don’t want to get in trouble.”

Dana, who’s overheard this conversation, grows increasingly concerned—not only by the babysitter’s influence, but by the social pressure Lacey and Ashley are putting on Octavia.

Later that week during a math review, Dana notices students struggling at the whiteboard with problems they’d aced on recent homework and take-home quizzes. During a “speed round” where students solve problems on whiteboards and hold them up, she sees widespread errors that don’t match prior performance.

During recess, Dana casually asks, “So, are you all ready for your test?”

Hector responds, “I guess... I hope it’s not too hard.”

Dana gently probes, “Hector, I noticed you had trouble in today’s review, but your homework has been excellent. What happened?”

Hector replies, “I wasn’t really paying attention when my dad was doing it with me. He gets mad when I mess up, so he just gives me the answers. My sister does it too. They just want me to get good grades.”

Before Dana can respond, Hector runs off to join a game. But his words linger. How many students are receiving too much help at home—help that prevents them from actually learning? This could explain the growing gap between students’ homework and in-class work, just as Gary had hinted earlier.

On Friday, during a teacher workday, Dana finds time to speak with her colleague Alyssa, a veteran 8th grade teacher.

“Hi Alyssa, do you have a minute to chat?”

“Of course! Come on in—how’s 6th grade treating you?” Alyssa asks.

“I’m enjoying it—even though I originally thought I’d be teaching first grade,” Dana replies.

Alyssa laughs. “Well, from what I hear, the students like you, and the parents do too.”

Dana thanks her and shares everything—from the plagiarism concerns to peer pressure to Gary’s observations about after-school behaviors.

“I’m not surprised,” Alyssa says. “These kids are immersed in tech. They cut and paste all the time and genuinely may not connect that with ‘cheating’ unless we explicitly teach them. Their brains are still developing abstract moral reasoning—they often don’t grasp the nuances unless we make it concrete.”

Dana nods. “Exactly! But I don’t want to overstep with parents by teaching their kids something they may see as ‘moral instruction’ and I certainly don’t want the kids to think that their parents are being dishonest or cheating by using technology like this.”

“I think as long as it’s related to academic integrity—plagiarism, cheating, collaboration boundaries—it’s our job to teach it,” Alyssa says. “We’re not telling them what to believe morally in general. We’re helping them understand what is and isn’t acceptable in school.”

Alyssa continues, “Some parents also enable this behavior. They think middle schoolers are too young for real consequences. And some are what we call *helicopter parents*—they step in too much to prevent failure. So, the child learns nothing except how to avoid consequences.”

Dana thinks back to Hector’s comment and nods slowly. “That really does sound like what’s happening with some of my students.”

They move on to discussing the pros and cons of educational apps, agreeing that some are effective but many aren’t. The key is teacher oversight and critical evaluation of how those tools are actually used.

After this conversation, Dana decides she will hold a class discussion—one that clearly addresses plagiarism, cheating, tech misuse, and how all of these affect learning, relationships, and personal responsibility.

3. GRADING AND EVALUATION

3.1 MULTIPLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Consistent with principles of authentic assessment, student learning was evaluated using multiple sources of evidence rather than a single performance or product [12]. Because the Debate Day assignment emphasizes the application of knowledge, collaborative reasoning, and theory-to-practice transfer, assessment was designed to capture both the products students created and the processes through which they developed and defended their ideas. This approach recognizes that meaningful learning may be demonstrated in different ways and that students contribute to collaborative problem-solving through a variety of roles and strengths.

Evaluation drew upon several sources of evidence, including group-produced materials, participation during debate activities, instructor observations, and individual reflection. Group products included the position poster, supporting empirical research, and opening remarks assignment. Participation during the debate provided evidence of students’ ability to apply theoretical concepts, respond to competing perspectives, and engage in

evidence-based argumentation. Instructor observations during preparation and debate sessions offered additional insight into student engagement, collaboration, and contributions to group decision-making. Finally, individual post-activity reflections provided students with an opportunity to describe their contributions, reflect on their learning, and document the ways in which they participated throughout the assignment.

By incorporating multiple forms of evidence, the grading process sought to evaluate not only what students produced, but also how they engaged with course concepts, collaborated with peers, and applied educational psychology theories to a realistic educational dilemma.

3.2 INSTRUCTOR OBSERVATION AND PARTICIPATION

Instructor observation served as an important source of evidence throughout the assignment. During preparation and debate activities, the instructor circulated among groups, listened to discussions, asked clarifying questions, and monitored students' application of theoretical concepts. These interactions provided opportunities to assess understanding in real time and identify misconceptions before they became embedded within group arguments.

Observations focused on how students applied their assigned theoretical perspectives, incorporated empirical evidence, and contributed to collaborative problem-solving. Participation was evaluated across multiple roles, including speaking, research, note-taking, poster development, and strategic planning. Because the assignment occurred later in the semester, observations were informed by an existing understanding of students' typical participation patterns and group interactions. Observation notes were considered alongside group products, debate performance, and individual reflections when evaluating student learning and engagement.

3.3 DEBATE PERFORMANCE

Debate performance was evaluated based on students' ability to apply their assigned theoretical perspectives, incorporate empirical evidence, and justify proposed interventions. Particular attention was given to the quality of students' reasoning, the accuracy of theory application, and their ability to connect course concepts to the classroom dilemma presented in the scenario.

During rebuttal and discussion rounds, students were encouraged to critically evaluate competing perspectives, defend their positions using evidence, and respond thoughtfully to critiques from their peers. Additional credit was awarded for particularly insightful or creative applications of theory that remained consistent with course concepts and empirical research.

4. REFLECTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Following the debate, students completed an individual reflection describing their contributions to the assignment, the roles they assumed within their group, and their perceptions of the group's overall collaboration. These reflections provided an additional source of evidence regarding participation and learning while encouraging students to reflect on their engagement with the activity.

Because the assignment was graded primarily as a group project, all members typically received the same grade. However, individual reflections, peer reports, and instructor observations were used to identify substantial disparities in contribution. In cases where a student was consistently identified as having made minimal contributions, and this assessment aligned with instructor observations, the student received a reduced score. This approach was intended to balance the collaborative nature of the assignment with individual accountability while encouraging shared responsibility for group success.

5. DATA SOURCES

Three sources of evidence—student feedback, instructor observations, and student work—were used to examine students' experiences with the Debate Day assignment. Together, these sources provided insight into student engagement, theory application, collaborative learning, and opportunities for future refinement of the activity.

5.1 STUDENT FEEDBACK

Student feedback was captured using the Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ). SOQs are administered at the end of each semester by the university through the student portal as an opportunity for students to provide feedback on their overall classroom experience. The questionnaire is composed of five questions that asks students to rate the instructor (e.g., The instructor created an environment suitable for learning) and one open ended question for the student to provide written feedback. For the purposes of this study, only students' written responses were analyzed, as they provided direct feedback regarding the assignment and classroom experience. The SOQs for the present study were administered in Spring 2024 and

Spring 2025. For Spring 2024, 12 out of 40 students completed their SOQs with a response rate of 30% and for Spring 2025, 20 out of 47 students completed their SOQs with a response rate of 43%.

5.2 INSTRUCTOR'S OBSERVATIONS

During the activity, the instructor wrote memos (field notes) documenting student engagement, participation patterns, group dynamics, theory application, and collaborative problem-solving throughout the activity. The instructor wrote on average 8-10 memos per class. The class took place during two days for 1 hour and 15 minutes each class period.

TABLE 1. GROUP ASSIGNED PERSPECTIVES FOR DEBATE DAY

Assigned Perspective	Description
Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1)	Specifically focusing on Self-Regulated Learning to help Dana build students' self-regulation skills and manage academic behaviors.
Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (2)	Specifically focusing on Self-Efficacy to help Dana build students' belief in their academic skills learning and to manage academic choices.
Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory	Emphasizing the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and how Dana can scaffold students' and peer interactions to help them bridge the gap between what they can do independently and with help. Talk about parents too.
Self-Determination Theory	Focused on supporting Dana in fostering intrinsic motivation and autonomy in students by aligning classroom activities with their needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness.
Expectancy-Value Theory	Looking at how Dana can adjust the value students place on the tasks and expectations for success to increase motivation, such as providing more relevant tasks or offering clear outcomes related to success.
Achievement Goal Theory	Analyzing how Dana can foster mastery goals (focused on learning and improvement) over performance goals (focused on grades or competition), helping students develop a more adaptive mindset toward their schoolwork.
Learning & Memory	Exploring how Dana can incorporate meaningful learn techniques to improve students' learning (think of the full 3 stage model) and avoid cognitive overload by adjusting the complexity of tasks, breaking them into smaller chunks, or offering more guided instruction.
Peer Influence & Adolescent Brain Development	Use your knowledge about social learning and adolescent cognitive development to propose an intervention that works with students' peer groups and risk taking to establish new norms around academic integrity and ethical behavior in a way that shifts group behavior.

5.3 STUDENT WORK

Student-produced artifacts served as an additional source of evidence. These artifacts included group posters, opening remarks submissions, and individual reflections. A total of sixteen group posters were examined across the two semesters. Student work provided examples of how groups applied educational psychology theories, incorporated empirical evidence, and developed recommendations in response to the classroom scenario.

6. DATA ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed using an inductive thematic analysis approach [29]. The goal of the analysis was to identify recurring patterns across student feedback, instructor observations, and student work that reflected engagement, theory application, collaborative learning, and perceptions of the assignment.

All data sources were reviewed multiple times to identify meaningful units of text, behaviors, and artifacts relevant to the study objectives. Initial codes were generated and refined through iterative review, with similar codes grouped into broader themes. Particular attention was given to patterns related to student engagement, application of educational psychology theories, collaborative reasoning, classroom climate, and perceptions of learning.

To strengthen credibility, themes were compared across data sources and across semesters (Spring 2024 and Spring 2025) to examine consistency in findings. The use of multiple forms of evidence allowed for triangulation and supported a more comprehensive understanding of how students experienced the Debate Day assignment.

7. REFLEXIVITY STATEMENT

As the course instructor and primary researcher, I occupied a dual role in the design, implementation, and analysis of this instructional intervention. My approach to teaching is informed by the belief that meaningful learning occurs when students actively apply knowledge, engage in dialogue, and connect theory to authentic problems. These commitments shaped both the development of the Debate Day assignment and my interest in examining students' experiences with it.

To mitigate potential bias, analytic decisions were documented through reflexive memos during coding and theme development. Attention was given to distinguishing observable behaviors and documented student feedback from interpretive assumptions. The use of multiple data sources—including student feedback, instructor observations, and student artifacts—allowed for triangulation and strengthened the credibility of the findings.

VI. RESULTS

Findings suggest that students experienced the assignment as engaging and intellectually meaningful, with consistent themes emerging across feedback, instructor observations, and student artifacts. The findings for each instrument are presented below.

1. STUDENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE (SOQs)

Analysis of open-ended SOQ responses revealed two main interrelated themes: *engagement* and *a welcoming classroom environment*.

Engagement. Students frequently described the assignment and instructional approach as promoting active engagement and real-world application. Engagement included four subthemes: real-world problem application, open discussion, reflection, and continued learning. Several students emphasized the value of applying theory to realistic contexts:

"We had multiple assignments that required us to analyze a real-world scenario involving a child's behavior and apply theoretical concepts to propose evidence-based solutions."

Another noted:

"The class had us practice making a lesson plan, debates, and other activities that allowed us to utilize what we learned right then and there."

Students also described the debate format as intellectually demanding and motivating:

"The professor had us prepare for debate days, which allowed us to apply concepts we learned throughout the course in a thoughtful and academic discussion. This influenced us to study our material deeply and put our knowledge to the test."

Across responses, students referenced real-time synthesis of course content, structured discussion, and opportunities to defend their ideas.

Welcoming classroom environment. The second theme captured students' feelings and perceptions of a supportive and inclusive learning climate. Subthemes included validation of student voices and experiences, encouragement of diverse perspectives, and creation of a safe space for dialogue.

One student shared:

"The professor promotes peer reflection and an environment where no student should be scared to speak their thoughts."

Another reflected on the relational dimension of the classroom:

"Ms. Harrison created a welcoming and supportive environment that was truly conducive to learning...

These activities helped me feel more comfortable participating and gradually helped me come out of my shell."

Students also noted the integration of personal experiences into academic discussion:

"In each lecture, the instructor encourages us to share our understanding of the topic and relate it to our personal experiences."

Together, these responses suggest that the structure of the assignment supported not only intellectual engagement but also psychological safety, which facilitated deeper participation.

2. INSTRUCTOR OBSERVATIONS (BEHAVIOR-FOCUSED THEMES)

Instructor memos were analyzed to examine observable patterns of student interaction and engagement during the two debate sessions. Three interrelated themes emerged: *support and collaboration*, *applied learning*, and *intellectual energy*.

Support and collaboration captured both verbal and nonverbal behaviors indicating shared responsibility for reporting information from the group. Students frequently invited group mates to contribute, built upon one another's ideas, and redistributed speaking opportunities within their groups. Memos documented students prompting one another with statements such as, "Do you want to add to that?" and referencing earlier classmates' arguments to extend or refine positions. Nonverbal indicators of engagement were also observed during rebuttal periods: students leaned forward in their seats, maintained sustained eye contact to signal readiness to speak, raised hands emphatically, and used gestures to express urgency. In several instances, students encouraged quieter group members to share points raised in small-group discussion; when peers hesitated, another student would articulate the idea while explicitly crediting the original contributor. After responding to critiques, students often redirected attention to teammates to elaborate, clarify, or strengthen the group's argument. Even while listening to opposing groups, students engaged in low-voiced strategizing within their teams to prepare subsequent rebuttals.

Applied learning reflected students' real-time integration of course concepts during debate exchanges. Observations indicated that students cited theoretical frameworks without instructor prompting, critiqued competing interpretations offered by other groups, and justified intervention proposals using terminology drawn directly from course lectures and assigned readings. On several occasions, students referenced concepts from other psychology courses, explicitly naming prior instructors or classes to contextualize their arguments. These moments suggested cross-course integration and spontaneous transfer of learning beyond the immediate assignment.

Finally, *intellectual energy* described the sustained, fast-paced, discussion-rich atmosphere observed across both sessions. Rebuttal periods were characterized by rapid exchanges, overlapping critiques from multiple groups, and sequential defenses of intervention strategies. Groups frequently received back-to-back challenges and responded collaboratively, with multiple students contributing to a single defense. The visible countdown timer projected during rebuttal periods structured these exchanges; however, students routinely used the entire allotted time and often required instructor facilitation to conclude responses. The tempo and persistence of debate exchanges indicated sustained cognitive engagement throughout the activity.

Across both semesters, these patterns were consistent, suggesting that the structure of the assignment supported active participation, collaborative reasoning, and real-time theoretical application.

3. STUDENT WORK (ARTIFACT ANALYSIS)

Analysis of student artifacts revealed two themes: *theoretical integration* and *ownership of learning*.

Theoretical integration captured the depth with which students synthesized course concepts in their intervention proposals. Across groups, posters reflected the application of educational psychology theories to a shared classroom dilemma, with students articulating how different theoretical perspectives informed distinct intervention strategies. Rather than summarizing theories in isolation, many groups demonstrated conceptual comparison, critique, and justification of proposed approaches. Groups regularly integrated empirical evidence alongside course concepts, using both sources to support recommendations for addressing the challenges presented in the scenario.

The second theme, *ownership of learning*, was reflected in the ways groups organized, communicated, and defended their analyses. Although posters varied in format and presentation style, students consistently made intentional decisions regarding how to represent their reasoning, support their claims, and communicate their proposed interventions. The integration of visual elements, structured argumentation, and personalized framing suggested investment in the learning process rather than completion of a procedural task. These design choices reflected students' efforts to communicate understanding in ways that were meaningful to their groups and consistent with their assigned theoretical perspectives.

Across semesters, student artifacts demonstrated application of course concepts beyond surface-level recall, providing evidence of theory-to-practice transfer and sustained engagement with the assignment.

VII. DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that the Debate Day assignment functioned as a form of authentic assessment that invited students to apply educational psychology theories to a realistic and complex problem. Across student feedback, instructor observations, and student artifacts, consistent evidence emerged that students were actively

engaging with course concepts, collaborating with peers, and applying theoretical knowledge in context. Rather than demonstrating learning through the reproduction of information, students were asked to interpret a classroom dilemma, evaluate competing explanations, justify intervention strategies, and defend their reasoning through dialogue and debate.

One particularly notable feature of the assignment is that it reduces the distance between learning and application. In many courses, students learn concepts with the expectation that they may apply them at some future point in their academic or professional lives. In contrast, the Debate Day assignment requires students to use course concepts immediately. As students analyzed the scenario, responded to competing interpretations, and defended proposed interventions, they engaged in the type of theory-to-practice transfer often emphasized as a goal of higher education but less frequently assessed directly.

The findings also highlight dialogue as a mechanism for learning. Students were required to listen to competing viewpoints, critique alternative interpretations, and refine their positions in response to peer feedback. Consistent with prior research on debate-based learning [10][25][22][23], these exchanges appeared to foster collaborative reasoning, communication, and evidence-based argumentation. Rather than viewing disagreement as a barrier to learning, the structure of the activity positioned it as an opportunity for deeper understanding.

Finally, student feedback underscored the importance of classroom climate. Students frequently described the classroom as welcoming, supportive, and conducive to participation. These findings suggest that authentic assessment and dialogic learning are most effective when implemented within environments that cultivate trust, belonging, and psychological safety. In this sense, the success of the assignment cannot be separated from the broader community-building practices that preceded it.

Taken together, the findings suggest that the Debate Day assignment provided students with opportunities to engage in authentic learning that extended beyond traditional demonstrations of knowledge. Students were asked not only to know educational psychology theories, but to use them. In doing so, the assignment created a space where application, collaboration, dialogue, and reflection became central components of assessment.

1. IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS AND REFLECTIVE REFINEMENT

While the Debate Day model demonstrated strong potential for fostering engagement, theory application, and collaborative reasoning, its effectiveness appears to be context-dependent. To date, the assignment has been implemented in face-to-face courses with enrollments ranging from approximately 40 to 48 students. The format relies heavily on sustained dialogue, small-group interaction, and collective participation, suggesting that it may be most effective in moderately sized classroom environments. Its effectiveness in large lecture courses or fully online settings remains unknown and warrants future investigation.

The ongoing refinement of the assignment has been guided by principles of reflective pedagogy and informed by both instructor observations and student feedback [30][31]. Following the second phase of Debate Day, students participate in a structured class reflection and discussion regarding the strengths and limitations of the activity. Feedback gathered through these conversations has informed subsequent revisions to the assignment and reinforced students' sense of agency by positioning them as contributors to the learning process.

Student feedback has directly shaped several procedural elements. For example, students proposed a colored-card system to structure the rebuttal period more effectively. Under this approach, one color signals a challenge to another group's argument, while another signals a request to respond. This modification improved the flow of the rebuttal period, increased participation opportunities, and reduced confusion during rebuttal exchanges.

Timing adjustments also yielded important insights. In one iteration, students were provided additional preparation time between opening statements and the final debate. Although this structure produced more polished presentations, students and instructor observations suggested that extended preparation sometimes resulted in uneven labor distribution and reduced spontaneity during discussion. In contrast, a shorter preparation timeline appeared to promote greater collaboration, active listening, and real-time reasoning. As one of the central goals of the assignment is to encourage students to apply theoretical knowledge in authentic contexts, the more condensed format was ultimately retained. Educational decision-making often occurs through dynamic conversation rather than rehearsed presentation, and the shorter timeline appeared to better support this objective.

Together, these refinements illustrate the value of treating instructional design as an iterative process. Rather than viewing assignments as fixed products, reflective refinement encourages educators to adapt activities in response to student experiences, classroom dynamics, and evolving learning goals.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In an educational climate marked by uncertainty, particularly around the role of generative AI in student learning, the Debate Day assignment offers an invitation to take an alternative path. Rather than centering the conversation on detection, surveillance, or technological solutions alone, this path encourages educators to revisit enduring principles of teaching and learning. It invites instructors to trust in the power of student voice, peer connection, authentic application, and meaningful dialogue, while imagining classroom spaces where intellectual rigor and joy can coexist.

The findings suggest that students benefited from opportunities to apply course concepts in real time, engage with competing perspectives, and connect theoretical knowledge to authentic educational challenges. These outcomes are not the product of new technologies, but of long-standing pedagogical principles that emphasize application, collaboration, reflection, and belonging. As higher education continues to adapt to rapid technological change, the challenge may not be to abandon foundational educational practices, but to reconsider how they can be reimagined for contemporary contexts.

The Debate Day activity offers one concrete, ready-to-implement model for doing so. Beyond the scenario and assignment structure, the paper highlights the importance of classroom climate, reflective refinement, and authentic assessment in supporting meaningful learning. While the technologies shaping higher education continue to evolve, the fundamental questions of how students learn, apply knowledge, and make meaning remain. Reimagining assessment in the age of AI may therefore require not only innovation, but also a renewed appreciation for the enduring foundations of education itself.

References

- [1] Huang, J. (2023). Engineering ChatGPT prompts for EFL writing classes. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, 5(4), 73-79. <https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.20230405>
- [2] Pettersson, J., Hult, E., Eriksson, T., & Adewumi, T. (2024). Generative AI and teachers--for us or against us? A case study. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03486.
- [3] Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *Higher Education*, 86(2), 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2>
- [4] Naughton, J. (2023, January 7). The ChatGPT bot is causing panic now — but it'll soon be as mundane a tool as Excel. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jan/07/chatgpt-bot-excel-ai-chatbot-tech>
- [5] O'Dea, X. (2024). Generative AI: is it a paradigm shift for higher education?. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(5), 811-816. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2332944>
- [6] Qian, Y. (2025). Pedagogical applications of generative AI in higher education: A systematic review of the field. *TechTrends*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01100-1>
- [7] Barrett, B., & Ashar, L. (2024). Creating artificial intelligence (ai) best practices in virtual learning environments: A primer approach for introducing the implementation of generative-ai as a teaching tool. In *EDULEARN24 Proceedings* (pp. 9197-9202). IATED. doi: [10.21125/edulearn.2024.2216](https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2024.2216)
- [8] Farooq, U., Malik, S. A., & Syed, A. S. (2024). Revolutionizing higher education: The transformative impact of artificial intelligence on teaching, learning, and career preparation. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i3.2024.3239>
- [9] McDonald, N., Johri, A., Ali, A., & Collier, A. H. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: Evidence from an analysis of institutional policies and guidelines. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2025.100121>
- [10] Bellon, J. (2000). A research-based justification for debate across the curriculum. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 36(3), 161–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2000.11951646>
- [11] Bridges, S., Chan, L. K., & Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2016). Situated learning and educational technologies: Theory and practice. In *Educational technologies in medical and health sciences education* (Vol. 5, pp. 1–6). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08275-2_1
- [12] Wiggins, G. P. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- [13] Dang, B., Huynh, L., Gul, F., Rosé, C., Järvelä, S., & Nguyen, A. (2025). Human–AI collaborative learning in mixed reality: Examining the cognitive and socio-emotional interactions. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(5), 2078-2101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13607>
- [14] Zhou, X., Teng, D., & Al-Samarraie, H. (2024). The mediating role of generative AI self-regulation on students' critical thinking and problem-solving. *Education Sciences*, 14(12), 1302. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121302>
- [15] Lee, H. P. H., Sarkar, A., Tankelevitch, L., Drosos, I., Rintel, S., Banks, R., & Wilson, N. (2025). The impact of generative ai on critical thinking: Self-reported reductions in cognitive effort and confidence

- effects from a survey of knowledge workers. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Society*, 42(1), 112-130. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713778>
- [16] Yueh, R. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: Philosophical, sociological, and pedagogical perspectives. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities & Social Science*, 6(4), 50–57. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56734/ijahss.v6n4a6>
- [17] Essien, A., Bukoye, O. T., O'Dea, X., & Kremantzis, M. (2024). The influence of AI text generators on critical thinking skills in UK business schools. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(5), 865-882. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2316881>
- [18] Xu, X. (2024). Navigating the AI revolution: Implications for business education and pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 13(1), 371.
- [19] Koh, K., Tan, C., & Ng, P. (2012). Creating thinking schools through authentic assessment: The case in Singapore. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 24(2), 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-011-9138-y>
- [20] Wiggins, G. P. (1989). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70(9), 703–713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200721>
- [21] Gick, M. L., & Holyoak, K. J. (1987). The cognitive basis of knowledge transfer. In S. M. Cormier & J. D. Hagman (Eds.), *Transfer of learning: Contemporary research and applications* (pp. 9–46). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-188950-0.50008-4>
- [22] Doody, O., & Condon, M. (2012). Increasing student involvement and learning through using debate as an assessment. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 12(4), 232–237. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2012.03.002>
- [23] Ghafar, Z., & Region-Iraq, K. (2024). The effect of classroom debate on students' academic achievement in higher education: An overview. *International Journal of Applied and Scientific Research*, 2(1), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijasr.v2i1.1258>
- [24] Tumposky, N. R. (2004). The debate. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 78(2), 52–56. <https://doi.org/10.3200/TCHS.78.2.52-56>
- [25] Darby, M. (2007). Debate: A teaching-learning strategy for developing competence in communication and critical thinking. *Journal of Dental Hygiene*, 81(4), 1–12.
- [26] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer.
- [27] Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. (2021). *Five principles of equitable and inclusive teaching*. University of Michigan. <https://crlt.umich.edu/equity-focused-teaching/principles-strategies-resources>
- [28] Willems, P. P., & Gonzalez-DeHass, A. R. (2017). *Case studies in educational psychology: Elementary school grades*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- [29] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- [30] Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. Jossey-Bass Publishing.
- [31] Center for Teaching & Learning. (n.d.). *Reflective teaching*. University of California, Berkeley. <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/teaching-strategies/teaching-your-course/reflective-teaching>