

Identifying Relations of Student Math Values in Biology



Alexander Coon¹ & Matthew Smith²

Kansas State University¹, North Dakota State University²

Introduction

- In recent years, there have been calls to increase the use of math in biology classrooms. [1]
- If we teach more math in biology, there are hurdles to be approached.
- Student views of math in biology needs to be more favorable to implement.
- Student math anxiety could be a problem.
 - Math anxiety causes drop in math performance **It's a problem.** [2]
- What can instructors use to easily predict student math anxiety or student perceptions of math in biology?
- What relationships exist between math anxiety, views of math in biology, and student performance?

Data Collected

Survey data was collected from two classes:

- BIOL 151 General Biology II (n=157)
- BIOL 252 Plant and Animal Diversity (n=33)

	ACT	TOSLS	AMAS	MBVI	
Pre	♦ □	♦ □		♦□	
Mid					
Post		♦ □		♦ □	
Kev	♦ =B	iol 252	□=Biol	151	

Rey V-Diol 232 Diol 131						
Assessment	Description					
	A 28 question test that assesses 9 skills.					
TOSLS [3]	These skills are broken into two groups:					
103L3 [3]	quantitative practices (QP) and non-					
	quantitative practices (NQP).					
	Nine question survey to asses self-reported					
AMAS [4]	math anxiety, reported from low-high					
	anxiety.					
	Eleven question survey to assess math					
MBVI [5]	values in biology. It has three categories:					
	Cost (C), Utility (U), and Interest (I).					

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (r_s) was used to determine statistical significance of relationships.

	BIOL 151: General Biology II							
ı	QP		A (QP A	ACT	NQP	
ı	NQP	0.538	Cost \propto Utility \propto Interest					
ı	ACT	0.418	0.637					
ı	C	-0.243	-0.075	-0.062	QP & Cost			
ı	U	0.073	0.063	-0.040	-0.217			
ı		0.126	0.060	-0.002	-0.484	0.447		
		QP	NQP	ACT	C	U		

BIOL 252: Plant and Animal Diversity

Pretest. r_s values in red signify significant relations (α =.05)

QP		Math Anxiety & C,I or L					
NQP	0.470			ath A			
ACT	0.411	0.242					
C	0.411	-0.314	0.088	IVICI		ric c y	
U	0.222	0.139	-0.046	-0.071			
	0.073	0.397	-0.016	-0.623	0.264		
AMA:	S -0.113	-0.002	-0.210	-0.085	-0.180	0.053	
	QP	NQP	ACT	C	U		AMAS

Pretest. r_s values in red signify significant relations (α =.05)

Future Work

- Research should be conducted to determine if the relationship between student favorability of math in biology causal relationship.
- A more specialized anxiety survey relating to math anxiety in the sciences in order to account for discrepancies between established research and observed relationships between math anxiety and quantitative performance.
- Surveys given (particularly AMAS and MBVI) should be given to lager classes of upper division students in order to gain more resolution of the results.

Conclusions

- The ACT can be used as a predictor for introductory classes, but cannot be used as a predictor for upper division course
 - There has been too much time since the student took the exam for it to be predictive.
- With favorable views of math in biology being strongly linked quantitative scientific literacy, an emphasis on improving one will likely improve the other.
 - Cost is the most important factor of favorability in this.
- Student math anxiety is its own problem.
 - It must be approached independently.
- In contrast to previous literature, no significant relationship between math related anxiety and QP was observed.
- Other differences between introductory courses and important to note:
 - Cost is a more important factor in scientific literacy in upper division courses.

References and Acknowledgements

- [1] American Association for the Advancement of Science. 2011
- [2] Ashcraft, Mark H. 2002
- [3] Gormally, Cara. Brickman, Peggy. Lutz, Mary. 2012
- [4] Hopko, Derek R. Mahadevan, Rajan. Bare, Robert L. Hunt, Melissa K. 2003
- [5] Andrews, Sarah E., Christopher Runyon, and Melissa L. Aikens. 2017

Thank you to NDSU CIDER, Dr. Jennifer Mommsen, Dr. Matthew Smith, and Melody McConnell Material based on this work supported by NSF DEU 1560142. Any opinions, findings, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF.