



A Graduate Teaching Assistant Experience: A Co-Constructivist Pedagogical Approach

Faridah Abraham
Kansas State University

Introduction

The role of a Graduate Teaching Assistant is integral to the success of higher education institutions. GTAs serve as a bridge between students and faculty, facilitating learning and reinforcing course material in meaningful ways (Cuseo, 2010). However, traditional pedagogical approaches often position GTAs as passive conduits of knowledge rather than active participants in the learning process (Weimer, 2013). This can limit their ability to engage students effectively and develop as educators. The co-constructivist pedagogical approach offers a compelling alternative by emphasizing collaborative knowledge-building, where students and instructors engage in shared meaning-making (Collins & Kapur, 2022). Rooted in Vygotsky's (1978) theory of social constructivism, this approach acknowledges that learning is an active, social process where students construct knowledge through interaction and engagement. Similarly, Lave and Wenger's (1991) situated learning theory highlights the importance of legitimate peripheral participation, where learners gradually move from novice to expert roles through social interaction.

By applying a co-constructivist paradigm, GTAs can shift from being knowledge transmitters to facilitators of learning, guiding students in active meaning-making processes (Chi, 2009). Research suggests that when students engage in active and interactive learning environments, they retain information more effectively and develop higher-order cognitive skills (Topping, 2005). This method also empowers GTAs to refine their teaching skills and develop confidence as educators, fostering a sense of agency in the learning process (Freire, 1970). Furthermore, integrating cognitive apprenticeship strategies, as outlined by Collins and Kapur (2022), allows GTAs to model expert thinking while encouraging student participation. This aligns with Redish's (2003) findings in

STEM education, which suggest that students learn more effectively when they are actively involved in problem-solving rather than passively receiving information.

Teaching in West Africa compared to a Midwestern Kansas University in America highlights stark contrasts in both cultural norms and pedagogical approaches. In West Africa, classrooms are often more traditional, with a strong emphasis on rote learning and lecture-based instruction, where the teacher is the primary source of knowledge, and students tend to adopt a more passive role. In contrast, teaching in a Midwestern university in America promotes a more interactive and student-centered approach, with an emphasis on critical thinking, discussions, and ac-

tive participation. Here, students are encouraged to engage with the material and share their perspectives openly, fostering a more collaborative environment. For instance, while in West Africa, I frequently relied on structured lecture formats and formal assessments, in the U.S., I found myself incorporating more experiential learning, case studies, and group projects to encourage problem-solving and student collaboration. The technology integration and resources available in the U.S. were also far more advanced, allowing for dynamic learning experiences through digital tools, which contrasted with the more limited access to such technology in West African classrooms. Overall, these differences in teaching environments underscored the varying educational philosophies, student expectations, and institutional support systems between the two contexts.

Adopting a co-constructivist approach enhances student engagement, fosters deeper learning, and empowers GTAs to take an active role in educational settings. By shifting towards collaborative knowledge-building, higher education institutions can create more dynamic and inclusive learning environments that benefit both students and instructors.

Problem Statement

Traditional teaching assistant roles often emphasize unidirectional knowledge transfer, where TAs reinforce lecture material without actively engaging students in the learning process. This approach may limit students' critical thinking abilities and reduce opportunities for interactive learning. The co-constructivist approach, grounded in Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural theory and Piaget's (1954) constructivism, presents an alternative framework that encourages active participation, scaffolding, and social interaction in knowledge construction. The problem lies in the lack of systematic implementation of co-constructivist strategies in TA training and classroom facilitation. This paper investigates how TAs can integrate co-constructivist methods into their teaching practices and the resulting impact on student learning outcomes.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research approach, integrating personal teaching experiences, student feedback, and educational theory to explore the role of co-constructivist pedagogy in a TA's teaching practice. Data sources include reflective journals that document weekly experiences, challenges, and instruc-

tional strategies (Brookfield, 2017); student feedback gathered through course evaluations and informal discussions (Bain, 2004); a literature review examining existing research on co-constructivist teaching, TA experiences, and student engagement (Palincsar, 1998); and case studies that highlight specific classroom scenarios where co-constructivist techniques were implemented (Vygotsky, 1978). Using an interpretive framework, the study identifies recurring themes and assesses the effectiveness of these strategies in fostering student engagement and comprehension (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Discussion: The Role of the TA in a Co-Constructivist Classroom

The co-constructivist pedagogical approach fundamentally shifts the role of a Teaching Assistant (TA) from a passive knowledge conduit to an active facilitator of learning. By engaging in collaborative knowledge-building, TAs create learning environments that encourage student participation and critical thinking (Palincsar, 1998). Unlike traditional lecture-based methods, which often reinforce hierarchical knowledge transmission, co-constructivism fosters an interactive classroom where both students and instructors contribute to meaning-making (Brookfield, 2017). This shift not only enhances student comprehension but also empowers TAs by positioning them as co-learners and facilitators, rather than mere instructional assistants.

One key aspect of this approach is reflective teaching, which enables TAs to continually assess and adapt their strategies based on student responses and classroom dynamics (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Reflective journals serve as an essential tool for documenting teaching experiences, analyzing challenges, and refining pedagogical methods. Through weekly reflections, TAs can identify patterns in student engagement, recognize effective instructional techniques, and modify their approach to better meet students' needs. Such continuous self-assessment aligns with the principles of co-constructivism, which emphasize adaptability and responsiveness in teaching (Brookfield, 2017).

Student feedback further reinforces the effectiveness of the co-constructivist model. Informal discussions and course evaluations provide valuable insights into students' learning experiences, highlighting areas where participatory teaching enhances comprehension and engagement (Bain, 2004). Research suggests

Keywords: Teaching Assistant, Active Participation, Academic Ownership, Student-Centered Learning

that students in co-constructivist classrooms are more likely to develop higher-order thinking skills, as they actively engage with course material rather than passively receiving information (Palincsar, 1998). When students feel that their perspectives are valued, they become more invested in their learning process, fostering a deeper sense of academic ownership (Vygotsky, 1978).

Additionally, case studies of classroom interactions illustrate the practical application of co-constructivist techniques. For example, when TAs incorporate discussion-based learning, peer collaboration, and problem-solving exercises, students tend to demonstrate greater conceptual understanding and critical reasoning (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Such strategies align with Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the zone of proximal development, which asserts that learning is most effective when students are supported in reaching just beyond their current level of competence through guided interaction. By positioning themselves as facilitators rather than lecturers, TAs can maximize students' potential through scaffolded learning experiences.

Ultimately, the co-constructivist pedagogical approach not only benefits students but also enhances the professional development of TAs. As they refine their facilitation skills, adapt to diverse classroom needs, and engage in reflective practice, TAs gain valuable teaching competencies that prepare them for future academic and professional roles (Brookfield, 2017). By fostering an interactive and student-centered classroom, co-constructivist pedagogy contributes to a more dynamic and effective learning environment, making it a promising model for TA engagement in higher education.

Conclusion

The teaching assistant experience offers a unique opportunity to bridge the gap between faculty-led instruction and student learning. By adopting a co-constructivist pedagogical approach, TAs can create a more engaging, collaborative, and student-centered learning environment. This approach not only enhances student comprehension but also empowers TAs to develop their teaching philosophies and instructional skills. Future research should explore how institutional support and TA training programs can further integrate co-constructivist strategies to optimize learning experiences for both students and educators.

References

Alexander, R. J. (2008). Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk. *Dialogos*.
Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Harvard University Press.
Barrows, H. S. (1986). A taxonomy of problem-based learning methods. *Medical Education*, 20(6), 481-486.
Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
Chi, M. T. H. (2009). Active-constructive-interactive: A conceptual framework for differentiating learning activities. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 1(1), 73-105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-8765.2008.01005.x>
Collins, A., & Kapur, M. (2022). Cognitive apprenticeship and the co-construction of knowledge. *Educational Psychologist*, 57(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1991351>
Cuseo, J. (2010). The empirical case for the first-year seminar: Promoting positive student outcomes and campus-wide benefits. *E-Source for College Transitions*, 7(6), 3-8.
Dillenbourg, P. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches*. Pergamon.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
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. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8410-8415.
Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
Palincsar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 345-375. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.345>
Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. Routledge.
Redish, E. F. (2003). *Teaching physics with the Physics Suite*. John Wiley & Sons.
Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. *Educational Psychology*, 25(6), 631-645. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410500345172>

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. Jossey-Bass.
Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89-100.

Faridah Abraham is a graduate student in communication studies at the A.Q. Miller School of Media and Communication, Kansas State University. Her research focuses on the intersection of gender and health; she has 14 years of experience in health communication in Nigeria.

© Faridah Abraham, 2025. Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.