

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2026, Vol. 7, No. 9, 4070 – 4079

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.09.20>

Research Article

Between Researcher and Teacher: A Subjective Personal Introspection on Designing and Living the First Cycle of an Action Research Study in an Introductory Economics Course

Kimberly Christie S. Vergara*

Department of Economics, De La Salle University, Philippines

Article history:

Submission 30 August 2026

Revised 13 September 2026

Accepted 23 September 2026

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

kimberly.vergara@dlsu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This account explores what a first-cycle classroom action research (CAR) in an introductory economics course taught a research-teacher that the formal publication could not contain. Through subjective personal introspection (SPI), it examines the antecedents, actions, and outcomes of designing and inhabiting a four-component authentic assessment ecosystem across a fourteen-week trimester. Three insights emerge from this inquiry. First, scaffolded sustained engagement works because it keeps students engaged with an economic issue long enough for it to become genuinely complicated, but maintaining these conditions across a large class demands a quality and volume of instructor labor that the design does not acknowledge. Second, feedback is constitutive of learning in theory and finite in practice, and the line between guiding students and spoon-feeding them is one that pressure makes easy to cross. Third, the problem with generative artificial intelligence (AI) in the classroom is not AI use itself but intellectual outsourcing, a form of academic dishonesty that predates the tools that now make it easier. Each insight carries implications for the design of Cycle 2.

Keywords: *Authentic Assessments, Economic Education, Subjective Personal Introspection*

Introduction

Situating the Self: On Why This Account Had to Be Written

Every research publication is, in some measure, a cleaned-up version of itself. The peer-reviewed account of my first-cycle classroom action research (CAR) in an

introductory economics course (Vergara & Vergara, 2026) tells a coherent story: the design rationale, the instruments, the findings, and the plans for what comes next. What it does not tell is the experience of doing the work, both as a teacher and a researcher: the doubts before the data, the cost of giving out feedback

How to cite:

Vergara, K. C. S. (2026). Between Researcher and Teacher: A Subjective Personal Introspection on Designing and Living the First Cycle of an Action Research Study in an Introductory Economics Course. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 7(9), 4070 – 4079. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.07.09.20

for authentic assessments, the complicated feelings about students who used generative artificial intelligence (AI), and the slower, harder learning that happened in me as I watched a course I had redesigned unfold in real time. This account is written to tell that story.

The methodological basis for doing so is subjective personal introspection, or SPI. Originally developed by Holbrook (1986, 1995) in the context of consumer research, SPI is a method for generating rich, impressionistic narrative accounts of the writer's own experience regarding a phenomenon of interest. As Holbrook (2005) argues, because the writer is human, writing about oneself inevitably illuminates something of the broader human condition: SPI is not mere memoir but a form of participant observation in one's own life. Rod (2011) extended this methodological approach into the context of action-oriented organizational research, demonstrating that SPI could serve as a vehicle for reporting both what a study found and how it felt to conduct it: the antecedents that shaped the researcher's decisions, the tensions that surfaced during fieldwork, and the insights that emerged only in retrospect. SPI, in Rod's framing, is both theoretical and reflective, both descriptive and analytical. It assumes a confessional stance, not in the sense of self-flagellation, but in naming what usually goes unspoken in formal research accounts.

It is in this spirit that I write this account. The main question of this inquiry is what I learned from the experience of designing and living through a four-component authentic assessment ecosystem, from watching my intentions meet the reality of almost ninety students across a fourteen-week trimester, and from confronting, in the reflective space that writing creates, the assumptions I carried into the classroom and the assumptions the experience has since revised. I am writing this not immediately after the term ended, but after the Cycle 1 paper has been completed and submitted for publication. That distance matters as it allows me to detach from the researcher I was during the term and engage more honestly with the experience to question my motivations, confront my contradictions, and reflect on what I now believe about my

teaching and research that I did not believe before.

There is a structural tension that shapes the context of this account, and which I feel the need to detail before I proceed. This tension stems from my occupying three simultaneous but distinct roles: first and foremost, as the instructor responsible for student learning; second, as the researcher designing and observing an intervention; and finally, as the practitioner who would benefit from the findings. These roles have competing motivations. As the instructor, I want my students to succeed. I will intervene as soon as I see issues in student learning or if I discover a better way of teaching or providing feedback. As a researcher, I want the data to be honest, and so I worry that such interventions during the period of inquiry would unintentionally influence the data. As a practitioner, I want the insights to be useful and actionable; I also want to distinguish which insights came from the natural course of the learning process and which resulted from interventions.

It is precisely this structural tension that SPI is equipped to surface because it rejects the pretense that the researcher is detached from the phenomenon under study (Rod, 2011). I was living inside this phenomenon and experienced it for fourteen weeks, and this account is written from that position. The Cycle 1 CAR was written to satisfy the researcher's and practitioner's objectives, but many of my experiences arising from this tension didn't make it onto the page. The reflexivity that results from this experience is as important as the findings from the Cycle 1 CAR in understanding the learning experience within an authentic assessment ecosystem in an introductory economics classroom.

Part I: Antecedents — What Brought Me Here

I am, in some sense, a product of the very teaching tradition I set out to challenge. I learned economics the way economics has long been taught: through lectures, textbooks, and assessments that asked me to recall and recognize concepts rather than to reason and apply principles. I was a capable student of that tradition, which is perhaps why I became an economics instructor. Nevertheless, I have

spent years noticing the gap between being good at taking a fixed-response economics examination and being genuinely capable of using economic principles to understand the world, and I refuse to see my students fall into that gap. The value in a fundamentals of economics course is not in remembering the technical definitions of inflation or computing equilibrium prices; its true value lies in being able to make sense of the world using its principles, and learning how to make better decisions as a result. This is precisely the objective of the authentic assessment ecosystem design in my introductory economics course.

Developing economic literacy is my core motivation for teaching introductory economics. I want to build the capacity to use economic principles as a lens for making sense of complex reality, to understand why people decide the way they do, and to trace how individual decisions aggregate into outcomes that affect other individuals, communities, and nations. I believe that students who develop economic literacy carry something useful into whatever life they go to lead, which is something more valuable and durable than a grade. Moreover, it has come to me that many students can take on an introductory economics course, pass all examinations that test their recall, and yet never develop the economic literacy that the course aimed to develop in the first place. Many students can test well in traditional economics examinations and still lack the ability to apply economic principles to explain real world issues. I have noticed that once they reach their thesis or capstone years, they tend to turn to marketing frameworks or common-sense reasoning, even though an economic lens would be more rigorous and illuminating. I have long wondered whether this is a problem of poor teaching strategy, poor course engagement, or both.

Institutional change catalyzed my decision to conduct formal classroom action research. My department released revised syllabus guidelines that introduced several changes to course learning objectives and assessment structures, along with explicit policies governing the use of generative AI, a provision absent from previous syllabi. The changes

prompted me to rethink how I had been designing group-based assessments. In previous terms, group work had consisted of one or two major presentations scheduled close to the midterm and final deadlines, as the objective was to provide feedback on students' research and analysis prior to the major assessments. However, I felt that the timing of these presentations provided limited opportunities for feedback and correction before those high-stakes moments. The revised guidelines gave me the opening I had been looking for. I used the opportunity to restructure all group-based assessments into a sequence of presentations distributed across the trimester, allowing me to track students' research and analysis in real time and provide feedback at multiple points rather than all at once. With these changes in place, it felt like the right time to ask formally and systematically whether the redesigned course was achieving its intended outcomes.

I have recorded my experiences in my teaching journals across several terms because writing about what happened in a class helps me understand it better. Most entries include my lectures, the activities I had the students perform, and how they responded to them. These journals are not at all polished. Many entries are mid-sentence observations, sometimes questions I was asking myself about a student's response, or a moment—a lecture, an activity, or questions that surprised me because they either exceeded my expectations or failed to achieve my objectives. I also use the journal to reflect on what worked and did not work during the term. Most importantly, I use this reflection to consider what will change in the succeeding term. They are also, in retrospect, the primary data source for this account. The decision to write this SPI is, in part, a decision to take those private records seriously as scholarly material: to treat my observations, doubts, and developing understanding as evidence to move forward.

In the course of writing this account, I was also forced to confront my values as a Lasallian educator. The Lasallian tradition asks educators to orient their work toward those who are most vulnerable to the decisions of the powerful. The irony isn't lost to me that the Lasallian institution where I teach is one

considered to be elite, and that students of this university are being groomed to become the decision-makers of the country. Teaching them to think economically is not a neutral pedagogical objective but a preparation for the responsibility of protecting the welfare of the most vulnerable. Carrying out this mission is the motivation behind why I teach, why I felt that a syllabus redesign was necessary, and, ultimately, why I wanted to examine whether my redesign would achieve my objectives.

Part II: Actions — Living Inside the Design

Movement 1: The Scaffolded Design as an Act of Trust

Before the term began, I had already made a commitment whose consequences I could not fully see. As in previous terms, I had decided that students would choose, from a predetermined list of Philippine economic issues, the one they would research and analyze throughout the trimester. Every subsequent assessment (the individual assignments, the group presentations, the midterm learning paper, and the final podcast) would be anchored to that chosen issue. The logic of this design allowed sustained engagement with a single issue over fourteen weeks, which I assumed would help students to develop a depth of understanding that traditional, fixed-response-style approaches in teaching economics courses rarely permit. As I prepared for the first week, I was aware that I was asking students to trust that a choice they made before they had any real understanding of economics would continue to feel meaningful as their understanding grew.

I began the term by asking students about their goals: their academic goals for the course and their broader aspirations for the next three to five years. This is a strategy from Slavich and Zimbardo's (2012) transformative teaching framework, and one that I have been doing for some time. Asking students to articulate their goals before introducing course content had consistently helped me ground economic principles in their actual lives rather than in abstract models. This was particularly helpful when introducing the first two principles: trade-offs and opportunity costs. Most students genuinely want to succeed in the course. While success looks different for each one, achieving

those goals depends on their individual choices. This is a good starting point for introducing the trade-offs they face with each choice, and calling attention to the opportunity cost of each choice. For example, many students express the desire to earn a high grade. The next step is for them to reflect on which choices will lead such an outcome. How should they make use of their time? Which choices will lead to their desired outcome? And if they so choose not to perform what is needed to succeed, what would they be giving up as a result? It is typically in these lessons that they begin to realize that economics is a framework for making sense of reality.

I gave students the choice of an economic issue, and this was as much an act of trust in students I had not yet met as it was a pedagogical strategy. I did not know which groups would take the choice seriously and which would select an issue because it seemed manageable rather than because it genuinely engaged them. What I found, in the first group presentations, was that the quality of early engagement varied considerably, but that the students who chose issues connected to their own contexts (i.e., migration, fast fashion consumption, traffic, AI-use) brought a quality of attention to their research that was difficult to manufacture through any assignment structure I might have designed. The issue, in those cases, was already theirs before the course gave them the language to analyze it.

I sequenced all major group assessments as presentations rather than written submissions, and this was the one that generated the most doubt before the data arrived. I was asking students to prepare presented work in a format that required more preparation than in-class activities and at a higher frequency than in previous terms. I worried about the timing of each group presentation and the resource demands this placed on students, particularly in a fourteen-week trimester punctuated by weather events, campus closures, and the logistical unpredictability that characterizes academic life in the Philippines.

What surprised me was not that some groups struggled with the pace, but that the frequency of presentations appeared to create a productive struggle for the presentations. The sequencing of presentations coincided with the

sequencing of the lectures and the timing of the major requirements, so later presentations became increasingly complex. Students who knew they would be presenting again in two weeks or close to the deadline for a major requirement were more likely to act on feedback than those who did not face the same conditions. The presentation sequence compressed the feedback loop in a way that written assignments, marked and returned days later, could not. In a sense, adding a third presentation provided an additional opportunity for instantaneous feedback. The groups that took advantage did well on the major requirements, whether in the midterm paper or the final group requirement.

Movement 2: The Marking Load as an Ethical and Practical Crisis

While the formal CAR publication explored the resource demands of authentic assessments, this was not fully and comprehensively explored in the paper. I want to say it here: the feedback burden of a four-component authentic assessment ecosystem with a class of nearly ninety students is genuinely unsustainable at the quality level the design requires. I discovered this in the specific experience of marking everyone's individual assignments almost every week during the first half of the trimester.

My initial instinct was that feedback at every stage was helpful and necessary, and that the scaffolded sequence of assessments functioned only as a scaffold if each component provided students with enough information to improve their work before the next component was due. I believed this, and I still believe it. However, believing it did not resolve my struggle: about ninety assignments, each requiring enough engagement to be genuinely useful, across a week that also included class preparation, consultations, and my own research commitments. In previous terms, I tried but ultimately failed to provide detailed written feedback on early assignments. I felt that the assessments had been designed with that feedback in mind, and that students had been implicitly promised a level of instructional response that the design could not deliver without labor that was, I eventually had to admit, excessive.

The workaround I developed for the term in study was to shift the primary feedback mechanism from written commentary on individual assignments to real-time response during the group presentations. Unlike written feedback, oral feedback during a presentation allows me to probe: to ask a group to walk me through their reasoning, to push back on a conclusion, and to redirect an analysis before it hardens into a midterm paper. This benefits the whole class, not just the presenting group. Students who listen attentively during another group's presentation and Q&A receive feedback that is often more clarifying than the comments on their own work, because they can see reasoning errors and analytical gaps without the defensiveness that sometimes accompanies written criticism of their submission.

Yet, I want to be honest about what this workaround costs. Relying on presentations as the primary feedback venue meant that students who did not present in a given week received less direct, individualized feedback on their developing understanding. It also meant that the quality of the oral exchange depended heavily on how well prepared a group was to present and on how engaged the rest of the class was in listening. Both of these varied considerably throughout the term. The compromise was real, and I am not sure all students experienced it as adequate.

Movement 3: The AI Problem as a Mirror

There is a productive irony in writing an autoethnographic account of an action research study that was partly defined by concerns about generative AI use, in an era when academic readers will reasonably wonder how much AI assistance I receive in the design and delivery of my course and my own research work. I am aware of this irony, and I discuss it here because it is precisely the kind of doubled self-consciousness that SPI is designed to make productive rather than paralyzing. I was watching my students navigate the boundary between legitimate use of generative AI tools and intellectual outsourcing, just as I am navigating a similar boundary as a teacher and researcher. Naming this does not resolve it, but it clarifies the actual

issue, and I think clarifying it is the most useful finding this movement can do.

During the CAR term, my working stance toward generative AI was what I would now describe as tolerant suspicion. I assumed that most students were using AI tools to assist with their work and that some were using them inappropriately, not because I had verified this across the class, but because the scale of the temptation and the difficulty of policing it made the assumption feel more honest than hope. The revised syllabus included AI use guidelines, and I incorporated specific provisions into my assessment rubrics: students whose midterm learning papers or final requirements included hallucinated citations, references to sources that do not exist, which is a distinctive marker of unreflective AI-generated text, would receive a zero on that assessment. This criterion was easy to distinguish; what was not easy was distinguishing between using AI as a research aid and using AI as a ghostwriter.

Honestly, I often felt that it was the latter and that students were outsourcing their research, analysis, and writing to AI. When a group's oral presentation could not support the analytical sophistication of their written submission, that is, when students introduced an economic principle not discussed in class but could not answer follow-up questions about the principles they had cited, I drew conclusions that the rubric did not ask me to draw. The presentation format made some of these gaps visible in ways that written assignments could not. In fact, in some cases, they showed that students produced work that they did not fully understand.

Herein is the value of SPI. After thoughtful reflection on why this bothered me, I realized that it was not the use of AI *per se* that was the issue. The problem I was experiencing predates AI: students submitting work that did not reflect their own understanding, and claiming it as evidence of learning. That is plagiarism in its functional sense, regardless of the instrument used to produce the borrowed work. The specific risk of generative AI is that it makes this form of intellectual outsourcing faster, more fluent, and harder to detect than copying from a textbook or another student's paper. Yet, the ethical violation and the pedagogical harm are the same.

Movement 4: What the Data Felt Like Before It Became Data

The first group presentations happened in the second week of the trimester. By design, this was held earlier than the presentations in previous terms, and early enough that students were still in the initial stages of understanding both their chosen economic issue and the economic principles they were being asked to apply to it. The presentations were not polished, but they were revealing in a way that I had not fully anticipated when I planned the sequence.

What the early presentations made visible was the prior framework each group had brought to their economic issue before the course gave them the tools to analyze it. Students presenting the costs of technology use, such as solar energy or electric vehicles, initially framed it merely as a consumer decision rather than as a matter of resource reallocation that impacts not just those who participate in the market exchange but also how communities and industries are shaped and reshaped. Students presenting on the cost of urban traffic described it in terms of inconvenience or time losses to commuters, rather than as significant cost to the national economy. Their initial analyses are correct but still lack the rigor of analyzing the issue through the lens of incentive structures, market failures, and the aggregate consequences of individual stakeholder decisions. I could see, in those early presentations, exactly where the course needed to intervene, and I could see it before the pre-survey data had been formally analyzed, before I had any quantitative measure of where students were starting from.

It was also in these early presentations that I first noticed the students who would go on to demonstrate the most significant transformation across the term. Some were not always the strongest presenters in the first few weeks of the trimester. Sometimes, they were the students who asked the most questions after other groups presented, those who seemed genuinely troubled by the gap between their intuitive understanding of an issue and the analytical tools the course was offering them. I recognized the struggle that many of these students faced. These students stayed

after class to ask follow-up questions about concepts raised in a peer's presentation and to ask for feedback on where they went wrong. These consultations became a reliable signal that the presentation sequence was fostering the sustained engagement I had hoped for.

By the second group presentation, which served as a midterm checkpoint before the learning paper deadline, the development was often palpable. Groups that had arrived at their issues through relatively thin initial frameworks were now speaking about incentive structures and the difference between what individual stakeholders wanted and what their collective decisions produced. These are the conceptual moves that introductory economics is supposed to develop. Seeing them happen in spoken, public form, where I could probe and push back in real time, was a qualitatively different experience from seeing them reflected in pre-post survey means. The data, when it came, confirmed what I had already, imperfectly, sensed: the students were developing confidence in a subject matter that initially intimidated them.

Part III: Outcomes — What the Experience Taught That the Findings Could Not

Outcome 1: What Sustained Scaffolded Engagement Actually Looks Like

The course syllabus has been revised many times over the years of teaching the course. Each revision has been, in some sense, an informal experiment: a set of changes made on the basis of observation and evaluation, without the structure of formal research to hold me accountable to the evidence. The first cycle CAR is my first systematic attempt to document whether the changes I was making were achieving their intended outcomes. What I learned from doing this formally, rather than informally, is that I had been doing many things right without fully understanding why they were working, and that the discipline of the research process forced me to understand rather than simply to continue.

The scaffolded sequence of assessments worked, in the most fundamental sense, because it kept students engaged with their economic issue long enough for the issue to become genuinely complicated. Students who had described their chosen issue in simple,

causal terms in Week 2 were, by Week 7 and 8, naming stakeholders, navigating tradeoffs, and identifying the gap between desired outcomes and actual behavior. This is the core intellectual move that economic reasoning requires: replacing single-cause explanations with multi-stakeholder analyses, and recognizing that outcomes are the product of systems rather than intentions. The assessment sequence created the conditions for this development not just by teaching it through lectures but by giving students repeated occasions to try it, fail at it, receive feedback on it, and try it again.

What the published paper could not convey is the cost to maintaining these conditions over a full trimester. The instructor's labor in a scaffolded assessment ecosystem is not front-loaded, the way a well-prepared lecture course might be. It is distributed across weekly presentations, consultation sessions, assignment marking, real-time feedback, and the ongoing interpretive work of understanding where each group is in their developing analysis and what they need next. I do not regret the design but I want to name this cost honestly, because any instructor considering a similar redesign deserves to know that the workload is real and that managing it requires explicit prioritization, not just additional effort.

Outcome 2: The Contradiction at the Heart of Authentic Assessment at Scale

We do not develop knowledge by memorizing concepts introduced in class; we develop it by using those concepts to make better sense of the world. Making this distinction helps us contextualize how we should “test” students. Traditional fixed-response assessment measure what students can recall at a specific moment in time, which is different from measuring what students have come to understand across a sustained period of inquiry. If the goal of a course is knowledge transformation, then the assessments designed to measure it must evaluate not just what is known, but how it came to be known, which is the creative and analytical process through which a student's framework for understanding a phenomenon shifts, deepens, or is revised.

Authentic assessment serves this purpose, and its foundational premise is that feedback is constitutive of learning. Feedback, in this view, is not merely a grade or an evaluative statement that students receive after submitting their work; it is a process through which learning happens. And it is through this feedback loop sustained across the term that a teacher is able to evaluate the very process of knowledge transformation that authentic assessment is designed to produce.

This premise is sound and I remain committed to it. What the experience of this term shows is that it contains a structural implication that becomes acute at scale. If feedback is constitutive of learning, then learning in a large authentic assessment course depends on the instructor's capacity to provide feedback that is timely, substantive, and specific. Yet this capacity is finite in ways that the design does not always fully acknowledge. Distributing feedback across oral presentations, rather than through commentary on every written submission, was my pragmatic response to this constraint, however imperfect it was. Oral feedback during presentations benefits the class as a whole, but it carries its own risks: students who are introverted, those who miss a session, those who choose not to listen, or those who need the privacy of a written commentary to process critiques without the pressure of a public setting may not receive the feedback in a form they can use. This rumination resulted from performing SPI, and was one that I did not realize during the term. It is important to raise this as a genuine limitation of my workaround, not merely a logistical inconvenience.

Outcome 3: AI as the Uninvited Co-Designer

The Cycle 1 paper was not primarily a paper about AI. It was a paper about authentic assessment and knowledge transformation, but AI was present throughout the term in ways that the formal paper did not have space to address, and that presence raises a question the formal paper also could not ask: to what extent does the pre-post data I collected reflect what the authentic assessment ecosystem taught students, and to what extent does it reflect what generative AI helped students perform?

I do not have a clean answer to this question. What I have is the awareness that the question needs to be asked, and a set of design implications for Cycle 2 that follow from asking it. If some students used AI tools to produce work that did not reflect their genuine understanding, then the pre-survey and post-survey data, which asked students to self-assess their confidence across a range of economic knowledge and skill domains, may have been completed with a more accurate sense of their own understanding than the written assessments that surrounded them. The surveys, in other words, may be better data than they appear: students answering questions about their own confidence do not benefit from AI assistance in the way that students writing analytical papers do. The gap between what students knew and what some of their submissions demonstrated is one that the formal analysis could not fully close, and I want to name it here as an honest limitation.

What I have come to believe, and this belief has crystallized through reflection rather than through anything that happened during the term, is that my role in relation to AI is not primarily surveillance. It is the development of AI fluency: helping students understand how to use these tools in ways that extend, rather than replace, their own thinking, and designing assessments that make outsourcing genuinely less useful than engaging in it. The oral presentation component of my assessment ecosystem was already doing some of this work, because no AI tool can present on a student's behalf in a live Q&A. The design had an answer to the problem I was worrying about; I was not always confident enough in that answer to trust it.

I want to note that this shift in perspective happened after the CAR, not during it. This is precisely the value of reflexivity and SPI, specifically: the reflective distance that formal research publishing does not accommodate. During the term, I was managing the AI problem. In writing this account, I am beginning to understand it.

What I carry from this into Cycle 2 is not a more punitive approach to AI detection, but a clearer design intention: to create assessment tasks in which the act of doing the task is inseparable from demonstrating

understanding. The oral presentation component already achieves this, to a significant degree. A student who cannot explain their own analysis in a live Q&A cannot borrow that explanation from any tool. Extending this logic to other components of the assessment ecosystem, designing tasks where the process of inquiry is itself the evidence of learning, is one of the clearest actionable insights this SPI has produced.

Turning Toward: What I Carry into Cycle 2

I began this CAR with questions about my students, and I am ending this account with questions about myself. This, I think, is the correct order of things in SPI-informed action research. The formal paper answers the questions I began with: whether the assessment ecosystem produced measurable shifts in self-perceived economic knowledge and skill, and which domains showed the greatest and least transformation. This account answers a different set of questions: what it was like to design and inhabit that ecosystem, what I got wrong and what I now understand about why, and what I now believe about teaching, about feedback, and about the role of economic education that I did not fully believe before.

What I carry into Cycle 2 is not primarily a set of design modifications, though I have those. It is a set of orientations: a greater willingness to trust the assessment sequence to create learning without my constant intervention; a clearer understanding that feedback is most valuable when it prompts students to interrogate their own reasoning rather than when it corrects their conclusions; a more nuanced relationship to the AI question, focused on developing fluency rather than policing misuse; and a deeper commitment to the oral presentation format as the component of the ecosystem that is most resistant to outsourcing and most directly revelatory of genuine understanding.

I also carry a renewed conviction about why the introductory economics course matters. My students are, in many cases, being prepared to become those decision-makers. The economic issues they chose to research in this course are the conditions that will define the lives of the communities my students will

one day have authority over. And that, more than any finding in the formal paper, is what continues to motivate my research.

SPI does not resolve the tensions it surfaces. It names them, holds them, and asks the researcher to live more honestly inside them. I am still the instructor who designed an ecosystem I could not fully sustain. I am still the researcher whose data may have been quietly confounded by tools I could not police. I am still uncertain about where feedback ends and dependency begins. What has changed is that I have named these uncertainties in writing, in public, as a scholar, and, as Rod (2011) suggests, naming them is the first step toward understanding them well enough to act differently. I am not sure I will act differently in every way I intend to. I am carrying the questions into Cycle 2, and that feels like the right way to begin.

References

- Holbrook, M. B. (1986). I'm hip: An autobiographical account of some musical consumption experiences. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 13, 614–618.
- Holbrook, M. B. (1995). *Consumer research: Introspective essays on the study of consumption*. SAGE.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483327334>
- Holbrook, M. B. (2005). Customer value and autoethnography: Subjective personal introspection and the meanings of a photographic collection. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(1), 45–61.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(03\)00079-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00079-1)
- Rod, M. (2011). Subjective personal introspection in action-oriented research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 6(1), 6–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17465641111129362>
- Slavich, G. M., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2012). Transformational teaching: Theoretical underpinnings, basic principles, and core methods. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24(4), 569–608.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-012-9199-6>

Vergara, K. C. S., & Vergara, R. A. G. (2026). Assessing knowledge transformation through an authentic assessment ecosystem: Evidence from a first-cycle classroom action research study in an introductory economics course.

International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 7(6), 2535–2554. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.06.15>