



# CONNEXIONS

Second Technology Issue  
Volume 14, Number 2 Summer 2002

The Publication of the  
International Society  
for Exploring Teaching  
Alternatives

## **President's Message: Teaching with Technology II**

By Bruce Saulnier  
Quinnipiac University

As I sit in my office, fresh from the forays of another semester of teaching with and about technology, I ponder what to write for this issue. As a Professor of Computer Information Systems, technology is both an integral part of my teaching style and the primary basis of my content area. One thing is certain, my learning never ceases: just when I have a new machine or software package down reasonably well, another change or revision comes out.

Just this morning, while collecting my thoughts regarding this issue, I put the string "Teaching with Technology" into the Google search engine, and it returned about 2.340,000 hits. Another certainty – this is certainly a "hot" topic with many self-professed experts ready to give us the latest technological panacea for our classrooms.

In using technology in my classrooms I use two quotes as 2 of the 3 bases of my pedagogical compass: (1) "Good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" – Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach*, p. 10; and (2) "The biggest and most long-lasting reforms of undergraduate education will come when individual faculty or small groups of instructors adopt the view of themselves as reformers within their immediate sphere of influence, the classes they teach every day" – K. Patricia Cross. The third base is Chickering's and Gamson's *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*.

So what does this have to do with teaching with technology? As a Professor of Computer Information Systems, what advice would I give to those concerned with this issue? Simply put: (1) Be Yourself – do not be afraid to admit what you know and what you do not know, and be true to yourself and your identity in the classroom and with colleagues; (2) Be Courageous – do not be afraid to learn and try new methods in the classroom, as long as those methods are geared toward student learning. It's about the students, not about the technology; and (3) Be Humble – recognize that what you are doing is but the latest in a long line of pedagogical methods. Base your methods on sound research in your subject matter; in pedagogy in general, and in your subject matter in particular; and in what we know about how people learn.

## **Technology in the classroom: Bells and Whistles of Technoism or Technological Tools to Facilitate Learning?**

By Beverly J. Davis  
and Alexander W. Crispo  
Purdue University

Recently an instructor shared the fact that when offering a class online for the first time, she missed experiencing "the multiplicity of physical clues and the communicability of the mood." That is, she missed the interpersonal piece that lets her know the current mindset of the students. Instructors are continually pushed and prodded to put classes online. Web education is the wave of the future. The prediction is, better get on board or be left behind. This type of admonishment or the subtle clues that educators routinely experience are a product of "Technoism." "Technoism" is a word to describe the shame, guilt and condemnation one feels when asked if the switch to multimedia or web based education is justifiable. In other words, does the professor dare ask for verification of the perceived or the educational benefits of online courses? One of the most contentious issues is the amount of, or lack of, interaction experienced with online offerings. One student conveyed that it is impossible to experience cultural diversity in a web-based format. It was through open discussions in a live gender and diversity class that the first-hand experience of working with different types of people came to life. Would this reflective moment have occurred if the course had been offered online? Will instructors continue to accept this loss of interpersonal interaction in lieu of the bottom line profits associated with web-based learning driven by "Technoism"?  
*(continued on page 5)*

# CONNEXIONS

Volume 14, Number 2  
Spring 2002

## ISETA PRESIDENT

Bruce Saulnier  
Lender School of Business  
Quinnipiac University  
Hamden, CT 06518  
[Bruce.Saulnier@quinnipiac.edu](mailto:Bruce.Saulnier@quinnipiac.edu)

## EDITOR

Susan Copeland Henry  
Department of Humanities  
Clayton College and State Univ.  
Morrow, GA 30260  
[susanhenry@mail.clayton.edu](mailto:susanhenry@mail.clayton.edu)

## ASSISTANT EDITOR

John Carta-Falsa  
National University  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626  
[CARTA@HOME.COM](mailto:CARTA@HOME.COM)

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Rosemary Christenson  
*University of Wisconsin*  
Lynne Anderson  
*National University*  
Sue Caulfield  
*Western Michigan University*  
Peter Doolittle  
*Virginia Tech*  
David Gillette  
*Truman State University*  
Ann Jablonski  
*Marywood University*  
Jay Larson  
*Great Basin College*  
Dan Lybrook  
*Purdue University*  
Andrew Milks  
*Stark State College*  
Gail Rice  
*Loma Linda University*  
Sally Stephenson  
*Frostburg State University*  
David Wright  
*University of Dayton*

## SUBMISSIONS

Submit articles of 250-1000 words on alternative teaching methods to the editor via regular or e-mail. All articles are peer-reviewed.

## Using Chat Rooms to Promote an Online Community

By Joyce Swofford  
Clayton College and State University

Twenty-four computers. Twenty-four people sitting at the computers. Twenty-four different rooms. Twenty-four students taking an online class. Are they isolated? Well, yes and no: “yes” in the sense of physical isolation, but “no” in the sense of psychological isolation if the instructor for the course is encouraging online communication among his/her students. It’s not easy to do this—to get strangers talking to one another—but it is possible if enough planning has been given to this communication environment as a way of building a sense of online community. As part of a series of faculty development seminars offered during fall semester, I worked with two other team leaders in researching and synthesizing information about online communication as part of the course requirement. The following is a set of guidelines that I composed for the seminar for successfully implementing chats in an online course. The suggestions are divided into four categories: implementation and management, student motivation and training, assessment of student learning using chat sessions, and evaluation of effectiveness of chat sessions.

### Implementation and Management

1. Prepare for the chat by
  - a. Taking a second (or third) look at the directions for the chat to make sure they are clearly stated and will produce the results that you want.
  - b. Having only one major topic per chat session. Keep the students focused.
  - c. Either assigning student groups for chat and giving them class time to agree on a chat time and/or assign times to the four chat rooms so that students can readily access the chat.
  - d. Not scheduling more than three people to a chat if you want everyone to have an opportunity to speak during a 30-minute chat session. If the session is longer, four or five people can participate.
  - e. Giving the students a time limit for a chat session, allowing extra minutes for the socialization that will probably take place at the beginning and ending. Don’t ask the students to chat for more than an hour at a time because they won’t do it anyway.

2. Be flexible in your time range when asking students to complete chat sessions, but have a set beginning date and ending date for completing the chat, preferably  
*(continued on page 7)*

## **Lessons Learned From Jane Doe College Professor**

By Angela Humphrey Brown, Barbara Benson, and Anna P. Uhde  
Piedmont College

The three of us – Jane Doe’s one, two, and three – are typical professors with varying degrees of proficiency and comfort regarding technology. Our recent experiences validate current research regarding barriers encountered by professionals when trying to infuse technology. We have all struggled with multi-faceted problems during our adventures with technology integration. Our experiences are representative of Jane Doe college professors across the country. One of the most important problems that Jane Doe college professors face is the minimal support for faculty in the pursuit of technological infusion. In connection with this problem, three issues that we three Jane Doe’s have also confronted are time, self-esteem, and collaborative mentoring.

Bates (2000) notes that training in itself is not the ultimate solution in preparing Jane Doe college professors to be more savvy in their uses of instructional technology. One of the most important lessons that we three Jane Doe’s learned regarding time was that in addition to allowing time for initial training, one must allot time to use programs and equipment continually so that information is not forgotten. We have each had the experience of learning an important skill during trainings, and yet without ongoing practice, the skill was forgotten. Another issue with time relates to the rapid advancement of technology encountered by the Jane Doe college professor. How can Jane Doe catch up when she is already behind and what she learned last semester is obsolete the following year? There is a relearning curve imbedded in becoming technologically savvy. All three Jane Doe’s first began learning about technology more than 15 years ago and continually sought training in technology. However, the technology practices we Jane Doe’s received in the trainings were no longer cutting-edge practices or were even obsolete by the time we were proficient in using them.

Bates reported that many college professors remain on the fringes of technology because they fear that the integration of technology into their instruction will increase their work load (2000). The situations of us three Jane Doe’s support Bates’ findings. As college professors all three of us have encountered technological issues that led to increased work or lost teaching time. This increased work load had negative effects on the amount of technological infusion in our professional lives.

The typical Jane Doe college professor is not a risk-taker due to the anticipated sense of failure. Technology requires risk-taking. Findings indicate that one predictor of using technology effectively is the computer self-efficacy of the college professor (Hirschbuhl & Faseyitan, 1994). We three Jane Doe’s continually make efforts to increase our knowledge base of technology and yet we do not reach our goals for using technology in the teaching/learning process. We read about technology practices, we attend instructional technology workshops, but we three Jane Doe college professors know that our level of proficiency is limited. Consequently, insecurities emerge and the self-perceptions of technological competence decrease. Our experiences tell us that the Jane Doe college professor does not have enough practice to make technology work the way she wants it to work. One’s lack of experience confounds one’s sense of insecurity and lack of a strong self-concept. Once having successfully integrated technology into one aspect of instruction, a professor’s confidence and enthusiasm will likely increase (Hirschbuhl & Faseyitan, 1994).

According to Spotts and Bowman (1995), “most articles about technology in higher education appear to be based on anecdotal evidence about outstanding professors who are using the latest innovations in dramatic and highly effective ways” (p. 58). Current literature continues to emphasize cutting edge technology practices by a few as if it were the norm of Jane Doe college professors across college campuses. The Jane Doe college professor never seems to receive enough training and practice to reach the bar described in current literature. It is a vicious cycle that perpetuates frustration of never reaching the “cutting edge” of instructional technology integration in the teaching/learning process.

One important lesson that we three Jane Doe college professors have learned related to collaboration is the need for scaffolding when providing technological information and the opportunities for performance. As in other skill areas that require instruction and practice, there is an apprenticeship inherent in the acquisition of technology expertise between the technologically savvy and the Jane Doe user. We three Jane Doe’s get frustrated when those who are technologically savvy do not seem to have the time or patience to aid us in our quest for effective technology infusion. This makes it difficult for Jane  
*(continued on page 9)*

## The Pedagogy of Technology – Our Next Frontier?

By Jerry W. Samples

University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown

ISETA has been working for years to provide alternatives to the lecture and to advance the cause of student centered learning. Today, technology is advertised as advancing the frontier of student centered learning. Technology is being adopted as a solution to student centered learning at a rapid pace. The term “technology” includes a broad range of systems from in-class technologies to those used to build distance learning systems. Is technology providing what it advertises? The question to be asked when evaluating the use of technology is: will the desired learning modes be satisfied? If not, what is the impact of technology on the learning? What are the upper and lower limits on learning to have an effective learning experience? Finally, when does the pedagogy fail to support the use of technology and student learning? (Lloyd). It is important to remember that “what improves learning is well designed instruction.” (ANTA) This is the case without regard to the methodology.

Pedagogy is “the science or profession of teaching; also, the theory or the teaching how to teach” (Funk & Wagnall). Pedagogy therefore, can be considered the study of the profession of teaching. It is the development of the learning environment and the practice of methods that provide that learning environment. The practice of good teaching has been the subject of many books and countless articles. One such article was the *AAHE Bulletin* that contained the “Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” (Chickering). “The seven practices are:

1. Good Practice Encourages Contacts Between Students.
2. Good Practice Develops Reciprocity and Cooperation Among Students and Faculty.
3. Good Practice Uses Active Learning Techniques.
4. Good Practice Gives Prompt Feedback.
5. Good Practice Emphasizes Time on Task.
6. Good Practice Communicates High Expectations.
7. Good Practice Respects Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning.” (Chickering)

Armed with these and some fundamental presentation and interpersonal skills a professor is on the way to being a master. So why worry about technology?

Unfortunately, in the current economic environment on most campuses there is a drive to “Write Once – Distribute Everywhere” (Lloyd). There is a drive to use technology to assist in the delivery of course materials, to increase enrollments and to reduce costs. Where are we in the development of the pedagogy to support this new learning “methodology”? An answer is that “we first use new technology in old ways.” (Gillespie). It is common that as the new technologies are introduced to use them the old way. Notes are converted to overhead slides, slides to PowerPoint, and PowerPoint is placed on the computer to form the basis of distance education. No more old yellowed paper notes but - the same old material. The same material developed for one medium is presented via a new medium.

The new medium can be any level of technology; however, distance education may require the most study because of the lack of contact between students and teachers, learners and facilitators. In “Implementing the Seven Principles, Technology as Lever”, it is clear from the beginning that technology is a tool. “Faculty members who already work with students in ways consistent with the Principles need to be tough-minded about the software- and technology- assisted interactions they create and buy into. They need to eschew materials that are simply didactic, and search instead for those that are interactive, problem oriented, relevant to real world issues, and that evoke student motivation.” (Chickering). Student motivation is one of the most important factors to academic success. Poorly developed instruction can reduce motivation. So, is it the technology or the professor that causes this loss of motivation? Essentially it is the lack of pedagogy: an instructor problem.

The Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) indicates that technology is coming before pedagogy: “The value of any technology for education is proportional to the needs for that technology to realise educational objectives. We are constantly reminded that learning must be developed around learning needs, meeting educational objectives and producing viable graduates. However, at this stage of development, the effort put into exploring technologies to ‘keep at the cutting edge’ is at the expense of equal investment in the underpinning educational design.” Further, there is an argument that repackaging of lecture handouts to satisfy technological media is not the type of redevelopment necessary to effectively

use the technology. Development requires knowledge of best practices and a sincere effort to make the distance event like the classroom on campus. “Teachers who are applying good instructional design principles to online learning are likely to have been the ones who have always done so regardless of the medium” (ANTA).

So, how does this impact ISETA? Should it impact ISETA? Pedagogy is “the science or profession of teaching; also, the theory or the teaching how to teach.” (Funk & Wagnall). It is important that the pedagogy is included in instructional design and that professors spend the time to learn about the medium and develop the pedagogy rather than repackage the old yellow notes. Good teachers teach well regardless of medium. Good teachers investigate the pedagogy of the medium and work to ensure that learning is being accomplished. The best practice can be a lever with the use of technology. Technology is a tool, not the solution to learning. The pedagogy of teaching with technology is lagging behind the technology. It is important that pedagogy and technology be developed together to ensure the maximum learning experience is available to students. ISETA has been impacting pedagogy for years. It may be time to impact this new teaching method by being part of the solution: The developers of pedagogy that makes technology a better teaching and learning vehicle.

#### REFERENCES

- Australian National Training Authority (ANTA). Teaching and Learning Styles that Facilitate Online Learning. <http://www.tafe.sa.edu.au/lsrc/one/natproj/tal/pedissues/pedaiss.htm>
- Chickering, A.W., and Ehrmann, S.C. (1996). Implementing the Seven Principles: Technology as Lever. AAHE Bulletin (October), [www.aahe.org/bulletin.htm](http://www.aahe.org/bulletin.htm).
- Funk & Wagnalls New College Standard Dictionary. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1950.
- Gillespie, F. (1998). Instructional Design for the New Technologies. The Impact of Technology on Faculty Development, Life, and Work, 76 (winter), 45.
- Lloyd, A.D. (2000). Pedagogy vs. Competition in Higher Education Distance Learning. Educational Technology & Society, 3(2), [http://ifets.ieee.org/periodical/vol\\_2\\_2000/lloyd.htm](http://ifets.ieee.org/periodical/vol_2_2000/lloyd.htm).
- 

*(continued from page 1)*

The effectiveness of online courses is still hotly debated although most technology advocates would have you believe that it is the only way to go in the future. Do students really gain the knowledge and skills necessary via a computer interface? A recent advertisement offered an online course in public speaking. It is difficult to visualize how a student could develop public speaking skills online. Many have suggested that educational institutions will experience financial windfalls from Internet courses, but what are the long-term implications for the students? At the risk of sounding like Luddites we would like to consider a few issues when it comes to the marriage of education and technology. Technology certainly should be part of academe and a useful pedagogical tool. Here are some insights on how educators can effectively use technology in the learning process:

1. Don't sacrifice substance for style. The most controversial topic in relation to online courses is the quality of the material of the specific offering. Does style over shadow substance? Although designing online courses may keep an instructor in the technological loop and may demonstrate graphical skills, is substance lost when the bells and whistles are the main focus of the course? Online courses can be designed effectively if the designer is aware of this issue and does not lose focus of course objectives. Learning objectives must take precedence over style. Studies have shown that at the university level, many students feel that the use of modern technology only provides an attractive presentation format but does little to enhance the learning.

2. Another strong argument against online courses is the lack of interaction and contact. As earlier mentioned, the classroom experience will not be duplicated online. There is something isolating and limiting with electronic communication. If an educator chooses online course design, a good rule of thumb is to offer virtual office hours and possibly student-to-student project work so the students can experience a holistic educational experience.
3. Find a technique to offer up to the minute feedback on homework and projects. Research consistently shows that a learner-centered environment consists of personal feedback. Feedback that is personal demonstrates interest in the student's learning, and developmentally this motivates the student.
4. Don't sacrifice your teaching philosophy because of "Technoism." If you must participate in distance education, evaluate your teaching philosophy and determine how technology fits your personal teaching objectives. If students derive energy and enthusiasm from your personal contacts, distance education may not be for you. Technology might be the wave of the future but possibly only the future of those who want to embrace it. Your teaching has been honed over years of experience. If there are high tech tools out there that will improve your students learning, use them. If "Technoism" is pushing you just for the sake of new technology, make sure what you currently do is broken before you reinvent it.
5. Lastly, do not use technology for the sake of technology without evaluating its educational usefulness. Will the technology enhance the learning experience? Will it facilitate learning of course objectives? Will it provide reasonable return on investment; will this investment better prepare students for the future? A recent study of K-12 educators found a common complaint centering on the fact that school systems purchased the latest technology due to "Technoism" and not because it enhanced learning. Sometimes new makes students nervous and anxious and puts undue pressure on them to learn the technology, thus taking away from the time spent learning course materials.

"Technoism" may be the driving force behind the inundation of technology in education. If faculty don't stand firm against the encroachment of web based learning and the so-called Internet University, a few multimedia superstars will build and market electronic courseware that is one size and fits all. It will be similar to having the same Wal-Mart in every town. This will threaten the community of scholars, eliminate diverging views and could ultimately put education in the hands of a few. Sound ludicrous; look at the number of mergers and acquisitions in the business world. Education is following in these same footsteps.

It is time to step back and evaluate technology in our institutions. Faculty must openly discuss distance education and make educated choices without fear of reprisal or condemnation.

#### REFERENCES

- Davis, B. J., & Crispo, A. W. (2001). Technoism: Suppressed skepticism and the technology revolution. *Proceedings of the Emerging Issues in Business and Technology Conference, USA*, 27.
- Jennings, L. (2001, January-February). Alternative visions for the future university. *The Futurist*, 58-59.
- Stoll, C., (1995). *Silicon Snake Oil*. New York, NY: Doubleday
- World trends and forecasts, (2001, September-October). The cyber children have arrived. *The Futurist*, 14-15.

*(continued from page 2)*

- within a one-week time span.
3. Encourage people to be on time for the chat so that everyone “hears” everything that is said and no repeats have to be made for latecomers. If there are unpreventable latecomers, be courteous by orienting them as to what has been going on so far in the conversation.
  4. Copy and paste their chat log for either your reference or for posting for students who couldn’t attend the chat session. This is particularly important if the group is completing an ongoing group project.
  5. If the instructor is a participant in the chat session, he/she might want to design a system equivalent to “raising your hand” to take turns to talk so that the chat conversation can be a little more controlled and sequential. Also, allow students time at the end of the chat for questions and answers, even at the very end for off the immediate topic questions. (Others disinterested can log off then.)
  6. Give the students the topic before the scheduled day of the chat. This could be giving them assigned readings, topics for discussion, questions to answer, problems to solve. These can be given out on the calendar posting for the chat, on the discussion board, or through emails.
  7. Tell the students (and instructor should also) to have his/her preparation information at hand when sitting down for the chat so that the participants are ready to begin at the scheduled beginning time.
  8. Take roll at the beginning in case you lose your connection.
  9. Use chat rooms for meaningful learning experiences: it might be brainstorming before writing a paper, discussing group assignments, comparing answers to questions, reviewing for a test, clarifying difficult concepts in the class material, holding virtual office hours, asking and answering questions, etc.
  10. Guest speakers can make an interesting chat if the students are intellectually prepared for the experience.

### *Student Motivation and Training*

1. Make sure all students can access the chat rooms and know how to operate the chat room techniques.
2. Teach students (and the instructor should do this also) to respond by prefacing with a name to whom you are responding to help give the chat sequence more logical continuity. If the comment is to more than one person, reference a bit of the original comment in the response, so as to “pinpoint” the object of the response.
3. Think twice about how much it counts as a grade because other commitments might legitimately prevent some students from participating, and this doesn’t seem fair.
4. Do count the participation in some way as part of their grade, or they aren’t as motivated to participate.
5. Teach students (and instructor should do this also) to break up long responses into shorter entries. In other words, hit “enter” after a couple of lines and then keep typing the same sentence or paragraph. This helps the readers grasp the thoughts as they come to the writer and also prevents others from jumping into the conversation and causing a loss in continuity.
6. Teach students to prepare questions and comments in a Word file that they can then copy and paste into the conversation at appropriate times. This is particularly useful if a problem/scenario has been solved/considered before the chat ever begins and everyone is supposed to contribute a response before the discussion begins.
7. Teach the students chat etiquette.

### *Assessment of Student Learning Using Chat Sessions*

1. Remember that some students cannot type as fast as others, so their comments are going to be disjointed. Also related to typing speed is the realization that the “loudest” students are not always the best participants. Sometimes, people “speak” for power.

2. Chats are good places for one-on-one “oral” quizzes. This can be time-consuming probably no more so than person-to-person oral quizzes.
3. If it doesn’t count a whole lot, the chat could be used as a quiz for the three or four participants in the chat session. Their responses give a pretty good idea of how well they understand the material or if they have given critical thought to the previously read scenario and reached any conclusions.
4. Use a chat session as a “debriefing” exercise, asking questions about the assignment if you suspect plagiarism.
5. Having weekly critiques of students’ performance in the field could be conveniently held in a chat room. Have set times for each student from the beginning of the semester so that they know when to log on for their individual sessions with the instructor.
6. Participate in some chat sessions (not all because you don’t have the time if there are too many) so that you can monitor a chat that you want to assess for quality of interactions. (This can also be assessed by the instructor reading the chat logs.)
7. To assess a series of chats, students could take turns summarizing the most important lessons learned in each chat session and submitting them to the others and/or to the instructor. The instructor can randomly validate these summary submissions against the actual chat logs.
8. During a chat time in which the whole class participates, three or four members could carry on a “panel discussion” while the rest of the class “lurks.” Or the group could make “presentations” to the rest of the class. (This could also lead to an in-class discussion based on the online presentation.)
9. At the end of the semester, students could reflect on how he/she has benefited from participation in the chat sessions during the semester. Students could also evaluate other chat participants if they have had several chat sessions together. If this is done, a set of agreed upon criteria available at the beginning the sessions might be the fairest way to do peer evaluations.
10. Chat sessions could be explicit sources of exam questions.
11. Chat sessions could be spin-offs for extended research projects. If desired, the instructor could require students to use issues/questions/etc. that are raised in chat sessions as a basis for further research and reporting.

#### Evaluation of Effectiveness of Chat Sessions

1. Have clear goals and objectives for the chat sessions. Evaluate effectiveness of the chats based on these goals and objectives. Know clearly the results you want.
2. Design written criteria for an effective chat before the chat sessions begin. Use criteria measures that won’t produce ambiguous responses.
3. Be alert, however, for unintended consequences, both positive and negative, as a result of a chat session. Be alert to evaluation criteria that might emerge during a chat session, ways of evaluating the session or the student participation that you hadn’t thought of before.
4. If the purpose of the chat session is to save class time for other instructional activities, evaluate if the chat activity was best served by being conducted online or if it should truly have taken place in the class setting.
5. Giving opportunity for students to take more responsibility for their own learning or for intellectual exploration and creativity (when instructor not present) are both legitimate uses of chat sessions.
6. Allow students to respond to chat sessions with opinions about both their social and task satisfaction after having participated in the chat experience.
7. Remember, don’t do a chat just to be doing a chat. It’s a waste of everyone’s time and energy.

If the course is a web-enhanced course, utilizing online technology but not relying on it, these suggestions will also work in that environment. The important concept to realize is that good chats don’t just happen. They are planned events, and it’s up to the instructor to create an interactive, meaningful, and pleasant learning environment that encourages the students to participate actively in the class.

## REFERENCES

- Boettcher, Judith V. and Rita-Marie Conrad (1999). Faculty Guide for Moving Teaching and Learning to the Web. Mission Viego, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Jolliffe, Alan, Ritter, Jonathan, and Stevens, David (2001). The Online Learning Handbook. London: Krogan Page Limited.
- Ko, Susan and Rossen, Steve (2001). Teaching Online: A Practical Guide. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001.
- Maier, Pat and Warren, Adam (2000). Integrating Technology in Learning & Teaching: A Practical Guide for Educators. London: Krogan Page Limited.
- Palloff, Rena M. and Pratt, Keith (1999). Building Learning Communities in Cyberspace. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schweizer, Heidi (1999). Designing and Teaching an On-line Course. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- 

*(continued from page 3)*

Doe's to ask for assistance when we feel that the expert is too busy, condescending, and/or impatient. Many times, in working with the technological gurus, the Jane Doe college professor may feel intimidated and technologically illiterate. The Jane Doe may feel technologically abused and thus her self-esteem is negatively impacted.

Positive attitudes towards the infusion of technology and the development of technological skills are enhanced through a risk-free environment (Richards, 1999). In a safe collaborative environment, the person who provides the scaffolding is committed to helping Jane Doe college professor at her current level of technology development through an encouraging and supportive atmosphere. We three Jane Doe's have established a risk-free environment through an open atmosphere working with other Jane Doe's where ideas have been shared and mistakes have been permitted in the acquisition of technology skills. To handle our fear of being technologically abused, we three Jane Doe's have learned to move smoothly in and out of the mentor/apprentice roles as needed to complete the task at hand. For example, through her collaboration with the other two Jane Doe's, Jane Doe Three learned several new strategies for editing efficiently on the computer during the creation of this exposé.

The revelations from our technology experiences lead to questions that need to be explored by Jane Doe college professors as well as the technologically savvy professors in every post-secondary institution. The Jane Doe's highlighted in this exposé request that the questions below permeate the reflections of all of those in higher education who are committed to effective technology integration in the teaching/learning process. How can the one-hour "technology workshop" method be incorporated to have a greater impact on the technological development of Jane Doe college professor? What role should college administration take in supporting Jane Doe college professors to develop their technology integration? How can those in higher education who are technologically savvy help effectively scaffold the technological development of the Jane Doe college professors? How can we create an on-campus environment which encourages and facilitates professors using technology effectively in the teaching/learning process?

## REFERENCES

- Bates, T. (2000). Managing technological change: Strategies for college and university leaders. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hirschbuhl, J.J., & Faseyitan, S.O. (1994). Faculty uses of computers: Fears, facts and perceptions. T.H.E. Journal, 21, 64-65.
- Richards, R.T. (1999). Lessons learned from teaching with technology: A critical perspective. Tech Trends, 43(4), 31-33.
- Spotts, T.H., & Bowman, M.A. (1995). Faculty use of instructional technologies in higher education. Educational Technology, 35, 56-64.

Susan Copeland Henry, Editor  
Connexions  
Department of Humanities  
Clayton College and State University  
Morrow, GA 30260

**CALL FOR PARTICIPATION  
32<sup>nd</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE:  
ISETA 2002**

**SHERATON STATION  
SQUARE HOTEL  
PITTSBURGH, PA**

**OCTOBER 24-26, 2002  
HOSTED BY POINT PARK  
COLLEGE**

**SEE [HTTP://WWW.ISETA.ORG](http://www.iseta.org)**

**Editor's Postscript**

By Susan Copeland Henry

This was an interesting edition to put together because the writers were approaching the issue of teaching with technology from vastly different angles, and the articles really reflect the variety of pedagogical, philosophical, psychological, and practical concerns, tensions, and ideas across college and university campuses. They also indicate the vastly different levels of infrastructure and technical support which various campuses possess, as well as the availability of training or lack thereof. This is a good dialogue to open, and we all can learn from each other about what the possibilities and problems are.

At CCSU we were blessed – or some were cursed! – with the Information Technology Project (1997-2000) during which rooms were wired, all students rented laptops, and we received (and continue to receive) excellent training and support. In that time we made a number of mistakes, but we also learned some things that seem to work. Much of what we have available regarding tech support is on the Web. For downloadable instructions on many topics ranging from Web page design to PowerPoint to WebCT, please visit <http://learningcenter.clayton.edu/fidl/online.htm>. Martha Wicker, our faculty development coordinator, has placed all of her workshop materials to share with us and with other colleagues.

As a hopeless lover of gadgetry, I tend to embrace technology and have developed or found some effective tools for teaching and learning. For instance, I use technology to teach “de-centered” classes in my literature courses. For those who would like a description of the literature course methods, please scroll down to the link to my paper at the following address:

<http://home.maconstate.edu/conf2001/main.htm>. For those interested in trying this method, I will be glad to export my collected online resources to others' e-mail accounts with a description of how to import them and open them. Other colleagues like June Legge and David Ludley use different levels of technology depending on their comfort levels, and each has also met with great results.

If anyone has any other resources or methods, please share; we need to help each other. Among the pedagogical certainties, though, are that technology is not for everyone and that technology is one more vehicle, one more tool, and should not stand in the way of course content and learning. Also, it will never diminish the role and importance of the good teacher.