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Time Not Wasted: 30 Ideas and Strategies
1. Network with others at conferences
2. Conduct tech integration brainstorming meetings at lunches and dinners
3. Every time embed new technology, think of research around it
4. Recruit student volunteers
5. Think of conferences to present at

Time Not Wasted: 30 Ideas and Strategies
6. Obtain human subjects on class
7. Listen to students
8. Have students demonstrate technology ideas
9. Share with others in the dept.
10. Plan ahead

Time Not Wasted: 30 Ideas and Strategies
11. Link and build research across classes or semesters
12. Collaborate with former students in other states and countries
13. Collegial mentoring of former students
14. Apply or get nominated for teaching awards
15. Look for mentors and role models

Time Not Wasted: 30 Ideas and Strategies
16. Build time in planner
17. When read about a new technology that is interesting, take note of it
18. Write to others using such technologies (for advice, symposia, etc.)
19. Apply for summer monies to incorporate technologies
20. Look for courses not being researched but have goldmines of data
Time Not Wasted: 30 Ideas and Strategies

21. Look for innovative colleagues
22. Put examples of tech integration at personal Website
23. Make a list of possible journals to publish in (share list with team)
24. Write to the editors of such journals and scan journals
25. Write or edit a book on what you did

26. Create model of acronym
27. Attend state and national conferences on teaching (quick vita line items)
28. Reflect on multiple studies and try to make sense of your journey
29. Blog on your pedagogical ideas
30. Read Campus Technology, etc.

Idea for Resistant, Reluctant, and Hesitant Instructors

- Examples
- Success stories
- Faculty dept discussions
- Recognition
- Showcases
- Make resources available online
- Make tech integration part of the culture

Ok, Million Dollar Question: How can you get resistant faculty to use technology?

Sources of Faculty Resistance

ION Faculty Trainers - Presentations
January 18, 2002
http://www.Ion.Illinois.edu/Present/presentations/020118/facrescomments.asp

1. No time
2. Don’t want to be forced
3. Concerns about quality
4. Concerns about losing control
5. Competence (fear of technology)
6. Not appropriate for MY discipline
7. Not good online; skepticism
8. Negative perceptions of distance courses
9. Lack of recognition this expands audience
10. Resource diverted from trad ed

11. Learning how to teach online takes time
12. Just a fad—this too shall pass
13. Overhearing the frustrations of online faculty
14. Enthusiasts sound like members of a cult
15. Focused on content; no time for technology
16. No appreciation it’s an incremental process
17. Marketing responsibilities for online courses
18. Some faculty don’t have basic computer skills
19. Threatened by younger faculty
20. Concerns about large classes
Inhibiting Factor List for Distance Ed
Catherine Schifter, Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, Volume V, Number 1, Spring 2002

1. Concern about faculty workload
2. Negative comments made by colleagues about distance ed teaching experiences
3. Lack of training from institution
4. Lack of dept colleague encouragement
5. Lack of release time
6. Lack of professional prestige
7. Lack of technical background
8. Lack of support from dean or chair

Inhibiting Factor List for Distance Ed
Catherine Schifter, Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, Volume V, Number 1, Spring 2002

9. Lack of grants for materials/expenses
10. Concern about quality of courses
11. Lack of technical support from institution
12. Lack of merit pay
13. Lack of support from administrators
14. Lack of monetary support (stipend, overload pay)
15. Concern about quality of students
16. Lack of salary increase
17. Lack of credit toward promotion and tenure

Possible Solutions
ION Faculty Trainers - Presentations
January 18, 2002
http://www.ion.illinois.edu/Present/presentations/020118/ 
facrescomments.asp

1. Staff are there to help them, not to dictate.
2. Promote training/development in dept mgts
3. Not redesigning their course, but focusing on how to make it work online.
4. Reassure faculty—not perfect the first time
5. Show examples of what DOES work, developed by their peers, not techies.
6. Get them to take small steps (e.g., email)
7. Force faculty members to use technology

How Support Faculty?

- Show and Tell, Tech Fair, Share, Brown Bags,
- Design Web pages to support teaching
- Faculty technology mentor program
- Create resident experts for faculty dev
- Modeling from deans and chairs
- Incentives
  - hardware, software upgrades, new equip priority
  - travel monies
  - discretionary dollars
  - assistance in writing grants for technology

More Support (Rogers, 2000)

- Internal Support:
  - IC, help desk, tech support onsite,
  - small pots of funding, active learning grants
  - summer workshops, colloqs, faculty institutes
  - laptop programs
  - salient on annual reports, encourage research on teaching, include in tenure requirements
- External Support: tech training, courses, certificate, resources, conferences, newsletters, join network (e.g., GEN), consortia

Technology and Professional Development:
Ten Tips to Make it Better
(Rogers, 2000, Ed Tech Review)

1. Offer training
2. Give technology to take home
3. Provide on-site technical support
4. Encourage collegial collaboration
5. Send to professional develop conference
6. Stretch the day
7. Encourage research
8. Provide online resources
9. Influence preservice education
10. Celebrate success
Types of Training
(Rogers, 2000; Ed Tech Review)

- 1:1; just-in-time, help desk
- Small group workshops
- Departmental
- Interactive CBT or WBT
- Tutorials
- Teletraining (distance learning)
- Lunch Bytes
- Faculty Institutes
- Multimedia User Groups
- Mentors

Ten More Ideas from PT3 Grants

1. Conduct needs assessment (Texas A&M, Sonoma St)
2. Involve faculty in planning (UNC)
3. Communicate training opp (Maryland Dept of Ed)
4. Estab tech requirements for tenure (Sonoma St)
5. Develop database of projects (Univ of Houston)
6. Develop partnerships (Wichita State)
7. Provide stipends for participation (Valdosta State)
8. Offer key tech workshops (Indiana State)
9. Create best practice workshops (Niagara University)
10. Encourage student centered model (Univ of SD)

10 More Ideas:
How to Support Resistant Faculty

1. Present Enrollment Trends and Projections

2. Make it clear that this will not go away...

3. Showcase Best Practices
4. Showcase Free Tools as Incentive

5. Convince Them by Summarizing the Research.

6. Develop and Use New Teaching Models and Frameworks

7. Find Incentives that Work

8. Create a Portal and Online Help System
9. Offer Portals, Certificates, Institutes, and Degrees

10. Share Pedagogical Strategies that Can Implement Immediately

Multiple Pieces to this Story

Areas of Current Research
1. Wikibook creation and ownership
3. Open source movement in North America and China
4. Synchronous instruction with Breeze
5. Blended learning in corp trng in 5-6 countries
6. Development of online communities in online MBA program
7. Virtual teaming and case learning in online MBA program
8. Creativity and collaboration in online art and design program called Omnium
9. Motivation in online environments
10. Delphi study of blended learning experts on collaboration in blended learning

My Research Interests
- Professional Interests:
  - Nontraditional/informal learning and distance education; Web-based training and teaching; blended learning, online mentoring, interactive learning environments; collaborative learning tools; online learning communities; adult education; problem-based learning; learning in a social context; collaborative writing technologies; alternative instructional strategies; future learning technologies.

Sociocultural Ideas (Bonk & Cunningham, 1998)
1. Shared Space and Build Intersubjectivity
2. Social Dialogue on Authentic Problems (mind is in social interaction and extends beyond skin)
3. Mentoring and Teleapprenticeships
4. Scaffolding and Electronic Assistance in ZPD
5. Group Processing and Reflection
6. Collaboration and Negotiation in ZPD
7. Choice and Challenge
8. Community of Learning with Experts & Peers
9. Portfolio Assessment and Feedback
10. Assisted Learning (e.g., task structuring)
11. Reciprocal Teaching & Peer Collaboration
Cognitive Apprenticeship

- Learners should be acculturated into an established community of practice. This is done through guided participation, scaffolding, and a gradual transfer of responsibility for the learning from the more experienced partner to the learner.

Scaffolding in one’s ZPD (Robert Slavin, 1963)

- The learner is guided towards the zone of proximal development.

10 Stories over 15 Years

1. 1993-1994: Peace, dude, hop off the return key, save me some stress.
2. 1995: What if Vygotsky had lived to 100...
3. 1996: Do not ride your bike to work.
4. 1997: Look out for the Russians...
5. 1998: Do you believe in the power of sharing?
6. 2001: You were in, but you were never there.
7. 1998-2005: Who needs a TICKIT?
8. 2004-2006: Data at your fingertips.
10. 2006-2007: Where is a Wikibookian when you need one?

Taxonomy: Level of Collaborative Tool
(Bonk, Medury, & Reynolds, 1994)

Level 0: Stand Alone Tools
Level 1: E-mail and Delayed Messaging Tools
Level 2: Remote Access/Delayed Collab Tools
Level 3: RT Dialoguing and Idea Gen Tools
Level 4: RT Collaboration (text only)
Level 5: Cooperative Hypermedia
Level 6: Tools That Don’t Fit Nicely

Web Conferencing Tools

- VaxNOTES
- NiceNet
- WebCrossing
- Sitescape Forum
- COW
- FirstClass
- WebCT, Blackboard, Virtual U, etc.
Research on Electronic Cases

1. RT vs. Delayed Collab
   - Groups Preset by Major
   - Tchr Generated Cases
   - Local/Univ. Networks
   - Limited Instructor Mentoring

2. Web-Based Conference
   - Grps Formed on Interest
   - Student Gen. Cases
   - World Wide Web
   - Extensive Instructor and Peer Mentoring

Study #1: 1993/1994
(Bank, Hansen, Grabner, Lazar, and Mirabella, 1998)

- Two Semester: VAXNotes vs. Connect
- Two Conditions: (1) Real-time vs. (2) Delayed
- Subjects = 65 secondary ed majors
  (5 grps: PE, Foreign Language, Social Studies, English, Math)
- Mentors = limited instructor commenting
- Procedures:
  - (1) Respond to 4 cases in small groups
  - (2) Respond to peer comments

Research Questions: Study #1

1. What social interactions occur in real-time & delayed?
2. How code electronic social interaction patterns?
3. How do case size & complexity affect grp processing?
4. Do RT or delayed foster > discuss depth & quality?
5. Do shared experiences stimulate grp intersubjectivity?

Some Findings From Study #1

- Delayed Collab > Elaboration
  - 1,287 words/interaction vs. 266 words/interaction
- RT Collab > Responses
  - 9.1 comments/person/case vs. 3.3 comments/person
- Low off-task behaviors (about 10%)
- Rich data, but hard to code
- Students excited to write & publish ideas
- Minimal q's and feedback
- Interaction inc. over time; common zones
- Some student domination

Example of real-time dialogue:

- How might he deal with these students? Well, he might flunk them. He might make them sit in the corner until they can get the problem correct...I don't know. (Un...hello...Jaime where is your valuable insight to these problems?) (October 26, 1993, Time: 11:19:37, Ellen Lister, Grp 5).
Example of Delayed Dialogue:

Joyce’s new system offers a wide variety of assessment forms. These different forms complement the diverse learning and test taking abilities of her students. Joyce seems to cover the two goals of classroom assessment with her final exam—to increase learning and increase participation. Students will increase their learning because they will not just remember information to regurgitate on an exam, but instead they will store these items in their long-term memory and later may be able to make a general transfer. Joyce will increase student participation because she has deviated from the normal assessment method expected by her students.

Joyce’s test will probably be both reliable and valid considering that she implemented three different forms of tests. Joyce’s test also might reduce test anxiety. If her students know what to expect on the test (they even write the questions) they are more likely to be less anxious on exam day... (January 31, 1994, Time: 59:28, Sarah Femway, Language Group.)

Sample of Larry’s Comments....

- “Peace, dude, hop off the return key, saw me some stress.”
- “I am currently preparing my anti-groupwork support group.”
- “I’ve noticed several people writing and saying that they would have done this or that brilliant or intuitive thing. I personally am brilliant or intuitive and I think other could use a little humility. This Karen’s made some mistakes, but we all make mistakes, and when (dare I say), we are in her shoes, we should expect to make some of the same ones that confound her.”

Story #2 (1995): What if Vygotsky had lived to 100...?

Sample Projects
1. Peer scaffolded support with technology.
2. Critical thinking with tech supports.
3. PBL situations and role play
4. Scaffolded learning from the Arctic.
5. Forms of online e-mail assistance.
6. Bring experts to teach at any time.
7. Online case learning and exam preparation.
8. Alternating class and online activities.
9. Roles in electronic discussions.
10. Structure electronic role play.
Patterns of Knowledge Construction in Electronic Discussion (Zhu, 1998)

Adventure Learning Purpose: engage in adventurous study of the global environment (e.g., Telepresence or virtual fieldtrips, ask an expert forums, cross-classroom collaboration, debate forums, online communities, MayaQuest, the Jason Project)

Adventure Learning Findings (Bonk & Sugar, 1998)

Aspects within Aspects (Cooney, 1998)

Implications: Build Courses Based on Sociocultural Principles (Bonk, 1998)

Smartweb Activities
- Weekly Chapter Activ
- Starter-Wrapper Disc
- Personal Profiles
- Student Portfolios
- Feedback on Portfolios
- Links Prior Semesters
- Field Reflections
- Field Observ Case Disc
- Café Latte

Sociocultural Link
- Connect to Experience
- Recip Teach & Dialogue
- Build Intersubjectivity
- Dynamic Assessment
- Scaffolding within Zones
- Modeling and Legacy
- Apprentices Learning
- Scaffolded & Authentic
- Shared Knowledge

Story #3 (1996): Do not ride your bike to work.
Three Basic Levels:
1. Conference (public or private)
2. Topic (e.g., special education)
3. Conversation (e.g., reading rewards)

Purpose of COW Project
- Students in field experiences write cases
- Teachers and students from around the world provide electronic mentoring
- Authentic cases and mentoring transform learning environment
- Helps preserve teachers understand the role of technology in education
Problems Solved By COW

- Student isolation in field experiences
- Lack of community/dialogue among teacher education participants
- Disconnectedness between class and field experience
- Limited reflective practices of novice teachers
- Need for appreciation of multiple perspectives

Quantitative Methods

Average results for prior to TITLE (TITLE):
- Participants per semester: 130 (>300)
- Cases per semester: 230 (624)
- Cases per student: 1.75 (same 1.80)
- Average responses per case: 4.5 (3.9)
- Average words per case: 100-140 (198)

Types of Heavy Scaffolding:
1. Social Acknowledgement
2. Questioning
3. Direct Instruction
4. Modeling/Demonstration
5. Feedback/Practise
6. Cognitive Task Structuring
7. Cognitive Feedback/Explorations
8. Push to Eager
9. Promoting Reflection/Self Awareness
10. Transposing/Articulation/Dialogue Promoting
11. Scaffolding/Booklet/Suggestions
12. Management

Bonk, Angeli, Malikowski, & Suppes, 2001)
Transcript Results

A. Peer Content Talk
   31% Social Acknowledgments
   60% Unsupported Claims and Opinions
   7% Justified Claims
   2% Dialogue Extension Q's and Stmt

B. Mentor Scaffolding
   24% Feedback, Praise, and Social
   24% General Advice and Suggestions
   20% Scaffolding and Socratic Questioning
   16% Providing Examples and Models
   8% Low Level Questioning
   8% Direct Instruction & Explanations/Elab

Study: COW, Spring 1998
(Bonk, Mallikowski, Supplee, & Dennen, 2000)

- Two Month Conference (One Condition)
  - 3 discussion areas (TU, Finland, and Cultural Immersions)
- Subjects = 110 students
  (80 US and 30 Finnish students)
- Mentors = 2 AIs, 1 supervisor, 4 coop tcrs, 3 conference moderators.
- Videoconferences + Web Conferences

Overall Major Findings

- COW enhanced student learning
  - provided a link between classroom and field connected to textbook concepts
  - encouraged learning about technology
- COW extended student learning
  - students got feedback from multiple sources and outside their community
  - students saw international perspective
- COW transformed student learning
  - students took ownership for learning
  - students co-constructed knowledge base

Qualitative Themes Continued...

- Students were attracted to cases that...
  - had interesting titles
  - were on familiar topics
  - were on controversial topics
  - they had opinions about
- Peer feedback was appreciated but not deep
- Mentor feedback was apprec. & motivating

Finnish Cases Were Longer and more Reflective and Often Co-Authored...

Let's consider a math class in an elementary school as an example. Often a teacher teaches the new subject area and after that pupil/practice counting those exercises. When a pupil has finished s/he receives extra exercises, or s/he is asked to do some work in other subjects but s/he is not allowed to continue further in the math book. Should the pupil be allowed to continue further on his own? There is no danger that if s/he continues s/he will make more mistakes than if s/he waits until the teacher has taught the next step in the subject area. However, is it dangerous to do mistakes? Do teachers suppose that outside school there is always someone to tell what to do and how to do it in a right way?

Moya Ford Washington states in her summary: "It is painful to consider that a good portion of America's gifted and talented students spend most of their elementary and middle school careers learning to be average. It is even more painful to admit that they usually succeed." The same seems to apply to Finland. How could we solve this problem? Moeit & Haji
Vertical Mentoring Examples

9. Author: Jerry Cochey (Mentor)
Date: Mar. 11 1:46 PM 1998
To shift from teacher centered classrooms to child centered classrooms and learning takes time. Patience and a commitment to the idea that students are responsible for their own learning. Even in this age of enlightenment (?), we think that a quiet, teacher controlled classroom shows learning, while research shows that active, talking, sharing of learning experiences with peers is more productive. Be patient, it takes a long time to have students change to being responsible for their own.

Horizontal Finnish Mentoring

12. Author: Leena
Date: Mar. 30 11:52 AM 1998
This case is something I feel very close to. I have been trying to find ways of being a teacher in a new way, trying to think everything from the students' perspective, to challenge my own old traditions of teaching and try to seek ways which I could find ways of studying things together with the students. What really puzzles me is that these different "projects" have had such extremely different lives.... What really don't know yet is how to be a proper supporter of these processes for students... - Leena

Justified Statement (Finnish)

3. Author: Kirs
Date: Mar. 6 8:11 AM 1998
Why not let the student study math farther by himself and the teacher could help him whenever the teacher has time. At least some of the math study books are so designed that the page has examples that teach you how to solve the problem and then on the next page there are exercises. I personally hate being said 'wait' since when I'm interested in something I want to go on and learn more and not wait. This way I think the child learns to be responsible of his own learning. I quote dear Mr. Vygotsky here again, the teacher should be sensitive to see where the child's problems are and to help the child over it. The teacher's task is not to try to keep the child on the level he has reached but to help him learn more if he is interested...

Unjustified Statements (US)

24. Author: Katherine
Date: Apr. 27 5:12 AM 1998
I agree with you that technology is definitely taking a large part in the classroom; and will continue to do so. With technological advances that will be coming but I don't believe that I could actually take over the role of a teacher...but I'm sure that even the role of a teacher.

25. Author: Jason
Date: Apr. 28 1:47 PM 1998
I feel that technology will never take over the role of the teacher...I feel however, this is just how teachers are will and the role is another role for us to consider now with in the children's. No matter how advanced technology gets it will never be able to...

26. Author: Daniel
Date: Apr. 30 8:11 AM 1998
I believe that the role of the teacher is being changed by computers, but the computer will never totally replace the teacher...I believe that the computers will eventually make teaching easier for us and that most of the children's work will be done on computers. But I believe that there will always be the need for the teacher.

Indicators for the Quality of Students' Dialogue

(Aneli, Valanides, & Bonk, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social acknowledgment/Sharing/Feedback</td>
<td>hello, good to hear from you...I agree, good point, great idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inappropriate statements (advice)</td>
<td>I think you should try this...This is what I would do...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Questioning for clarification and extend dialogue</td>
<td>Could you give us more info?...explain what you mean by...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Critical thinking, Reasoned thinking, judgment</td>
<td>I disagree with X, because in class we discussed...I see the following discrepancies in this approach...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unformatted Table
Caseweb Visions
- Intros, Expert Commentaries, Reviews
- Expanded and Shrunken Case Views
- Hyperlink Options
- Conceptual Labels—chapters, themes, ideas
- Role Taking Options
- Mentoring Scaffolds/Questions
- Forced Counterpoints
- Sample Mentor and Peer Feedback
- Case Comparison Statistics

Spring of '97 (FirstClass)
Content Analysis of Online Discussion in Ed Psych (Hara, Bonk, & Angell, 2001, Instructional Science)

Purpose and Questions of this Study
- To understand how graduate students interact online?
- What are inter patterns with starter-wrapper roles?
- What is role of instructor in weekly interactions?
- How extensive is social, cog, metacog commenting?
- How in-depth would online discussions get?
  - And can conferencing deepen class discussions?

Dimensions of Learning Process (Henri, 1992)
1. Participation (rate, timing, duration of messages)
2. Interactivity (explicit interaction, implicit interaction, & independent comment)
3. Social Events (stms unrelated to content)
4. Cognitive Events (e.g., clarifications, inferencing, judgment, and strategies)
5. Metacognitive Events (e.g., both metacognitive knowledge—person, and task, and strategy and well as metacognitive skill—evaluation, planning, regulation, and self-awareness)

Graduate Course Findings
- Participation
  + Most participated once/week
  + Student-centered & depend on starter
  + Posts more interactive over time
  + Lengthy & Cognitively Deep
    - Ave post: 300 words & over 18 sentences
    - From 33 words to over 1000 words
    - Some just satisfied course requirements

Findings Continued (see Henri, 1992)
- Social (in 26.7% of units coded)
  - social cues decreased as semester progressed
  - messages gradually became less formal
  - became more embedded within statement
- Cognitive (in 81.7% of units)
  - More inferences & judgments than elem clarifications and in-depth clarifications
  - Cog Deep: 33% surface; 55% deep; 12 both
- Metacognitive (in 56% of units)
  - More reflections on exp & self-awareness
  - Some planning, eval, & regulation & self q'ing
Surface vs. Deep Posts
(Heni, 1992)

Surface Processing
- making judgments without justification,
- stating that one shares ideas or opinions already stated,
- repeating what has been said
- asking irrelevant questions
- i.e., fragmented, narrow, and somewhat trite.

In-depth Processing
- linked facts and ideas,
- offered new elements of information,
- discussed advantages and disadvantages of a situation,
- made judgments that were supported by examples and/or justification.
- i.e., more integrated, weighty, and refreshing.

Level of Cognitive Processing:
All Posts

- Both: 12%
- Surface: 33%
- Deep: 55%

Starter Centered Interaction:

Week 1

Scattered Interaction (no starter):

Week 4
Recommendations

- Structure online discussions
  - e.g., get them to use subject line better.
- When done, have them print out transcripts!
  - Can take the class with them when done!
- Realize that diff conferencing software and features serve diff instructional purposes

Story #5 (1999): Do you believe in the power of sharing?

1999 Study of the World Lecture Hall Matrix of Web Interactions
(Cummings, Banks, & Jacobs, 2002)

Instructor to Student: syllabus, notes, feedback
to Instructor: Course resources, syllabi, notes
to Practitioner: Tutorials, articles, listservs
Student to Student: Intros, sample work, debates
to Instructor: Voting, tests, papers, evals.
to Practitioner: Web links, resumes
Practitioner to Student: Internships, jobs, fieldtrips
to Instructor: Opinion surveys, tblk, listservs
to Practitioner: Forums, listservs

Story #6 (2001): You were in, but you were never there.
Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Online Collaboration Among Pre-Service Teachers in Finland, Korea, and the US


Sample & Data Sources
- In Spring 1998:
  - Finland: 30 students and 5 instructors
  - USA: 88 students and 7 instructors
- In Fall 1998
  - Korea: 21 students and 1 instructor
- A content analysis using Curtis & Lawson's coding scheme to describe utterances in online collaboration.
  - Post collaboration questionnaire, interviews, video conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Categories</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Group Sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Organizing Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Isolating Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Help Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Feedback Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Encouraging Participation and Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Sharing Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Compromising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Building Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Expressing Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Seeking Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Reflection on Written Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online Collaboration Behaviors by Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Categories</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Input</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection/ Monitoring</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online Collaboration Analysis (Korea)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Categories</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Korea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from the Quantitative Analysis
- Low participation rate of instructors across all the groups.
  - A majority of utterances fell into the "contributing" category.
  - Differences in the intercultural participation levels across cultures.
Differences in Reflection Behaviors (monitoring effects)
- A Finnish case on student motivation (ME)
  "As a result of this discussion so far, we have made some conclusions dealing with students' motivation to learn. We agree that it is impossible to motivate students deliberately. There is not any specific act that can be used to increase students' motivation. According to McCombs, almost everything that teachers do in the classroom has a motivational influence on students... Intrinsic motivation and self-regulation strategies are also important and these can be supported by successful external supports...."

Differences in Feedback Seeking & Giving
- A U.S. case on disciplinary problems (FBS)
  "One day I came into teach the class and one of the twenty students is very quiet. He seemed alright at the time of teaching, but towards the end he just starts crying for no reason... The questions that were raised in my head were: 1. How involved should I get? 2. Should I call the family and tell them what happened? 3. Should I tell the other teachers and see what we all can do?"

Differences in Social Interaction Behaviors
- Social Interactions Among Korean students
  - Well, like a cup of coffee, may this new thing be relaxing (I am praying now). It must be the beginning, so I am happy now. I wonder whether someone would reply to me. I am a little bit nervous 'cause I am not so familiar with Web conferencing.
  - Sister Sunny, take care of yourself, and I hope your health will be good soon. I'm not accustomed to Web conference, either, but it is a good chance to participate. Please, cheer up!
  - Thank you for your interest in my health, but I'm all right now. Just before, my long message to you has gone by my slight mistake, so I am sad (crying). And, sorry for my late reply to you.

Communication Styles & Culture
- Low context communication
  - Focuses on explicit verbal message
  - U.S. Finland, and most of the Western cultures
- High context communication
  - Emphasizes how intention or meaning is conveyed through the context (e.g., social roles, positions, etc.)
  - Korea and most of the Asian cultures
- Importance of social interaction in the high context communication culture

Findings from the Qualitative Analysis
- U.S. students more action-oriented and pragmatic in seeking results or giving solutions.
- Finnish students were more group focused as well as reflective and theoretically driven.
- Korean students were more socially and contextually driven.

Implications
- Instructors have a key role in facilitating effective cross-cultural communication (e.g. social interaction activities for students from high context cultures).
- Instructional designers and software developers need to build learning tools that address learner needs from different cultures (usability tests in different cultures).
- Online learners need prior examples or case transcripts highlighting cultural differences in communication styles.
**Story #7 (1998-2005): Who needs a ticket?**


Curt Bonk
Lee Ehman
Emily Hixon
Lisa Yamagata-Lynch
John Keller
Indiana University

**TICKIT (1998 to 2003 and to present)**

- Five year investigation of the implementation of the Teacher Institute for Curriculum Knowledge about the Integration of Technology which annually trains 25 teachers from 5 rural Indiana schools; exploring long-term impact of inservice technology integration program.

**TICKIT Team**

1. Dr. Lee Ehman, IU, C&I Dept.
2. Dr. John Keller, IUPUI
3. Dr. Emily Hixon, IU Northwest
4. Dr. Lisa Yamagata Lynch, Univ of Northern Illinois
5. Timothy Hew, IU, IST Dept.
6. me

**TICKIT Program Features**

- Welcome to TICKIT
- Teacher Institute for Curriculum Knowledge about the Integration of Technology
- Knowledge, skill, & confidence
- Thoughtful integration of technology
- Leadership cadres in schools
- Link schools and university
- Help schools capitalize on their technology investments

**TICKIT Teachers**
Goal Statement

"Obviously, I'm technologically in the Dark Ages. My students are so computer savvy that I feel I must at least attempt to catch up with them." – Debbie White, North Gibson, summer 2002

Online Interaction

Typical TICKIT Training and Projects

- Includes class, department, or school website.
- Write: Electronic newsletters, book reviews.
- Tools: Photoshop, Inspiration, PowerPoint.
- Telecom: e-mail with foreign key pairs.
- Digitizing: using camera, scanning, digitizing.
- Videoconferencing: connecting classes.
- Web Course: HighWired.com, MyClass.net,
  Lightspan.com, eBoard.com

Example Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project type</th>
<th>Number of projects (132)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webquest</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic newsletters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web editing &amp; publishing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online conferencing, collaboration, and discussion (includes email and phone)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual tours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer apps (Excel, PP, Word, Internet)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure construction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic portfolio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Friend Post Example

"Beverly: Before I forget, I want to thank you again for your invaluable help at the ICE conference. I get used to using a particular piece of equipment or program, and it's hard for me to adapt quickly. You saved the day. One thing I have learned from using technology is that we need to depend upon each other for support. We are all in this boat together."

Forms of Learning Assistance

Figure 1. Forms of Learning Assistance in TICKIT Activities

Findings: Summary

- Feedback, praise, social interaction most frequent
- Critical friends provide peer support, help, social
- Reading reactions & debates more content focus
- Critical friend postings perceived more beneficial
- Reading reactions & debates "just another task"
- Justification: 77% claims unsupported; 20% referenced classroom & other experience
- Depth: ~80% surface level
- Off Task: 7% total; most in critical friend activity

Research Question: Study #2

Do teachers who have been through the TICKIT program differ from teachers who have not on dimensions of computer integration?

TICKIT Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technology Integration</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>7.608***</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technology Limitations</td>
<td>11.67*</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>-1.281**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Technology Resistance</td>
<td>4.22**</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>-1.163**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Computer Proficiency</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>0.014**</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learner-centered Instruction</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>7.231***</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Impact

- Per student impact
- Per course impact
- Per school impact
- Per school district impact
- Per district impact
- Per state impact
- Per national impact
- Per international impact
- Per global impact
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TICKIT Teacher Voices

> “This class was very helpful. I gained a lot of confidence as a technology user from this class.”
> “The door is now open. I will continue to try to find technological ways to teach them.”
> “This was the best program I have ever been involved with as a teacher.”

Story #8 (2004-2006): Data at your fingertips...
Research on the Online MBA Program, Kelley Direct (KD), at Indiana Univ
• 12 students in 1999 to 1,000 in 2004
• fully online; 1 week summer residencies
• Use regular on-ground instructors
• Data Collected: Surveys, focus groups, content analysis, interviews, document review, etc.

Online MBA Program (Dec. 2003-Present)
• Exploring many aspects of Kelley Direct online MBA program at IU—the only top 20 MBA program that is fully online (includes research on virtual teaming, case-based learning, student and faculty perceptions, asynchronous discussion, instructor roles, technology use, time management, etc.). (Supervised 8-9 people on this project—work includes student and faculty interviews, focus groups, surveys, content analyses, etc.)

Online MBA Program Team
1. Dr. Rich Madjuku, IU, KD Bus School
2. Dr. Seung-hee Lee, IU, KD Bus School
3. Dr. Xiaojing Liu, IU, KD Bus School
4. Bude Su, IU, IST and KD Bus School
5. Dr. KJ Kim, Portland State University
6. Shijuan Liu, IU, IST Dept.
7. Dr. Min Shi, University in China
9. Dr. Minyoung Do, James Madison University
10. Allyse Wise, IU, Learning Sciences
11. Pam Fuhrmann, IU, Ed Psych Dept.
13. me

Exploring Four Dimensions of Online Instructor Roles: A Program Level Case Study (Liu, Konk, Madjuku, Lee, & Su, 2003)

Problems within Roles
• Lack program wide faculty interaction (P)
• Lack facilitation skills (P)
• Concerns about time commitment (P/S)
• Lack skills in weaving discussion (M)
• Lack awareness of social role (S)
• Lack better technology for social role (S)
• Lack technical skills (T)
• Concern about accessibility issues (T)
**Table 2. Summary of Technology Tools and Other Course Resources Used in Online MBA Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technologies</th>
<th>Course using</th>
<th>Course not using</th>
<th>Percentage of usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task based time synchronous/asynchronous text-based (e.g., discussion forums)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task based asynchronous tools (e.g., chat)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive quiz tools</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint slides</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio and video clips</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice- and visual-based two way communications (voice mail, instant messaging, video chat etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategies Used for Virtual Teaming**

(From Crambajal, LaPointe, and Gunawardena (2003))

**Strategies Used for Virtual Teaming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Courses in use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task dimension</td>
<td>Team change by each assignment</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team discussion</td>
<td>23 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team-level deliverables</td>
<td>21 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group interaction (critique, feedback, idea sharing)</td>
<td>9 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer evaluation</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination of teamwork and individual work</td>
<td>21 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dimension</td>
<td>Online coffee house</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online introduction forum</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal profile</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other social events</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Dimensions of Virtual Teams in Online MBA Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of virtual teams</th>
<th>Degree(M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Dimension</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of virtual tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of synchronous tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of advanced tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dimension</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of social interaction</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of team tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of virtual tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of collaborative tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of asynchronous tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of communication tools</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) H=High, M=Medium, L=Low
Concerns with Community Building (Blended!)

"As for community, I think we're staggering toward one that's driven by the faculty members themselves. The times that we've been in the same room we say to each other, "We've got to get together. We've got to form some kind of group so we can trade ideas." We did get together for a lunch but it was like very unplanned and we can do a lot more with that."

Strength of the Program

- **Flexibility**: 60%; Per 1 student "Flexibility if it wasn't online I wouldn't be getting an MBA."
- **Excellent faculty**: 34%; Students perceive professors as knowledgeable, various teaching methods, good at providing immediate feedback.
- **High quality curriculum and course content**: 30% felt the program offers a high quality curriculum and course content; case-based instructional method valuable.
- **Reputation (13%)**: Admin. support: 11%; Quality students: 7%; Diversity of community: 6%
- **Other strengths including its week long in-residence program**: relatively low cost, overall program quality, and the possibility to use what is learned directly in the work setting.

Key Barriers to Online Learning

- **Lack of human interaction**: 33% of respondents think more interactions are needed between student and instructor, and among students.
- **Team schedule issue**: 18% of the respondents expressed the frustration over time zone differences and difficulty of scheduling sync ing.
- **Lack of sense of community**: 11%. A few students felt lonely due to lack of peer support and lack of a strong network of students.
- **Lack of interactive technology**: 8%; Delayed feedback: 8% Large group size: 7%
- **Other barriers include unclear expectations, not enough time for reading, unequal work load distribution, lengthy discussion forum, and lack of lecture.**

Dropping out???

- **Only 9% thought about dropping out due to disappointment with course design.**
- **Also a problem with a lack of community, lack of social presence of instructor, lack of bonding**
  - The intention of dropping out of the classes
    - negatively correlated with the learner engagement ($r = .40$).
    - feeling of being a part of a learning community ($r = .47$).
    - comfort level of reading messages and materials online ($r = .46$).
    - and helpfulness of instructor facilitation ($r = .51$).

One Word to Describe Program

- **70% were positive!**
- **Common words were excellent, good, exciting, rewarding, effective, satisfied, enlightening, educational, solid, and empowering.**
- **About 16% think the program is quite challenging (challenging, intense, demanding, adventure, and hard).**
- **One student wrote "this is the hardest thing I have ever done."**
- **New, unique, eye-opening, and surprising.**

Recommendations for Improvement

- **More technology integration**: 52%. Video & teleconferencing, better chat.
- **Immediate and detailed feedback**
- **More human interactions**: Over 50%.
- **More options, flexibility, elective courses.**
- **Enhance administrative support**: Consulting services, contact options, hot line help.
- **Flexibility on Team assignment**: Choose teammates.
- **Specific tasks**: More lectures, burned CD, slide narrations, key take aways, emailing course announcement, and more instructor check up.
Story #9 (2006--2007): A synchronous life is a Breeze.

Research on use of Breeze synchronous training tool in online teaching in Instructional Systems Technology at IU.
- Transcripts
- Interviews

The movement toward synchronous instruction

Making learning interactive is a Breeze!

Synchronous Conferencing

Synchronous Sessions (Breeze, Elluminate, WebEx, etc.)

Research Questions
- What sync strategies employ in critique activity?
- What instructional benefits of sync?
- What issues and challenges encounter?
- How is Breeze as a sync collaboration tool?
- What suggestions and practical guidelines?
Spring 2006:
Merge distance and residential
• 22 distance students
• 11 residential students
• One full-time faculty member
• Five graduate teaching assistants
• 49 synchronous critique sessions

Table 1: Numbers of Synchronous Critique Sessions and Tools Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of synchronous critique sessions held</th>
<th>Tools used for synchronous critique sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49 (including 3 practice sessions)</td>
<td>Breeze[1] &amp; telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[38][2] Breeze &amp; Breeze voice chat (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breeze &amp; Breeze text chat (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breeze &amp; Breeze voice chat &amp; telephone (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of Critique Sessions

• (1) to help students apply the newly learned design principles in order to evaluate media design products,
• (2) to exchange constructive feedback on each other’s project in progress.

Figure 1. Synchronous Critique in Breeze Context

Table 3: Benefits of Peer Critique

- Providing immediate feedback
- Encouraging to exchange multiple perspectives
- Increasing interactions among participants
- Enhancing dynamic interactions
- Promoting passive students to become active
- Strengthening social presence allowing to exchange of emotional supports and supplying verbal elements

Table 4: Instructional Strategies Employed

- Prepare students:
  - Provide ground rules and guidelines
  - Hold practice sessions
  - Provide materials to be critiqued

- Promote Interactions:
  - Structure the synchronous critique activity
  - Scaffold the discussion
  - Moderate students' critique behaviors
  - Use a small-group and be flexible about synchronous activity management
**Table 5: Issues Identified on Synchronous Tools and Scheduling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screen-share function during presentation</td>
<td>Small screen, fragile or difficult to display large images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features to organize participants’ voice and screen control</td>
<td>Vulnerability to user’s technical conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with the existing course requirements and archived function</td>
<td>Relatively high cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional cost required</td>
<td>Difficulty in maintaining discussions with a large number of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional workload required for instructors to arrange the meeting.</td>
<td>Feedback from students to improve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Story #10 (2006-2007): Where is a Wikibookian when you need one?**

Survey of more than 80 Wikibookians about the creation and coordination of a Wikibook. Issues addressed include ownership, problems encountered, tools to facilitate online collaboration.

**The Challenges and Successes of Wikibookian Experts and Want-To-Bees**

Suthiporn Sajjapanroj, Indiana University
ssajjapa@indiana.edu
Curt Bonk, Indiana University
Mimi Lee, University of Houston
Grace Lin, University of Houston

*Paper presented at the E-Learn Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii October 2006*

**Basic Study**

Survey of more than 80 Wikibookians about the creation and coordination of a Wikibook. Issues addressed include ownership, problems encountered, tools to facilitate online collaboration.

**Wikibookian**

A Wikibookian is someone who coordinates a Wikibook project.
Objective and Design

Two-part study:
I. Wikibook project among 3 classrooms in 3 locations
II. Wikibooks web site - http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Main_Page

Methodology

- Two Surveys for each group
  - 13 participants of cross-institutional Wikibook project
  - 80 participants of Wikibookians
- Follow-up questions were sent via email to:
  - Three people of the Wikibook project
  - Eight people of the Wikibookians group

Findings from Surveys (cont.)

- Demographical data: 58% of Wikibookians were younger than 25 years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Wikibookians</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographical data: more than 97% were male

Gender of Wikibookians:

- Male 97%
- Female 3%

Findings from Surveys (cont.)

- Demographical data: many without a college education

Highest Year of Schooling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate Level</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year College</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year College</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower than High School</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from Surveys (cont.)

- 77% of Wikibookians agree that their recent Wikibook project was successful.

Strong Agree 14%
Disagree 19%
Agree 83%
Findings from Surveys (cont.)

- Sense of community

What were your primary roles in developing a Wikibook?

*Data is displayed by ratio

Findings from Surveys (cont.)

- Control and ownership

Who are the owners of a Wikibook?

Findings from Surveys (cont.)

- Inspiration to work on Wikibooks

Findings from Surveys (cont.)

- Question: Can a Wikibook ever be completed?

What type of learning does a Wikibook foster?
1. How did you know about Wikibooks? Who, if anyone, initially showed you them or recommended Wikibooks and what did they say? (Wikibookian)

- I discovered WIKIBOOKS through WIKIPEDIA- some Wikipedia articles refer to articles on WikiBooks, saying "WikiBooks has more on the subject" and include a link.

2. What was (were) your expectation(s) before using Wiki? (Wikibookian)

- My expectation was to help create a free, collaboratively written textbook. At this point I have done almost all of the work on the book. Admittedly, word about the book hasn’t gotten out, but hopefully once it does others will begin to contribute. Until that happens, my expectations will not, technically, have been met.

5. Are there situations in a Wikibook environment that are unique or different from other collaborative environments you have encountered? If so, what are they?

- The difference is that I’m usually working with people I’ve never met, and with the sort of people I wouldn’t ordinarily work with in writing. It’s much more challenging to see where someone is coming from if you haven’t had a chance to meet her or talk with her..... Sometimes, the new perspective is very interesting. At other times, the other person can be way off base.

6. Explain whether a Wikibook is ever complete? Why or why not?

- No wiki is ever complete, because it is ever evolving. That’s one of the best things about wiki’s. I personally think that paper is dead and in many ways the ideas contained within them too. I want my ideas and thought evolved and allowing others to improve them makes the work alive.

7. What would happen if someone edited or changed a section of your Wikibook but you did not agree with the change? Has this ever happened to you? If so, what did you do?

- Sure it has happened and usually I challenge the changes and or clarify my points and will revert the changes after I have posted a discussion section and got others opinions.
8. What are the advantages and disadvantages of Wikibooks mechanisms?
- Advantages: Openness, accountability, record of changes and attributions, easiness of use, free license, formatting buttons, levels of permissions, automated features like the Infobox, formatting shortcuts, templates, and navigation, ...

9. Which activities or tools would you suggest to include in Wikibooks environment in order to promote learning collaboration?
- Make a special area where one set group of people can take over a book for a time, for example, to enable one class or one group of professors develop materials in a protected environment where, at least for a time, they have the final authority of whatever happens in that area.

10. Are there any concerns, suggestions, and/or recommendations to someone creating a Wikibook or for someone wanting to become a Wikibook author or editor?
- Get help. Don't try to do it on your own, it's a too big amount of work and you will definitely loose the overview.

11. What do you see in the future in terms of Wikibooks?
- I don't know. It might go two ways:
  * Become a success, people will use it.
  * Die a silent death, people won't use it. There is no "some people will use it". Because when you want your book to become used, it has to be used by a large amount of people, not by a few.

12. Do you have any other comments about Wikibooks or the Wikibook process?
- Go rockin' on!
What can we say about research on technology then???

- It is everywhere!!!!!!!!!
- Resistance is futile!!!!!!!!!

Poll: Do you think you will do research on classroom technology integration?
- a. Yes, definitely
- b. Probably yes
- c. Maybe
- d. No
- e. Do not yet know

Ten Final Tips
1. Always plan ahead
2. A published journal article is more important sometimes than the actual activity
3. Consider writing grant proposals to foundations that reward teaching related grants
4. Collect extra data and archive all data (graduate students might analyze in 2-3 years)
5. Take a leadership role in a technology type of conference

Ten Final Tips
6. Talk to others about how you overcame your hesitancy
7. Note technology integration efforts on your resume/CV (it is who you are)
8. Scan the Web for tech integration ideas and examples
9. Explain what you are doing to your students (be clear and honest)
10. Recruit help: post-docs, pre-docs, graduate students, undergrads, practitioners in the field, colleagues, etc.

It's Over...

Final Poll. Ok, then, who wants more???
- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Not sure
Sorry...it really is the end!!!

The End...Remember