

Nan Yang

eLearning for Quality Teaching in Higher Education

Teachers' Perception, Practice, and
Interventions

 Springer

eLearning for Quality Teaching in Higher Education

Nan Yang

eLearning for Quality Teaching in Higher Education

Teachers' Perception, Practice,
and Interventions

 Springer

Nan Yang
Institute of Higher Education
Beijing Academy of Educational Sciences
Beijing, China

ISBN 978-981-15-4400-2 ISBN 978-981-15-4401-9 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-4401-9>

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

Acknowledgements

This book is based on my doctoral dissertation with updating references, new findings from the epistemic network analysis, and reflections accumulated in the recent years of research experience. First of all, I would like to recognise the invaluable help and contribution, stimulating suggestions and constructive feedback of my supervisor Prof. Patrizia Ghislandi at the University of Trento, Italy. Her rigorous scholarship shaped my identity as an early-stage researcher, and her inspiring ideas came to fruition throughout my research. I am deeply indebted to her for her continuous guidance during my doctoral study and her insights after my graduation. I feel so fortunate to maintain research collaboration with her. To me, she is my supervisor and also my friend.

Many people deserve my gratitude for helping conduct the three-stage research in this book. I really appreciate research participants—university professors from Italy, the UK, and China for their participation and insights that went directly at the ‘heart’ of the research. I would like to thank my tutors of the abroad period—Prof. Grainne Conole and Prof. Palitha Edirisingha—in the Institute of Learning Innovation (ILI) at University of Leicester, UK. Their kindness and hospitality made my stay at ILI a very productive research period. I also want to express gratitude to Prof. David Hawkrige, regular discussions with him at ILI helped me keep reflecting on my research topics and approaches in analysing these topics. A special thank to Prof. Diana Laurillard for her research has a profound impact on me. The appointment with her at the London Knowledge Lab was a memorable moment in my research life. The discussion with her on my doctoral research gave me great confidence and encouragement to continue my work.

Thanks to the Department of Psychology and Cognitive Sciences at the University of Trento and the host institution during my abroad period—the University of Leicester to the support given by professors, colleagues, and technicians. In particular, I want to thank Prof. Sara Dellantonio to offer me an opportunity for investigating the impact of CSCL in her course. I want to thank Prof. Alison Fox for her ethical framework, which strongly shaped the way of designing, implementing, and reporting my research. I want to thank Prof. Luigi

Lombardi for his advices on the mixed model analysis. I want to thank my colleagues Simone, Lorenzo, Marco, Mara, and Brenda for their inputs on my research. Thanks to my ‘critical friend’ Prof. Juliana Raffaghelli for her generous and thoughtful comments during the fieldwork preparation and thesis writing. Thanks to Dr. Ming Nie for her support during the preparation for publication.

I also want to thank Beijing Academy of Educational Science (BAES), and the leaders and colleagues at BAES for their help and guidance in both my work and life. In particular, I would like to thank Mr. Yongwu Liu, Director of the Institute of Higher Education, for encouraging me to publish my doctoral dissertation. Without his support, this might not happen.

I am grateful, too, for the support and advice from Springer in preparing the book for publication, and in particular from Jane Li, my commissioning editor; Sophie Li, my editorial assistant; Melody Zhang, my editor; Vidya Shri K, my project coordinator; Nobuko Hirota, my production contact; Gowtham Chakravarthy V, my production manager. They have all been very patient, as I struggled to meet (or miss) deadlines.

Finally, my greatest thanks go to my family. In particular, I want to thank my husband Tong for his help and support in both my research and life.

Nan Yang

Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 eLearning as an Umbrella Term	1
1.1.1 Terminologies Discussion	1
1.1.2 The Scope of eLearning in This Book	5
1.2 Quality: A Complex Issue in Higher Education	6
1.2.1 Quality Culture	6
1.2.2 Dimensions of Evaluation	7
1.3 Conflicting Voices on eLearning for Quality University Teaching	8
1.4 Structure of the Book	9
References	9
2 Key Concepts	13
2.1 Quality Teaching in Higher Education	13
2.1.1 Characteristics and Approaches	13
2.1.2 Quality Teaching as the Mediation for Learning	14
2.1.3 Quality Teaching for the Learning Content	14
2.2 Learning for Understanding	15
2.2.1 Understanding as a Learning Process	16
2.2.2 Understanding as a Learning Outcome	17
2.3 Large Class Teaching	18
2.3.1 Challenges in Large Class Teaching	18
2.3.2 Potential Benefits in Large Class Teaching	19
2.3.3 Strategies for Large Class Teaching	20
2.4 Collaborative Learning	22
2.4.1 Potential Benefits for Teaching and Learning	23
2.4.2 Challenges for Effective Collaboration	24
2.4.3 Design Principles for Effective Collaboration	25
References	26

3	Stage 1: Exploration on University Teachers' Perception and Practice for Quality Teaching	35
3.1	Research Questions	35
3.2	Related Studies	36
3.2.1	Teachers' Conception of Teaching, Espoused Theories Versus Theories-in-Use in Teaching Practice	37
3.2.2	Teachers' Conception of eLearning and Their Adoption of eLearning in Practice	37
3.3	Methodology	38
3.3.1	The Rationale for Adopting Case Study	39
3.3.2	Unit of Analysis and a Multiple-Case Study	39
3.3.3	Sampling and Recruitment	40
3.3.4	Instrument	40
3.4	Data Collection	40
3.5	Data Analysis	41
3.5.1	Within-Case Analysis	42
3.5.2	Across-Case Analysis	43
3.5.3	Epistemic Network Analysis	46
3.6	Research Results	46
3.6.1	Perception of Quality Teaching	46
3.6.2	Problems for Quality Teaching in Practice	53
3.6.3	Strategies for Quality Teaching in Practice	61
3.6.4	eLearning for Quality Teaching	68
3.7	Discussion	76
3.7.1	Perception of Quality Teaching: Practitioners Versus Researchers	76
3.7.2	Quality Teaching: Perception Versus Practice	76
3.7.3	eLearning for Quality Teaching in Large University Classes	77
	References	77
4	Stage 2: Exploration on Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning in Large Class Teaching	81
4.1	Research Questions	81
4.2	Related Studies	82
4.3	Methodology	83
4.3.1	Rationale for Adopting Case Study	84
4.3.2	Unit of Analysis and Multiple-Case Study	84
4.3.3	Sampling and Recruitment	85
4.3.4	Instrument	85
4.4	Data Collection	85

- 4.5 Data Analysis 86
 - 4.5.1 Embedded Unit Analysis 86
 - 4.5.2 Within-Case Analysis 87
 - 4.5.3 Across-Case Analysis 88
- 4.6 Research Results 89
 - 4.6.1 University Teachers’ Perception of Class Size Effect 90
 - 4.6.2 CSCL for Large Class Teaching 92
 - 4.6.3 Strategies in Large Class Teaching 95
 - 4.6.4 Comparison Between Case A and Case B 97
- 4.7 Discussion 98
 - 4.7.1 Class Size Effect: Quality Teaching in Large University Classes 98
 - 4.7.2 Large Class Teaching: Experiments Versus Practices 98
- References 99

5 Stage 3: Implementation of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning for Quality Teaching in Large Classes 103

- 5.1 Research Questions 103
- 5.2 Related Studies 104
- 5.3 Methodology 105
 - 5.3.1 Rationale for Adopting Design-Based Research 105
 - 5.3.2 Impacts of CSCL on Quality Teaching in Large Classes 106
 - 5.3.3 Defining the Levels of Understanding 107
 - 5.3.4 An Authentic Learning Context 107
 - 5.3.5 Design of CSCL Activities 109
 - 5.3.6 Instruments 111
- 5.4 Data Collection 113
 - 5.4.1 Activity 1 and Activity 2 113
 - 5.4.2 Survey 114
 - 5.4.3 In-Depth Interview 114
 - 5.4.4 Forum Logs 114
 - 5.4.5 Exam Scores 115
- 5.5 Data Analysis 115
 - 5.5.1 Descriptive Statistics 115
 - 5.5.2 Inferential Statistics 116
 - 5.5.3 Thematic Analysis 117
- 5.6 Research Results 119
 - 5.6.1 The Impact of CSCL on Large Class Teaching 119
 - 5.6.2 Blended Learning for Quality Enhancement 121
 - 5.6.3 Forms of CSCL for Quality Teaching 123

5.7	Discussion	124
5.7.1	Social Loafing: Disadvantage Versus Advantage	124
5.7.2	CSCL for Deep Understanding	125
5.7.3	The Importance of Quality Lecturing	125
	References	126
6	Evaluation and Ethical Considerations	129
6.1	Validity, Reliability and Generalisability	129
6.1.1	Comparison Between Qualitative and Quantitative Research	129
6.1.2	Strategies for Validity, Reliability, and Generalisability	130
6.2	Ethical Consideration	132
6.2.1	The Ethical Appraisal Framework	132
6.2.2	Reflections on the Ethical Considerations	132
	References	135
7	Reflection on eLearning for Quality Teaching in Higher Education	137
7.1	Open Dialogue for Quality Teaching	137
7.2	Guidance for Implementing CSCL in Practice	138
7.2.1	Clear Statements for the Learning Outcome	138
7.2.2	Positive Interdependence for Group Members	139
7.2.3	Necessary Cultivation Strategies	140
7.2.4	Indispensable Instructors' Intervention	140
7.2.5	Effective Assessment for Quality Learning Experience	141
7.3	Dialectical View of eLearning's Impact	141
	References	142
	Appendix A: Financial Support on Pedagogic Research in Case B	145
	Appendix B: Topics and Learning Materials for Activity 2	147
	Appendix C: Guideline for Peer Assessment in Activity 2	149
	Appendix D: Survey of the Stage 3	151
	Appendix E: Activity Design	155
	Appendix F: Informed Consent Form	157

Acronyms

CSCL	Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning
ENA	Epistemic Network Analysis
F2F	Face-to-Face
HEIs	Higher Educational Institutions
ICTs	Information and Communication Technologies

Chapter 1

Introduction



Abstract This chapter provides a general background for topics in the book (such as eLearning, quality in higher education and quality university teaching) and a brief description of the book structure. It aims to introduce readers to open dialogues such as *what does eLearning mean? What does quality mean in higher education? What are the impacts of eLearning on quality university teaching?*

1.1 eLearning as an Umbrella Term

eLearning is an umbrella term. If you search it in the Wikipedia, it will redirect automatically to the term “educational technology” which represents the study and ethical practice of facilitating learning and improving performance by creating, using, and managing appropriate technological processes and resources. Since it is such a broad term that can mean different forms of learning such as online learning, blended learning, technology enhanced learning, computer-supported collaborative learning etc., it is necessary to discuss these terms in the very beginning for both a better understanding of the terminologies in educational technology and a clear scope of what forms of learning will be covered under the umbrella term “eLearning” within this book.

1.1.1 Terminologies Discussion

In this part, we are going to review terms that relevant to eLearning in a chronological order. Terms are grouped based on a similar time of the emergence. The time of emergence is defined by two ways. For those terms that have specific time of emergence, supporting references are quoted. For those terms without references that explained its emergence explicitly, the time of emergence is defined based on the result of searching these terms within the fields of abstract, keywords and article

title in the Scopus.¹ You might discover that some of the terms seems to be used less today while some are still widely adopted. This evolution of terminologies implies the shift of paradigms in the field and terms that compatible with new paradigms exist longer.

1.1.1.1 1960s: Computer Based Learning, Computer Assisted Instruction, Computer Aided Instruction, Computer Assisted Learning

These terms are based on the theory of programmed instruction, which aims to computerized teaching by structuring information, testing learners knowledge, and providing immediate feedback to learners without human intervention [7, 25, 52, 53]. Programmed instruction is based on the psychologist Skinner’s “operant conditioning”, which argues learning is change in behaviour that can be conditioned by rewarding the right stimulus-response patterns [63]. Beside the impact of psychology on the pedagogy, this form of learning might also be applied due to the societal reality. After World War II, veterans went to colleges according to the G.I. Bill,² which had a significant impact on college enrolment [13, 51]. The education system hoped that programmed instruction could make teaching into automation for a low-cost and productive educational process [8]. Skinner’s teaching machine [58],³ CASE [32]⁴ and PLATO [5]⁵ are examples of this form of learning. Early practices were in the field of engineering [64] and medical education [35].

1.1.1.2 1970s: Open Learning, Distance Learning, Computer Mediated Communication

Open learning, aims to give access in higher education to all, was one of the most noteworthy development in higher education in the 1970s [14].⁶ Open University in the UK, established in 1969 with the first students enrolled in 1971 [15], is centered on the concept “open” [14] and considered as one of the most comprehensive distance learning systems [74]. The term “open learning” emphasizes the openness as the vision while the term “distance learning” emphasizes being distant as the condition. Broadcasting was the main technology for this form of learning

¹Scopus is the largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature including scientific journals, books and conference proceedings. <https://www.scopus.com/>.

²The Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the G.I. Bill, was a law that provided a range of benefits for returning World War II veterans.

³Teaching machine and programmed learning <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jTH3ob1IRFo>.

⁴CASE: Computer Aided Software Engineering.

⁵PLATO: Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations.

⁶The origin of the open university movement can be traced to the University of London, which began offering degrees to external students in 1836. Source: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

[26, 40]. Computer mediated communication refers to communications that occur via computer-mediated formats such as instant messaging, email, chat rooms, online forums, social network, etc. [72]. This term was coined by Hiltz and Turoff, who combined traditional classroom teaching with online discussion forums [38]. In their book *The network nation: human communication via computer*, computer mediated communication was recommended as the cheapest, most convenient and potentially most powerful option for geographically dispersed groups of people to exchange information regularly.

1.1.1.3 1980s: Microcomputer Based Learning, Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning

In the late 1970s, three generations of microcomputers⁷ were successively available [1]. In the 1980s, scholars explored the impact of microcomputers on teaching and learning. Programmed multiple choice questions are implemented in a biochemistry undergraduate course to test important facts and concepts [6]. Lesgold proposed two usages of microcomputers in classrooms including providing practice in word recognition and better diagnostic data on children's progress [48]. Lepper considered the computer as a tool to compare educational philosophies such as instructional drills with educational games or explanatory learning with didactic instruction [47]. Dyke mentioned the limitation of the microcomputer for the QWERTY keyboard is a real barrier for pupils to interact with the machine [18] and Drage reviewed several "alternative keyboard" devices [4]. Computer-supported collaborative learning is a branch of learning sciences that studies how people can learn together with the help of computers. Computers in the classroom are seen by critics as boring and anti-social while CSCL is based on precisely the opposite view that it brings learners together and can offer creative activities for intellectual exploration and social interaction. The earliest workshop addressing CSCL was "Joint Problem Solving and Microcomputers" in San Diego in 1983. In 1989, a NATO⁸-sponsored workshop held in Maratea (Italy) was considered as the birth of the field for it was the first public and international gathering to use the term "computer-supported collaborative learning" in its title [70].

⁷The first generation of microcomputer was the Altair 8800 in 1975 (also the first one that introduced to teachers). The second generation was the Commodore PET and Radio Shack TRS-80 in 1977 (also the first personal computer with black-and-white CRT displays). The third generation were the Atari 400/800, the Texas Instruments 99/4 and Apple II in 1979 with color graphics.

⁸North Atlantic Treaty Organization: an intergovernmental military alliance between 29 North American and European countries.

1.1.1.4 1990s: Online Learning, Digital Learning, Technology Enhanced Learning, Web-Based Learning, Networked Learning, eLearning

The World Wide Web (also called the web) was invented by Tim Berners-Lee and it was released to the public on the Internet in 1991. The web, as a new way of communication and a new “world”, also had an impact on education. Online learning means learning that occurs over the Internet [57], which can transform education by promoting student-centred communication, collaboration and inquiry [78]. The web, as a new medium, became a popular way of displaying learning materials. The issue about the ownership of intellectual property in digital learning materials is raised by the Australian National University for it generated large quantities of text and image data for displaying over the web as learning materials [33]. Besides, learning environments can also be transferred to this new “world”. University of Minnesota implemented the world’s first ubiquitous laptop computing learning environment from 1993 to 1996, which transformed the university from a “paper” to “digital” learning environment [49]. Carnegie Mellon University explored technology enhanced learning through a system known as Carnegie Mellon Online that delivered materials to students both on and off campus [65]. Similar practices used the term “web-based learning” to describe the ways of producing the course materials [45] and the learning environment [55, 56] on the web. Networked learning is another term that describes online learning and web-based learning. The difference is the former emphasizes on the effect that people are learning collaboratively (which naturally forms the “networked learning community”) [10, 23, 60, 66] while the latter focus on the web as a medium. Jay Cross coined the term eLearning in 1998 when he judged the use of technologies did not result in self-paced learning and releasing instructors from the learning process [54].

1.1.1.5 2000s: Blended Learning

Blended learning is a form of learning that combines traditional methods of teaching (such as instructor-led classes held in a physical classroom) with internet-delivered content that is learner-driven and self-paced [76]. Though the learning effectiveness in many ways depends on increased demand for students’ convenience [75] and eLearning seems to provide more convenience to student learning (such as time, pace and place of learning), unfortunately it did not achieve the expectation of commentators and players within the industry [62]. Therefore, eLearning is reconsidered as a complement to traditional methods of teaching and training rather than a replacement [62]. The right mix of traditional learning and eLearning is vital to the effectiveness of blended learning [73]. Blended learning was implemented into teacher education [43] and maritime education [37] in its early practices. Besides, scholars found blended learning courses provided a stronger sense of community among students compared to traditional or fully online courses [68].

1.1.1.6 Summary

The idea of reviewing terms in a chronological order aims to present different forms of learning with specific social, economical and technological backgrounds. Several milestones such as the operant conditioning in behavioral psychology, the foundation of Open University in the UK, the popularity of microcomputers, the invention of World Wide Web, led to new forms of learning in the corresponding periods. Terms were coined with specific meanings in their own era and then the meaning of terms evolved over the time. For example, the term computer assisted learning came out in the 1960s. The term computer at that time might mean IBM 1440 [61], which is different compared to computers in the 21st century in terms of both the appearance and functions. The term “distance learning” was used to describe the use of broadcasting on teaching and learning at a distance in the 1970s while it mainly means online learning now. Indeed, it is still “distance learning”. The difference is the technique that supports teaching and learning at a distance changed from the broadcasting to the Internet. Therefore, it is quite often that you find terms from different time were used together [28, 59] as they keep adapting. Oppositely, some term sank in the times. The term microcomputer based learning belonged to 1980s. In sum, terms have different life span. Some exist longer while some vanish in the times. The term eLearning, an umbrella term that represents various terms, survives due to its adaptability.

1.1.2 *The Scope of eLearning in This Book*

As the title of this book, it discusses three parts of eLearning for quality teaching in the context of higher education including teachers’ perception, practice, and interventions. These three parts seem to be independent; actually, they are connected to each other for they are three stages of research in my doctoral project. I started with a general exploration of the impact of eLearning on quality university teaching and kept updating the research focus in the next stage according to the research findings of the previous stage. In this sense, the scope of eLearning changed according to the research focus of each stage. Specifically, the scope of eLearning in the first and second stage (teachers’ perception and practice) is considerably open. All the technologies including either online (such as learning management system, twitter, etc.) or offline electronic devices or software (such as Microsoft PowerPoint) are considered as eLearning. In the third stage, it has a specific focus on computer-supported collaborative learning, which is a particular form of eLearning.

1.2 Quality: A Complex Issue in Higher Education

Quality is a complex issue in higher education for many issues need to be clarified when discussing quality [31]. In this section, the complexity of quality will be explained in terms of quality culture and dimensions of evaluation.

1.2.1 Quality Culture

Harvey and Green [36] argued five notions of quality culture exist in the system of higher education: quality as exception, quality as perfection, quality as fitness for purpose, quality as value for money, and quality as transformation.

1.2.1.1 Quality as Exception

Exception means distinctive and exclusive. Quality as exception means something that possessed or being accessible by elites. In higher education, this notion of quality means Oxbridge education that inaccessible for the majority. Besides, this notion of quality does not need to be measured as people see the quality due to its exclusiveness.

1.2.1.2 Quality as Perfection

Perception means zero defects. This notion of quality comes from industry where quality means consistency and stability. It emphasizes the prevention of any problem in the products or services by setting predefined and measurable benchmarks to follow.

1.2.1.3 Quality as Value for Money

This notion of quality refers to cost effectiveness that you get what you pay for. At heart, this quality culture is about accountability that public services (such as education) are expected to be accountable for the funders (such as taxpayers) and to the customers (the users of this service).

1.2.1.4 Quality as Transformation

Transformation refers to qualitative change and a fundamental change of form. It is a concept well established in western philosophy that being discussed in the works of Aristotle, Kant, Hegel and Marx. It implies that education is a dialectical process in which the transformation means cognitive transcendence.