

Technology-Using Teachers

Comparing Perceptions of Exemplary Technology Use to Best Practice

Peggy A. Ertmer, Sangeetha Gopalakrishnan, and Eva M. Ross

Purdue University

Abstract

In this exploratory study, we compared characteristics and teaching practices of teachers perceived to be exemplary technology users with descriptions of exemplary users provided in the literature. Using a qualitative case-study design, we examined the pedagogical beliefs and classroom practices of 17 exemplary technology-using teachers. Findings suggest that exemplary technology use, as perceived and practiced by teachers, does not readily match descriptions of best practice provided in the literature. Rather, exemplary use reflects teachers' personal beliefs about teaching and learning as well as their specific teaching contexts. (Keywords: educational change, teachers' beliefs, technology integration.)

Educators today are confronted with a number of alternative, often opposing, views of what technology is and what purposes it should serve within instructional settings. Although studies have shown that most teachers today recognize the importance of using technology in their classrooms (Beichner, 1993; Fulton, 1993), they often lack a clear vision of how technology can be used to support educational best practices (Roblyer, 1993). Not only do the tools themselves continue to change at a rapid pace, but so does the prevailing wisdom on how teachers should use these technologies in schools—from teaching programming, to encouraging individualized drill and practice, to building computer literacy, to participating in electronic communities. Given the *evolving* nature of technology best practice, it is quite possible that today's practitioners and researchers have very different beliefs about what constitutes exemplary classroom technology use. Based on the assumption that teachers behave in concert with their beliefs (Erickson, 1986), this study was designed to examine the pedagogical beliefs and classroom practices of exemplary technology-using teachers and to determine the extent to which their beliefs correspond with educational best practice as described in the literature.

According to Dexter, Anderson, and Becker (1999), “The research on technology-using teachers characterizes different ways teachers employ technology in instruction. Data from this literature suggest that technology-using teachers range along a continuum of instructional styles from instruction to construction” (p. 221). Becker and Riel (1999) noted that teachers at the instruction end of the continuum “define teaching as a process of successful implementation of a set of frameworks or standards established by others” (p. 4). In contrast, teachers at the construction end define teaching as “a process of continual, reflective inquiry” (Becker & Riel, p. 4). The President's Panel on Educational Technology (PPET, 1997) noted that constructivist teachers place “the locus of initiative and control largely within the student, who typically undertakes substantial, authentic tasks, presented in a realistic context, that require the self-directed application of various sorts of knowledge and skills for their successful execution” (p. 34).

Although we can find examples of technology-using teachers who fall at every point along this instruction-construction continuum, the literature on *exemplary* technology use suggests that expert technology-using teachers (do or should) reside on the constructivist side of the continuum (Becker, 1994; Dede, 1998; Dexter et al., 1999; PPET, 1997). Recent literature on classroom practice in general (Brown, 1997; Bruer, 1994; Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1997) and technology use within that practice (Becker, 1994; Berg, Benz, Lasley II, & Raisch, 1998; Hadley & Sheingold, 1993) has tended to define exemplary in terms of the extent to which teachers' practices embrace a constructivist teaching philosophy. For example, the PPET stated:

While the Panel is unable to make a confident and definitive statement regarding the superiority of the constructivist approach, it believes there to be a high *likelihood* that many or all of the essential elements of this approach could play a major role in improving the quality of our nation's elementary and secondary schools. Although technology is likely to find use within a number of more traditional instructional roles as well, it seems likely (though not yet certain) that the student-centered constructivist paradigm may ultimately offer the most fertile ground for the application of technology to education. (p. 35; emphasis in original)

Grabe and Grabe (1996) and others (Hooper & Rieber, 1995; Jonassen, Peck, & Wilson, 1999) have outlined the primary differences between traditional and constructivist classroom environments (Table 1). In general, the literature on technology-using teachers describes exemplary use as that which supports the type of activities and approaches noted on the right side of the table. Thus, technology best practice would incorporate the following practices outlined by Becker and Riel (1999) in their description of constructivist teaching:

1. designing activities around teacher and student interests rather than in response to an externally mandated curriculum,
2. having students engage in collaborative group projects in which skills are taught and practiced in context rather than sequentially,
3. focusing instruction (and assessment) on students' understanding of complex ideas rather than on definitions and facts,
4. teaching students to self-consciously assess their own understanding, and engaging in learning in front of students, rather than presenting oneself as fully knowledgeable. (p. 9)

Categories of Classroom Practice	Traditional Setting	Integrated Setting

Classroom focus	• Teacher centered (didactic)	• Learner centered (interactive)
Teacher role	• Present information • Manage classroom	• Guide discovery • Model active learning • Collaborator (sometimes learner)
Student role	• Store information	• Create knowledge • Collaborator (sometimes expert)
Curricular characteristics	• Breadth • Fact retention • Fragmented knowledge and disciplinary separation	• Depth • Application of knowledge • Integrated multidisciplinary themes
Classroom social organization	• Independent learning • Individual responsibility for entire task	• Collaborative learning • Social distribution of thinking
Assessment practices	• Fact retention • Product oriented • Traditional tests • Norm referenced	• Applied knowledge • Process oriented • Alternative measures • Criterion referenced
Role for technology	• Drill and practice • Direct instruction • Programming	• Exploration and knowledge construction • Communication (collaboration, information access, expression)
Technology content	• Basic computer literacy with higher-level skills building on lower-level skills	• Emphasis on thinking skills and application
<i>Note. Adapted from Grabe & Grabe (1996).</i>		

In general, the teaching and learning practices that occur in constructivist classrooms are considered to be both *student centered* and *student directed*. That is, though activities and content are designed to engage students in authentic learning contexts (points 1–3 above), students are also encouraged to use self-regulatory learning processes to achieve both greater and deeper learning (points 4–5). These last two points, specifically, are geared toward facilitating development of students' self-regulation, that is, the ability and motivation to implement, monitor, and evaluate learning strategies for the purpose of facilitating knowledge growth (Ertmer & Dillon, 1998). As suggested by Becker and Riel (1999), teachers who adhere to a constructivist teaching philosophy are likely to promote these self-regulatory, student-directed practices within student-centered classrooms.

It is unclear whether these descriptions from the literature are consistent with the perceptions and practices of technology-using teachers, specifically those who identify themselves as exemplary users. Becker (1994) classified exemplary users based on standards that “suggest a classroom environment in which computers were both prominent in the experience of students and employed in order that students grow intellectually and not merely develop isolated skills” (p. 294). In the Bank Street study (Hadley & Sheingold, 1993), exemplary practitioners were described as directly addressing curricular goals by:

- having students use a wide variety of software including simulations, programming languages, spreadsheets, database programs, graphing programs, logic and problem-solving programs, writing tools, and electronic bulletin-board communications software and
- exploiting intellectual tools for writing, analyzing data, and solving problems.

How well do these conceptions of how teachers *should* use technology align with the ways in which exemplary teachers actually *use* technology in their classrooms? L. Williams (personal communication, February 1, 1999) noted that there is an “enormous chasm between conversations occurring in higher education and practices in schools—even in exemplary cases.” If this is the case, it may be important to discern the extent to which practitioners' views and practices differ from those being prescribed by researchers and university educators.

When practitioners are asked to identify exemplary technology-using teachers or to describe exemplary classroom practices, their responses suggest that they do not necessarily use the same criteria as those used in the literature. For example, when teachers in the Berg et al. (1998) study rated their most important uses of technology, they “agreed that research, writing, and uses related to their own instructional planning were among the most important uses for technology in the classroom” (p. 116). Yet, these activities do not necessarily support the kind of high-level uses advocated in the literature. In fact, the authors noted that “less frequent in use, despite shared belief in importance by coordinators and teachers in this study, were Internet applications, problem-solving, basic-skills practice, and student use of multimedia authoring programs” (Berg et al., p. 119). Interestingly, three of these applications represent practices that are more likely to occur within constructivist classrooms. The results of the Berg et al. study suggest that, although exemplary practitioners believe these types of uses are important, they do not consistently, or frequently, incorporate them into their practice.

There is some indication that technology-using teachers will, given enough time, evolve into constructivist teachers (Fisher, Dwyer, & Yocam, 1996; Hadley & Sheingold, 1993; Sandholtz, Ringstaff, & Dwyer, 1997). The assumption is that technology use actually prompts teachers to change their practices toward more student-centered approaches. Dexter et al. (1999) noted that if this were true then, “This makes the issue one of time. That is, given enough time, the variety of approaches to using technology will homogenize into a constructivist approach” (p. 222).

Yet, Miller and Olson (1994) and others (Hativa & Lesgold, 1996; Kerr, 1996) disagreed with this viewpoint, suggesting that traditional teachers do not become constructivist just because they have new tools at their fingertips. Pedagogical beliefs go deeper than technological capability or accessibility; beliefs define how teachers teach both with and without technology. Furthermore, changing beliefs is neither quickly nor easily accomplished (Cuban, 1993; Ertmer, 1999; Ertmer & Hruskoc, 1999; Kerr). As noted by PPET (1997):

In order to optimally cultivate this ground, schools will need to make changes that extend far beyond the mere installation of a network of computers. While some benefits may be obtained by using information technologies to pursue existing curricular objectives or by adding new material to an existing course, the richest harvest is likely to accrue from a fundamental restructuring—at least at the level of the individual course, and ideally, across boundaries. Such fundamental restructuring, however, is likely to prove complex, difficult, expensive, and time-consuming, and may encounter resistance from parents, educators, and the general public, particularly to the extent that such changes conflict with commonly held beliefs about the nature of knowledge and learning. (pp. 35–36)

Is it realistic to expect teachers to use technology in ways currently being advocated by best practice? Given that teachers themselves have not yet reached consensus on whether a traditional or constructivist teaching model is “best” (Center for Research on Information Technology and Organizations, 1999), is it reasonable to expect that exemplary users of technology, will, by definition, all adhere to a constructivist philosophy?

Purpose

This exploratory study was designed to examine the pedagogical beliefs and classroom practices of a group of technology-using teachers who considered themselves to be exemplary users. Through this research, we hoped to identify the beliefs and practices that were common as well as those that were distinct across teachers and then to compare our findings to best practice, as described in the literature. Specifically we asked:

1. To what extent do the characteristics of teachers who perceive themselves to be exemplary technology users compare to characteristics of exemplary users described in the literature?
2. How do teachers define exemplary technology practice? What are their visions of exemplary use, and how are these visions translated into practice? What role has technology played in either *enabling* or *changing* teachers’ beliefs and practices?
3. How do teachers’ perceptions and implementation of exemplary technology practice

compare to best practice? To what extent are teachers enacting both student-centered and student-directed curricula?

Methods

Overview

We used a qualitative case-study design to examine teachers' perceptions of their own exemplary technology practice, including the pedagogical beliefs supporting classroom use. Through a series of written responses, telephone and e-mail conversations, and extended face-to-face interviews and classroom observations, we examined how teachers defined and implemented exemplary practice in their classrooms. Following this, we considered the extent to which teachers' beliefs and practices aligned with the constructivist pedagogy advocated by current educators.

Background

This research was conducted in conjunction with the development of VisionQuest, a CD-ROM teacher development tool designed to highlight the classroom practices and pedagogical beliefs of exemplary technology-using teachers (Ertmer, Gopalakrishnan, & Ross, 2000). Teachers who wished to be considered for inclusion on the CD-ROM were required to complete an Application Form for Identifying Exemplary Technology-Using Teachers (Appendix). Teachers used this form to describe classroom technology resources, to enumerate their professional and instructional uses of technology, to characterize a successful use of technology in their classrooms, and to share their visions of a "wholly integrated classroom." The application form allowed participants to apply their own definitions of the term "exemplary." This enabled us to examine teachers' individual perceptions of exemplary technology classroom practice, to compare perceptions across teachers, and to examine how these perceptions corresponded to best practice.

Role of the Researchers

The research team consisted of a faculty member and seven students enrolled in an advanced educational technology research course at a large university in the Midwestern United States. Students had varied background experiences, in both corporate and K-12 classrooms, and were seeking master's ($n = 3$) or doctoral degrees ($n = 4$) in educational technology. This study resulted from the need to select, from a pool of 22 applicants, six technology-using teachers to be featured on the VisionQuest CD-ROM. As the first step in the development process, the instructor and students collaboratively examined the beliefs and practices of the 22 teachers who, by virtue of their applications to the project, comprised our purposeful sample. Graduate researchers participated in all aspects of the selection process—examining application forms, interviewing teachers, and conducting classroom observations.

Selection and Description of Participants

We initiated the participant selection process by soliciting nominations of exemplary technology-using teachers from 358 school principals located within an hour's drive of the university.

Copyright © 2001, ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education), 800.336.5191 (U.S. & Canada) or 541.302.3777 (Int'l), iste@iste.org, www.iste.org. All rights reserved.

Principals were asked to present the solicitation letter, a description of the CD-ROM project, and an accompanying application form to teachers in their buildings who might be appropriate for inclusion on the CD-ROM. Twenty-two teachers, representing 17 different classrooms (8 teachers constituted 3 teacher teams), completed the application form. Informed consent was also obtained from each teacher. Seventeen teachers were available for in-depth interviews and classroom observations during the fall semester (including all three teams). Interviewed teachers represented a range of subject areas, classroom contexts, and levels of access to technology (Table 2) and were not considered significantly different from those who were not interviewed.

Table 2. Demographics of Exemplary Technology-Using Teachers

Name	Years Teaching	School Size	School Location	Ethnic Makeup (%)	Public/Private	Grade Level	Content Taught	Classroom and Lab Computer Resources	Special Features
Jamie	8	6	Midsize city	0	Private	6–12	All	3 Macintoshes, 1 Toshiba, 1 Apple IIe	Cross-age students
Melissa	5	917	Urban fringe of midsize city	8.4	Public	1	All subjects	4 IBMs, 1 IBM lab (30 stations)	
Bev	23	800	Urban fringe of large city	45	Public	6–8	Music Communication skills	6 Macintosh G3s, 3 Macintosh labs (26 stations in each)	
Lindsey	5	505	Small town	3.8	Public	4	All subjects	1 Power Macintosh, 1 Macintosh LCII, Library	

Journal of Research on Computing in Education

Media Center
(34 stations)

Teresa	3	400	Urban fringe of large city	DK	Private PK–8	Computers	Computer lab with 26 Pentium stations	School for gifted; primarily white
Vivian	17	527	Urban fringe of midsize city	3.8	Public 4	All subjects	4 IBMs, 1 IBM lab (30 stations)	
Sam	30	2,000	Midsize central city	10	Public 9–12	Biology	15 Macintosh G3s, 2 Power Macintoshes	Team taught; block 8 schedule; 45 students/hour
Annie	6							
Connie	10							
Mary	21	863	Midsize central city	13.6	Public 6–8	Music	15 Power Macintoshes	Team planning
Joe	29							
Maribeth	14							
Emilie	5	DK	Urban fringe of large city		Private 6–8	Computers	Computer lab with 17 Power Macintoshes	
Kate	21	DK	Urban fringe of large city		Private PK–5	Computers	Computer lab with 10 iMacs (140 computers in lower school)	

Don	10	395	Large city	24.6	Private 9–12	Science; computers	17 older PCs, 2 Pentium PCs, 1 IBM lab (36 stations)
Joan	6	600	Urban fringe of large city	20	Public 1–2	Science themes	8 Pentiums, 2 computer labs: 1 Macintosh, 1 IBM (28 stations in each)
Jessie	12						2 Looping; job sharing; science & technology magnet school

Note. Names are pseudonyms.

Our interview sample included teachers from two high schools (Grades 9–12), one Grades 6–12 cross-age school, five middle schools (Grades 6–8), one PK–8, and six elementary schools (Grades 1–5). Five of the 17 teachers taught at private schools. The high school teachers (a 3-teacher team and a single teacher) taught science, four middle school teachers (a three-teacher team and a single teacher) taught music, and three teachers (one elementary, one middle school, one PK–8) taught computer skills in a lab setting. The remaining teachers taught in self-contained elementary or cross-age (Grades 6–12) classrooms. Classroom technology resources ranged from student:computer ratios of 1:1 to 12:1. The majority of each school’s population was White; ethnic minority students accounted for 0% to 45% of each school’s enrollment (Table 2).

Data Collection

Teachers’ applications to the VisionQuest project comprised our initial data set, detailing teachers’ instructional and professional uses of technology, their visions for an integrated classroom, and examples of successful classroom uses of technology. In respect to this last item, teachers were asked specifically “to include information about the *roles* you, your students, and the technology played; how students were *grouped*; the *goal* of the activity; its relevance to the *curriculum*; and the manner in which you *assessed* outcomes.” By considering “successful use” from the teachers’ point of view, we hoped to gain valuable insights into teachers’ definitions of exemplary use, as well as the kind of technology visions toward which they were oriented. Furthermore, the specific information included in their examples helped us identify the extent to which their practices incorporated the characteristics of an integrated classroom outlined in Table 1 (Grabe & Grabe, 1996).

Based on teacher and researcher availability, 17 teachers were interviewed and observed in their classrooms during the fall 1998 semester. Eight teachers were interviewed two times; nine teachers were interviewed once. Scheduling constraints limited observations of four teachers to one time each; all other interviewed teachers were observed two or more times. Observations were conducted over a one- or two-hour time period; interviews lasted approximately an hour. Interview questions were geared toward obtaining more detail about teachers' educational and technology backgrounds as well as their visions for future use. Specifically, we asked teachers to describe their personal journeys of technology integration—how they got started, the obstacles they encountered, and their reasons for persisting. Through subsequent classroom observations we witnessed the manner and the extent to which teachers' visions were translated into practice. Field notes were taken during each observation; interviews were audiotaped and transcribed.

Data Analysis

Early analysis focused on participant and classroom characteristics commonly thought to relate to teachers' exemplary technology use (e.g., years of teaching, technology training experiences, access to resources). Following this, open-ended questionnaire, interview, and observation data were analyzed and coded using both within- and cross-case analyses (Patton, 1990). We began by searching for recurring words and themes that captured each teacher's beliefs about classroom practice and, more specifically, their technology use relevant to that practice. For example, we examined teachers' descriptions of the connections they promoted between students' technology use and the classroom curricula. Did technology serve to supplement, enhance, or transform current curricula? In addition, we examined teachers' visions to determine the extent to which they emphasized students' attainment of basic skills, content knowledge, or higher-level thinking skills.

Using the categories outlined in Table 1, we created profiles of each teacher. Following this, we used cross-case analyses to compare teacher profiles, identifying both common and unique patterns of beliefs and practices related to technology use. Secondary data obtained through telephone and e-mail conversations, and teacher and student artifacts (lesson plans, technology projects) were used to support or negate tentative themes, or profiles, that emerged in early analysis stages. For example, whereas Table 1 depicted only two points along a teaching continuum (traditional versus integrated practice), we found, as might be expected, that teachers rarely used teaching practices that fell solely into one category. Thus, we expanded the table to include a "mixed-model" that captured teachers' hybrid approaches. For example, teachers' assessment practices were examined to determine the extent to which they emphasized facts or skills in isolation (traditional), facts or skills within specific content areas (hybrid), or the application of facts and skills within authentic project-based work (integrated). The results of these analyses, then, provided the bases for our comparison to best practice and allowed us to consider the extent to which teachers' perceptions of exemplary technology practice aligned with criteria used in the literature.

Issues of Validity and Reliability

Three data sources—applications, interviews, and observations—were used to triangulate findings and thus increase reliability. Reliability was also increased through the use of consistent

data collection methods; interviews and observations were conducted using semi-structured guides developed by the researchers. Themes noted across data sources were discussed and compared in classroom discussions and further validated through co-researcher visits to multiple classrooms. In most cases, either the instructor, a co-researcher, or both paid follow-up visits to classrooms assigned to individual researchers.

Interpretation of Results

In this section, we present findings that highlight the variety of situations in which teachers achieve technology integration as well as the range of visions and beliefs that support teachers' efforts to achieve exemplary use. Although high levels of confidence and innovativeness were common among participants, other characteristics varied widely.

Comparison of Participant Characteristics to Literature-Reported Characteristics

Teaching and Technology Experiences

According to Becker (1994), exemplary technology-using teachers tend to have both extensive teaching and computer training experiences. In this study, exemplary teachers had from 3 to 30 years of teaching experience, with an average of 13 years. Whereas Hadley and Sheingold (1993) reported that 75% of their sample had 13 or more years of experience, 59% of the teachers in this study ($n = 10$) had fewer than 13 years, with 6 teachers having 6 years or less. Becker also noted that exemplary technology-using teachers tend to have accumulated significantly more credits and degrees than other computer users (50 to 75% of exemplary users compared to 10% of other users). In this study, only six of the 17 teachers (35%) had earned master's degrees. Three teachers had computer endorsements (as part of their bachelor's [$n = 2$] or master's [$n = 1$] degree programs); two teachers were obtaining endorsements.

In general, the exemplary teachers in this study were relatively less experienced than those described by Becker (1994) and Hadley and Sheingold (1993). This difference may reflect recent changes in teacher training programs that now incorporate an increased emphasis on technology training. Perhaps newer teachers are entering the workforce having already achieved high levels of competency. However, a report by the U.S. Department of Education (1999) discounts this idea, noting that "relatively few teachers (20%) report feeling well prepared to integrate technology into classroom instruction" (p. iii). Still, new teachers are more likely to have mastered basic computer skills before entering the classroom, a pattern that Hadley and Sheingold would not have observed. Perhaps just having these basic skills gives new teachers a jumpstart compared to their more experienced colleagues who have had to acquire technology skills on their own time.

Levels of Confidence and Innovativeness

Another characteristic of exemplary technology-using teachers, noted in the literature (Marcinkiewicz, 1993–1994), relates to levels of confidence and innovativeness. All of the teachers in this study expressed high levels of confidence for using technology. Given that the teachers *volunteered* to participate in this project, it is fairly safe to assume they felt confident that their technology practices were, indeed, exemplary. Teachers' confidence was also manifest

in a no-nonsense approach to common integration barriers. Teachers in this study were not deterred by lack of resources, knowledge, or time; they found or invented ways to obtain needed resources. It was not that they did not encounter barriers; they did, yet *all* managed to work around constraints that have typically halted others' efforts (Ertmer, 1999; Ertmer & Hruskocy, 1999).

Within the context of their teaching practices, all of these teachers had initiated and sustained innovative approaches to teaching. Our participants were considered innovative by their building principals and often by their peers as well (e.g., many had received prestigious teaching awards). Clearly, all of these teachers had taken risks and sacrificed personal time and energy to achieve current levels of technology integration. Yet, *innovativeness*, like *exemplary use*, is a slippery construct that tends to be defined in relative terms. Compared to their immediate peers, *all* of our teachers had achieved innovative technology practice, yet compared to best practice, a number of discrepancies were noted. We revisit this point later when we address our third research question.

Support and Resource Availability

Becker's (1994) study suggested that exemplary technology-using teachers work in school districts that have made large investments in staff development and on-site support. This was confirmed by the majority of our participants. All but two teachers interviewed noted that they had many opportunities to participate in professional development experiences, including computer training. Yet, similar to results reported by Hadley and Sheingold (1993), almost all of our participants had achieved their technical skills on their own by accessing a wide range of available resources, including, but not limited to, professional development opportunities. For the most part, these teachers were responsible for *providing* rather than receiving training. Teachers in this study ($n = 10$) perceived that they had helped create collaborative working environments, specifically related to technology integration, within their schools. Furthermore, they noted that they had brought colleagues on-board by providing training, collaboration, and ongoing emotional support.

To achieve technology integration, teachers also need a considerable amount of technical support (Becker, 1994). This includes on-the-spot troubleshooting as well as ongoing system maintenance. Twelve teachers in our study had technology support staff available on-site, while four received additional district-level support. Three teachers received assistance at the district level only. Troubleshooting was completed primarily by the teachers themselves; many also helped with systems maintenance.

Access to computers, in terms of both location and numbers, is a major determinant of teachers' success in integrating technology into instruction (Hoffman, 1996; Means & Olson, 1997). Although five teachers taught in classrooms or computer labs with a 1:1 student-computer ratio, others had student:computer ratios that ranged anywhere from 3:1 to 12:1. Teachers got around this resource barrier by using effective organization and management strategies. For example, Joan and Jessie used a station approach in which students rotated through various activities; the computer station was just one of many possibilities. High school biology teacher Sam's students self-determined when to complete activities. Not all of them completed computer activities at the same time.

Teachers' Visions of Exemplary Technology Practice

When asked to describe their visions of technology integration, teachers emphasized a variety of teaching and learning goals. Whereas some teachers emphasized important computer or information literacy skills that their students needed to know (e.g., how to use a spreadsheet), others focused on helping students learn specific content (e.g., the variety of species populating the world), while still others went beyond content to support students' development of problem-solving and critical-thinking skills (e.g., using a spreadsheet to predict changing relationships among existing populations and available resources).

Skill-Oriented Visions

Teachers were classified as having skill-oriented visions if they made explicit reference to helping students learn specific technology or information literacy skills. For example, Teresa, a computer lab teacher at a private PK–8 school, stressed: "Technology has a goal in and of itself." Eleven of our 17 teachers noted that students needed to learn basic technology skills; three of these emphasized skills as their primary focus. However, these three teachers also made comments that suggested additional emphases on content and/or problem-solving skills.

Content-Oriented Visions

Teachers were classified as having content-oriented visions if they described how technology related to their current curricula. For example, Joe, a middle-school music teacher, stated, "We have a body of knowledge to teach. How we do that is sometimes determined by the tools we have." Maribeth noted, "Content is where it's at!"

All of the teachers in this study described how technology supported content-oriented goals; nine teachers suggested that content was their primary focus. Among these nine, however, differences were noted in whether teachers used technology to *maintain* or *go beyond* current curricula. Joan's definition of technology integration illustrates the former approach: "Technology integration is looking at technology as if it is not separate. It's not an extra or an add on. It is part of what you do every day, it's using technology as a tool to enhance what you are already doing." In contrast, Bev, a middle school music teacher, described going beyond what was previously possible: "I have become a better teacher, because of technology ... because the kids own it (the music). It is not me teaching them; it is me giving them opportunities to expand." In this study, 12 teachers used technology to support or enhance *current* curricula whereas 5 teachers used technology to *go beyond* current classroom work.

Process-Oriented Visions

Teachers were classified as having process-oriented visions if they emphasized helping students gain problem-solving, critical-thinking, or lifelong-learning skills. Thirteen of our 17 teachers made at least some reference to process-oriented visions; 5 teachers embraced this as their primary focus. Sam described his vision of helping students become active, independent learners:

The least important of our goals is that they learn biology. We are really much more concerned that they become independent learners and critical thinkers. And the

independent learning happens only if you give them control. ...

These kids need to be critical thinkers. They need to distinguish that all information is not equal. And they need to be able to evaluate the likelihood that it is good information. So those are our two primary goals. If they learn some biology along the way, then that's fine.

Overlapping Orientations

Eight teachers described visions that included references to all three orientations—skill, content, and process. This may simply reflect the fact that teachers adapt orientations to meet the needs of multiple stakeholders, or perhaps that visions are implemented in dynamic ways, reflecting immediate needs as well as future goals. Another explanation is that teachers are still evolving in their uses of technology or, more fundamentally, their beliefs about classroom practice. Melissa, a relatively new second-grade teacher, emphasized both technology and problem-solving skills *within* the designated curricular content. She described how she was moving away from an emphasis on skills:

I was reading an article about math and how our students are taught things but don't understand why they're doing them and how they lack problem-solving skills. And that made me realize, "Am I doing that? Am I holding my students back by giving them—giving, giving, giving?"

As a result of reflecting on this dilemma, Melissa began to encourage more decision making in her classroom and to place a stronger emphasis on cooperative learning activities. Furthermore, every group activity was followed by a debriefing session in which students reflected on *what* they had learned, as well as *how* they had learned it. By embedding both technology and process-oriented skills into the mandated second-grade curricular content, Melissa implemented a vision that integrated all three orientations.

In at least one case, a teacher's practice appeared constrained by existing job responsibilities. Emilie described a vision of technology integration that "provided students with opportunities to see the connections among subject areas." Yet, in her position as the computer teacher, her primary responsibility was to ensure "that middle school students are taught the various technology skills that are necessary for them to be successful in the Information Age." Given this particular context, it was difficult for Emilie to achieve her expressed vision of integrated technology use.

Technology: Enabler or Change Agent?

Becker and Riel (1999) noted that "how teachers organize their classes to a large extent reflects their beliefs about good teaching" (p. 10). Similarly, teacher's visions for and uses of technology reflect these same beliefs. In at least two cases, teachers described how technology enabled them to achieve long-held visions of good teaching. Sam explained:

I have always been devoted to the notion of—you have to be active to learn... Computer technology has simply allowed me to pursue that more. It hasn't really changed my

philosophy, it's *enabled* my philosophy; it's allowed me to live the philosophy that I have had for a long, long time.

Bev made a similar point:

I think my philosophy has always been the same—a real kinesthetic type learning situation—I teach children, I do not teach music. I teach children through music, through technology, through whatever I am doing.

In other cases, technology appeared to provide the impetus to make important changes in beliefs and practices. Joan described this process:

When I came in, I had not thought about how technology would be integrated. ... I was thinking of technology for me—what *I* would do; what activity sheets I would create, not what the kids would do. As I started using it more, I began to say, “OK, the student needs to be the worker a lot more than I do.” It became much more student-centered.

Thus, in this study, we have evidence supporting two views about the role technology may play in reforming teachers' practices. Sam and Bev provide evidence that technology *enables* an existing constructivist philosophy to be translated into practice. Yet, Joan's story suggests that the use of technology can prompt the emergence of more constructivist practices. Our results suggest that although constructivist practices do not *depend* on the use of technology, technology may both support and facilitate these practices.

Relationship of Teachers' Practice to Best Practice

To answer our third research question, we examined the extent to which the teaching practices of our participants were both student centered and student directed, as suggested by best practice (Becker & Riel, 1999). We describe how our teachers designed, implemented, and evaluated technology-based classroom activities, as well as the extent to which they promoted students' use of self-regulatory learning strategies.

Student-Centered Curricula

Externally mandated versus participant-driven curricula. Becker and Riel (1999) noted that teachers who implement constructivist practices tend to “design activities around teacher and student interests rather than in response to an externally mandated curriculum” (p. 9). In general, teachers in this study implemented a “hybrid” approach to classroom curricula. Although only four teachers specifically mentioned using externally mandated standards to guide their choice of content and activities, all but one teacher described using technology to support the “needs of the curriculum.” The one teacher (a computer lab teacher) who did not make a strong connection to subject area content focused instead on the specific “goals of technology.” Still, this reflects her particular curriculum (technology) as well as her teaching context (computer lab).

Having *ties* to externally mandated curriculum, however, did not mean that teachers ignored or minimized students' interests. On the contrary, teachers in this study used technology to both increase and sustain students' interest in learning, in general, and in the content areas,

specifically. As Joe, a music teacher, noted: "I think on the whole, because it [music] is much more relevant [it is done in the tools and language of kids today], it becomes more meaningful for them ... kids leave with a much better grasp of what was covered." Vivian described how she used technology to make lessons more dynamic by actively *engaging* students in concepts they were expected to learn at that grade level: "Technology is just another tool to make your lesson better. The activity [publishing a Web page] gives students a reason to research, study, and write." In summary, teachers in this study helped students achieve recommended standards by creating student-centered activities, facilitated through the use of technology.

Teaching isolated facts versus embedding complex ideas within authentic contexts. Becker and Riel (1999) suggested that teachers who use constructivist-compatible activities tend to engage students in collaborative group projects in which skills are taught and practiced in context, rather than sequentially. As a result, instruction is focused on helping students understand complex ideas rather than remembering isolated definitions and facts. In general, the teachers in this study tended to embed technology skills within other curricular content. Emilie, a middle school computer teacher, stated, "Technology skills are taught within content areas so that they are meaningful." Yet, it is not clear whether content area skills were, themselves, embedded within authentic project-based activities. For example, Melissa taught her first graders how to cut and paste (a technology skill) as part of a lesson on contractions (a language arts skill). However, the contraction lesson appeared to be an isolated, skill-building lesson rather than one related to specific projects the students were completing. Whereas 16 of our teachers seemed relatively adept at embedding technology skills within current curricular activities, relatively fewer ($n = 9$) embedded content skills within authentic project-based work on a regular basis.

Still, almost all of the teachers in this study had successfully implemented activities that engaged students in authentic, project-based work. For example, Lindsey described how her fourth graders created and marketed a music CD of Christmas songs, enabling them to experience, firsthand, a variety of economic principles. Emilie teamed up with a science teacher to engage seventh graders in an archeological dig in which they learned about the relationships among different Native American cultures, their artifacts, and their environments. Yet, these types of projects were only *part* of the work students completed. Students also completed worksheets, practiced skills, and learned facts as part of their ongoing classroom activities.

The fact that these teachers stressed both complex ideas and isolated facts suggests that using constructivist-compatible activities does not preclude teachers from using more traditional activities to meet other learning needs. Teachers may enjoy, and even prefer, using constructivist approaches but a sole focus on this approach may be too limiting, given the amount of time needed to complete such activities relative to the total number of curricular requirements. Teachers may feel compelled to combine approaches (use a hybrid approach) in an attempt to meet multiple needs.

Traditional versus alternative assessment methods. In this study, exemplary technology use did not necessarily translate into innovative assessment practices. Furthermore, teachers' orientations did not consistently relate to the types of measures used. That is, skill-oriented teachers did not always use objective-type tests, and process-oriented teachers did not always use alternative assessment measures. Teachers tended to vary methods, alternating among traditional tests,

performance-based measures, worksheets, and project-based activities, basing decisions on specific goals to be measured.

For example, Emilie’s sixth-grade class practiced keyboarding skills using a computer typing program. Students were assessed in terms of both speed and accuracy (performance-based assessment), and their names were added to a keyboarding stars chart when a specified level of mastery was achieved. In contrast, Emilie’s seventh-grade class created Web sites about Native American cultures after researching and gathering relevant information. Technical skills were learned within the specific content area. Student projects were evaluated by both peers and teacher for their thoroughness in content and overall incorporation of technical features (project-based assessment).

Student-Directed Curricula

Becker and Riel (1999) noted that constructivist teachers help students assess their own understanding. Furthermore, they described how constructivist teachers model the learning process by “engaging in learning in front of their students” (Becker & Riel, p. 9). These types of classroom practices promote student attainment of two of the three main components of the self-regulated learning (SRL) process (i.e., monitoring and evaluating) delineated by Zimmerman (1986), with the remaining component being planning. We examined our data to determine the extent to which teachers promoted students’ use of planning, monitoring, and evaluation learning strategies. In addition, we examined relationships among teachers’ promotion of these strategies and their specific teaching orientations, described earlier.

Eleven of the 17 teachers in our study promoted at least some student use of SRL strategies within their classrooms (Table 3) including goal setting, self-paced learning, peer- and self-assessment, as well as journal writing and reflection. Specifically, eight teachers promoted strategies specific to student-directed planning, seven teachers encouraged student monitoring, and eight teachers promoted student self-evaluation. Two teachers employed two of the three types of strategies; five teachers, including the three high school team-teachers, promoted all three.

Table 3. Teachers’ Visions of Technology Practice and Promotion of Student Self-Regulatory Learning (SRL) Strategies

	Teachers’ Visions/Primary Orientation			Teachers’ Promotion of Student SRL Strategies		
	Skill	Content	Process	Planning	Monitoring	Evaluating
Kate	x					
Lindsey	x					
Teresa	x					

Journal of Research on Computing in Education

Don	x			x	
Emilie	x				x
Joe	x				
Joan	x		x		x
Jessie B.	x		x		x
Mary	x		x		
Maribeth	x				
Melissa	x			x	
Vivian	x				
Annie		x	x	x	x
Bev		x	x	x	x
Connie		x	x	x	x
Jamie		x	x	x	x
Sam		x	x	x	x

Sam describes how he helped students become self-directed learners: “At the beginning of every unit, students ... are setting goals for themselves and then adjusting what they’re doing based upon how their performance is going. It gets them actively involved in directing their own course through the unit.” Connie, one of Sam’s team teachers, explains further:

We focus very, very heavily on goal setting and on making modifications as you go. If you don’t achieve a goal in a particular area, you need to compensate for it somewhere else in the unit. This really allows students to take a look at themselves. If it’s your plan, your calendar, you devise all of that yourself—then if it is not working, you are the responsible party.

Students in Sam’s classroom were expected to select, implement, and evaluate their own learning activities. Assessments were conducted in a variety of ways. Students self-determined when to take an oral test after completing other unit activities. In addition, students kept research logs and wrote weekly reflections, allowing them to assess progress toward their goals.

In general, teachers who emphasized a process-oriented vision also promoted student self-regulation within their classrooms. Eleven of the 13 teachers who made at least some reference to process-oriented visions promoted students’ use of SRL strategies. Furthermore, the five

teachers who emphasized process skills as their primary focus also made the greatest use of SRL strategies. Perhaps, SRL strategies were simply the tools teachers needed to translate their process-oriented visions into classroom practice. In general, teachers who focused on content ($n = 9$) used a smaller number of SRL strategies, whereas teachers who focused on skills ($n = 3$) were not observed to directly promote student SRL.

These patterns of strategy use, as they relate to teachers' visions, may be partially explained by the grade level at which teachers worked. That is, teachers at higher levels of schooling may be in a better position to promote student-directed strategies. In this study, teachers with skill orientations all taught at the elementary level. Teachers at this level, more than at the upper levels, may feel obligated to help students learn basic skills. In addition, younger students may not be intellectually or emotionally ready to assume control for their learning processes.

Summary

In general, the teaching practices and beliefs of the exemplary teachers in this study were both student centered and student directed. Yet, in relationship to best practice, they might best be described as hybrid approaches. For example, teachers in this study implemented externally mandated curricula yet used technology to do so in student-centered ways. Learning activities and assessment measures varied from activity to activity. Although many of our teachers emphasized learning skills in context, many of these same teachers required students to learn facts and skills, sometimes in isolation. Finally, although teachers with process orientations tended to foster self-regulated learning in their students, teachers with skill or content orientations implemented fewer strategies to promote these practices. The results of this study suggest that exemplary technology use, as perceived and practiced by teachers, does not readily align with current descriptions of best practice; rather, it illustrates what happens when visions meet reality in today's K-12 classrooms.

Discussion

Although it is generally agreed that teachers can be exemplary constructivist teachers without the use of technology, current sentiment suggests that exemplary technology users only operate within a constructivist framework. As expected, teachers in this study, perceived to be exemplary users, were at many points along the instruction-construction continuum. This suggests that definitions of exemplary, held by teachers themselves, are not necessarily based on definitions provided in the literature, but rather such definitions are based on the very real and practical world in which teachers implement their practice. Exemplary technology practice looks and acts differently depending on a host of variables, including the grade level at which teachers work, the visions which they embrace, the relative use of technology by others around them, and the very real constraints under which they attempt to implement their visions, in terms of both curricular expectations and available resources. Perhaps, given a perfect world, these teachers would implement practices that aligned more closely with those described by Becker and Riel (1999). Yet given current classrooms, students, resources, and curricular expectations, they have achieved a more reasonable and workable "best."

All of the teachers in this study were exemplary in one form or another. They were all motivated,

energetic, and dedicated teachers who had gone beyond usual responsibilities to design activities that engaged students in meaningful technology use. In many cases, they had overcome both access and technical support limitations to achieve these goals. Although the majority of our teachers (65%) described visions that included pedagogical elements that supported a constructivist philosophy, only five teachers implemented those visions in alignment with best practice. This is similar to the finding by Berg et al. (1999) in which teachers reported wanting to incorporate higher level uses but not currently being able to do so. Given that visions typically precede practice, it is possible that these teachers will, in time, translate more of their ideas into practice. Perhaps teachers would benefit from observing how colleagues have implemented their student-centered and student-directed visions within realistic environments in which technology is one component. Knowing how others have eliminated or circumvented barriers may help teachers find reasonable methods for achieving their visions under less-than-optimal conditions.

Although the teachers in this study were similar to those described in other studies of exemplary technology users (Becker, 1994; Hadley & Sheingold, 1993), there were also a number of differences. Because of our small number of participants, we were able to examine and describe teachers' *individual* situations, as opposed to describing the *most common* situation. This allowed us to see that, with the exception of high levels of confidence and motivation, no one characteristic or environmental resource appeared to be essential to exemplary use. Our sample included teachers who represented all possible combinations of variables; they were young and old, experienced and new teachers who worked at all levels of schooling (PK–12) and in a range of subject areas and who had variable levels of access to resources and support. However, what was most common across teachers was the belief that technology provided a valuable tool for achieving their visions of teaching and learning (whether they be skill, content, or process oriented). This finding highlights what many educators have known, but perhaps forgotten, in the more recent concern for acquiring resources: high levels of access and support, although desirable, are neither necessary nor sufficient for exemplary technology use to occur. It would be useful if the literature included more examples of exemplary teachers who have done meaningful things without having the latest and greatest equipment, because this is more likely to be the situation for the majority of teachers. It is our hope that the examples included here can provide novice users with powerful visions of use as well as practical strategies to achieve them.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Besides the small number of participants, additional factors may limit the impact of this study. Because of the nature of the application process and the fact that we focused on classrooms within 60 minutes' travel time, our participants all resided within a fairly small geographical area. Additionally, because our study was conducted within a semester's time frame, we were unable to observe everyone who applied for the project or spend great lengths of time in any one classroom. Also, as noted previously, there are numerous definitions and interpretations of exemplary technology integration. Perhaps we would have encountered a different population if we had asked principals to recommend exemplary teachers who use technology as opposed to exemplary technology-using teachers. Technology-using teachers tend to be identified relative to what others are doing around them, perhaps placing an unnecessary emphasis on teachers who *use* technology as opposed to teachers who *use it to support best practice*. It will be important to compare our teachers' visions to those of exemplary teachers who do not use technology, or to

teachers who use technology but are not considered exemplary users. To what extent do teachers, in general, embrace these different types of visions? Do technology-using teachers, in general, have a greater or lesser tendency to adopt process-oriented visions? These are questions to be explored in future work.

Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, it appears as though no one technology resource or educational experience is necessary for exemplary technology use to occur. Similarly, no one vision of teaching and learning motivates teachers to strive for exemplary use. Teachers in this study embraced visions that encompassed multiple emphases depending on the perceived needs of their students as well as the perceived requirements of their jobs.

Although being able to integrate technology is fast becoming an expectation for all teachers, it is not clear how this translates into practice. Based on the results of this study, however, it is fairly clear that some discrepancy exists between what is advocated in the literature and what occurs in schools, even in classrooms perceived to be exemplary. What is less clear, however, are the reasons for these discrepancies. Are teachers still evolving in their constructivist practices relative to technology use, or are the expectations outlined in the literature unrealistic? To what extent can we expect technology best practice to occur in teachers' classrooms? As suggested by McLaughlin (as cited in Dexter et al., 1999), best practice may be an unrealistic goal:

Instruction as observed in a classroom at any point in time reflects a teacher's response to many elements in the school and classroom setting—students, competing demands, instructional goals, norms, and expectations, to highlight just a few. Teaching practice is embedded in ... the “nowness” of the teaching context. (p. 223)

If, however, teachers are still evolving, professional development experiences can be designed to support teacher growth. Perhaps the description of exemplary practice included in the literature should be broadened to include more examples of how teachers adjust their constructivist practice to reflect real constraints and conflicting needs. It might also be useful to illustrate teachers at different points in their journeys of technology integration in order to highlight effective strategies for moving forward. By providing realistic visions of what others have achieved, teachers may be motivated to begin their own journeys toward exemplary technology use. Only by working within teachers' existing situations, can we truly expect best practice to be achieved.

Contributors

Peggy A. Ertmer is an assistant professor of educational technology in the School of Education at Purdue University. Her current research focuses on the effect that teachers' pedagogical visions and beliefs have on classroom technology use.

Sangeetha Gopalakrishnan is a master's student in educational technology at Purdue University. Her interests include designing multimedia instructional materials for distributed learning environments.

Eva M. Ross is a doctoral student in educational technology at Purdue University. Her research interests focus on motivational factors that support technology integration in the classroom and workplace.

Contact

Peggy Ertmer
Purdue University
School of Education
1442 LAEB
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1442
pertmer@purdue.edu

Acknowledgements

Portions of this work were supported by the Multimedia Instructional Development Center at Purdue University and the Herrick Foundation of Michigan. The authors wish to thank the participating teachers and their school principals for their hospitality and efforts during this project. In addition, the authors thankfully acknowledge the assistance of D. Scott Brandt, Dennis Dell, Valeria Moschetta, Suzy Steuben, and Olga Weiss during data collection and analysis.

References

- Becker, H. J. (1994). How exemplary computer-using teachers differ from other teachers: Implications for realizing the potential of computers in schools. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 26(3), 291–321.
- Becker, H. J., & Riel, M. M. (1999). *Teacher professionalism, school-work culture and the emergence of constructivist-compatible pedagogies* [Online document]. Irvine: University of California, Irvine, Center for Research on Information Technology and Organizations. Available: www.crito.uci.edu/tlc/findings/special_report2/index.htm.
- Beichner, R. J. (1993). Technology competencies for new teachers: Issues and suggestions. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 9(3), 17–20.
- Berg, S., Benz, C. R., Lasley II, T. J., & Raisch, C. D. (1998). Exemplary technology use in elementary classrooms. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 31(2), 111–122.
- Brown, A. L. (1997). The advancement of learning. In H. J. Walberg & Geneva D. Haertel (Eds.), *Psychology and educational practice* (pp. 52–76). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Bruer, J. T. (1994). *Schools for thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Center for Research on Information Technology and Organizations. (1999). *Contrasting teaching philosophies among American teachers* [Online document]. Available: www.crito.uci.edu/TLC/FINDINGS/internet-use/snapshots/snapshot-1.htm.
- Copyright © 2001, ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education), 800.336.5191 (U.S. & Canada) or 541.302.3777 (Int'l), iste@iste.org, www.iste.org. All rights reserved.

- Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1997). *The Jasper Project: Lessons in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cuban, L. (1993). Computers meet classroom: Classroom wins. *Teachers College Record*, 95, 185–210.
- Dede, C. (Ed.) (1998). *Learning with technology: The 1998 ASCD Yearbook*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dexter, S. L., Anderson, R. E., & Becker, H. J. (1999). Teachers' views of computers as catalysts for changes in their teaching practice. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 31(3), 221–238.
- Erickson, R. (1986). Tasks in time: Objects of study in a natural history of teaching. In Zumwalt (Ed.), *Improving teaching. 1986 ASCD Yearbook* (pp. 131–147). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ertmer, P.A. (1999). Addressing first- and second-order barriers to change: Strategies for technology integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 47(4), 47–61.
- Ertmer, P.A., & Dillon, D.R. (1998). “Shooting in the dark” versus “Breaking it down”: Understanding students' approaches to case-based instruction. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11, 605–622.
- Ertmer, P.A., Gopalakrishnan, S., & Ross, E.M. (2000, February). *VisionQuest: Helping our future teachers envision and achieve technology integration*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education, San Diego, CA. Available: www.edci.purdue.edu/ertmer/docs/SITE1_2000.pdf.
- Ertmer, P.A., & Hruskocy, C. (1999). Impacts of a university-elementary school partnership designed to support technology integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 47(1), 81–96.
- Fisher, C., Dwyer, D. C., & Yocam, K. (1996). *Education and technology: Reflections on computing in classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Fulton, K. (1993 Autumn/Winter). Teaching matters: The role of technology in education. *Ed Tech Review*, 5–10.
- Grabe, M., & Grabe, C. (1996). *Integrating technology for meaningful learning*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hadley, M., & Sheingold, K. (1993). Commonalties and distinctive patterns in teachers' integration of computers. *American Journal of Education*, 101, 261–315.
- Hativa, N., & Lesgold, A. (1996). Situational effects in classroom technology implementations: Unfulfilled expectations and unexpected outcomes. In S. T. Kerr (Ed.), *Technology and the*
- Copyright © 2001, ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education), 800.336.5191 (U.S. & Canada) or 541.302.3777 (Int'l), iste@iste.org, www.iste.org. All rights reserved.

future of schooling: Ninety-fifth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part 2 (pp. 131–171). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hoffman, B. (1996). Managing the information revolution: Planning the integration of school technology. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(582), 89–98.

Hooper, S., & Rieber, L. (1995). Teaching with technology. In A. C. Ornstein (Ed.), *Theory into practice* (pp. 155–170). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Jonassen, D. H., Peck, K. L., & Wilson, B. G. (1999). *Learning with technology: A constructivist perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.

Kerr, S. T. (1996). Visions of sugarplums: The future of technology, education, and the schools. In S. T. Kerr (Ed.) *Technology and the future of schooling: Ninety-fifth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part 2* (pp. 1–27). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marcinkiewicz, H. R. (1993-1994). Computers and teachers: Factors influencing computer use in the classroom. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 26(2), 220–237.

Means, B., & Olson, K. (1997). *Technology and education reform: Studies of education reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Miller, L., & Olson, J. (1994). Putting the computer in its place: A study of teaching with technology. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 26, 121–141.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods* (3rd. ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

President's Panel on Educational Technology. (1997). *Report to the President on the use of technology to strengthen K–12 education in the United States*. Washington DC U.S. Government Printing Office.

Roblyer, M. D. (1993). Why use technology in teaching? Making a case beyond research results. *Florida Technology in Education Quarterly*, 5(4), 7–13.

Sandholtz, J. H., Ringstaff, C., & Dwyer, D. C. (1997). *Teaching with technology: Creating student-centered classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

U.S. Department of Education (1999). *Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers*. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1986). Development of self-regulated learning: What are the key subprocesses? *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 16, 307–313.

Appendix

Application Form for Identifying Exemplary Technology-Using Teachers

Name:	School Phone:
School:	Fax:
City:	Home Phone:
Grade Level:	E-mail:

Content Area: _____

(if applicable) _____

Please answer the following questions as accurately and honestly as possible. You may use extra paper if you wish to elaborate on any response.

1. Describe your available technology resources (e.g., number/type of computers and peripherals; where located; support personnel).

2. Describe your professional uses of technology (how you use technology outside the classroom).

3. Describe your instructional uses of technology (include names of relevant software).

4. Describe an example of a “successful” use of technology in your classroom. Include information about the roles you, your students, and the technology played; how students were grouped; the goal of the activity; its relevance to the curriculum; and the manner in which you assessed outcomes.

5. Assuming no constraints, describe your vision of a wholly integrated classroom.
