

2008

An Analysis of Tidewater Community College English Instructors' Attitudes toward Using Instructional Technology

Linda Ferrara
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ferrara, Linda, "An Analysis of Tidewater Community College English Instructors' Attitudes toward Using Instructional Technology" (2008). *OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers*. 84.
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects/84

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the STEM Education & Professional Studies at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

**AN ANALYSIS OF TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ENGLISH INSTRUCTORS' ATTITUDES TOWARD USING
INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY**

A Research Paper

**Presented to the Graduate Faculty in
the Department of Occupational and Technical Studies
at Old Dominion University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the
Master of Science Degree**

By

Linda M. Ferrara

November 2008

Approval Page

This research paper was prepared by Linda M. Ferrara under the direction of Dr. John Ritz in OTED 636, Problems In Occupational And Technical Studies. It was submitted to the Graduate Program Director as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science.

Approved by: _____

Dr. John Ritz

Date

Professor and Graduate Program Director

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend special thanks to my academic and research advisor Dr. John Ritz for his patience, assistance, and guidance in the completion of this study. I would like to acknowledge my husband, Michael Ferrara and my kids, Rebecca, Daniel, and Cassidy, for understanding and accepting the time I needed to complete this research paper.

Linda M. Ferrara

TABLE OF CONTENT

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Approval Page ----- | ii |
| Acknowledgements ----- | iii |
| List of Tables ----- | v |
| CHAPTERS | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | |
| Statement of the Problem ----- | 2 |
| Research Goals ----- | 3 |
| Background and Significance ----- | 3 |
| Limitations ----- | 4 |
| Assumptions ----- | 5 |
| Procedures ----- | 5 |
| Definition of Terms ----- | 6 |
| Overview of Chapters ----- | 7 |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE | |
| Instructional Technology and English Composition ----- | 8 |
| Types of Technology and Its Uses ----- | 10 |
| Advantages of Using Instructional Technology ----- | 12 |
| Disadvantages of Using Instructional Technology ----- | 13 |
| Summary ----- | 14 |
| III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES | |
| Population ----- | 16 |
| Instrument Design ----- | 16 |
| Methods of Data Collection ----- | 17 |
| Statistical Analysis ----- | 17 |
| Summary ----- | 17 |
| IV. FINDINGS | |
| Instructor Survey Response Rate ----- | 19 |
| Survey Results ----- | 20 |
| Summary ----- | 35 |
| V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | |
| Summary ----- | 37 |
| Conclusions ----- | 39 |
| Recommendations ----- | 42 |
| REFERENCES ----- | 44 |
| APPENDICES ----- | 45 |
| Appendix A. Sample of Survey Questionnaire ----- | 46 |
| Appendix B. Sample of Cover Letter ----- | 49 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | Page |
|--|------|
| 4.1 Participating Instructors' Survey According to Years of Teaching Experience----- | 21 |
| 4.2 Classroom Use of Instructional Technology ----- | 22 |
| 4.3 Experience with Instructional Technology ----- | 24 |
| 4.4 Satisfaction with Instructional Technology Knowledge----- | 26 |
| 4.5 Successfully Integrating Instructional Technology ----- | 27 |
| 4.6 Skills to Design Lesson with Multiple Technologies ----- | 28 |
| 4.7 Advantages of Instructional Technology ----- | 30 |
| 4.8 Disadvantages of Instructional Technology ----- | 32 |
| 4.9 Adequate Training by Employer----- | 34 |
| 5.1 Making Instructional Technology Mandatory in Composition Courses- | 35 |

Chapter I

Introduction

Technology had been available for many decades and was increasingly being used in homes, businesses, and education. However, according to Jennings (2007, p. 4), "... some teachers are still apprehensive about embracing the technologies. They're fearful that they don't know everything and they feel like they should." The 21st century exploded with new technologies; and the question was are post-secondary English instructors incorporating and embracing these new technologies?

There were numerous reasons why some English instructors were still resisting using technology in their classrooms. One reason was that "too many English teachers are just not aware of the ways in which computers and technology can improve (their) ability to teach, or of the efficiency by which they can accomplish the many, often mundane, tasks that [they] are required to do" (Hillford, 2000, p. 22).

According to Selfe (2005), "not all English and language arts teachers have been able to identify an active role for themselves in managing technology or shaping computer-supported teaching and learning environments" (p. 7). He used the term "dynamic of blame" (p. 8) which describes how each individual was blaming another individual for the reason technology was not being used in the classroom. These individuals, according to Selfe (2005), included early adopter teachers, mainstream teachers, administrators, techies/staff, and students.

Another possible reason for the resistance in using instructional technology in the classroom was that

...technology is very time-consuming. People who work with technology in the classroom must spend a portion of their time learning and teaching new software to students and possibly colleagues. They often find themselves providing technical support to students and colleagues outside of class and office hours, sometimes taking on responsibilities that would not normally fall under their purview (Selfe, 1999, p. 40).

If English instructors along with instructors in other disciplines do not incorporate technology in their classrooms, are they doing a disservice to the students? Does their insufficiencies or lack of interest in technology result in students who “may be incapable of functioning effectively as literate citizens in a growing number of social spheres” (Hawisher et. al., 2004, pp. 242-243)? Technology is growing rapidly and there was a need to incorporate these technologies into the English classroom. There has been some resistance over the past years; however, we need to remember “... a time when in the office when you got rid of the typewriter in exchange for a computer. Because initially there were many people who said that nothing could ever equal the typewriter” (Jennings, 2007, p. 4).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the attitudes of English composition instructors toward using instructional technology in a post-secondary composition course.

Research Goals

The goals of this study were to:

1. Ascertain if instructors were using technology in the English Composition course.
2. Identify what types of technologies were being used.
3. Examine instructor's previous experience with technology.
4. Determine instructors' level of satisfaction and skill of using multiple technologies within their English composition courses.
5. Determine instructors' opinions in regards to the type of advantages when incorporating technology into their courses.
6. Identify any disadvantages in using instructional technology in the English composition classroom.
7. Determine the overall attitudes of English instructors towards incorporating technology into the course.

Background and Significance

The use of technology in a learning environment was still being challenged. For example, Paslay (2006) stated that technology interfered with "the traditional five-step writing process" (p. B02). Paslay also compared using "steroids in major-league baseball" to technology. He discussed how "technology had become a way for students to cheat – and bypass hard work and cut right to the end result" (p. B02).

On the other hand, Boston (2008) cited an opinion by Sterling, executive director emeritus of the National Writing Project, that "...cutting edge technology, contrary to what some might think, has only improved writing" (p. D01).

According to the research, there seemed to be two conflicting attitudes of English instructors incorporating technology into their writing courses. Some instructors did not want to incorporate technology for a variety of reasons and other instructors embraced technology and used it in their classrooms. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of today's English composition instructors toward using instructional technology in their classrooms. The significance of understanding the English composition instructors' attitudes towards instructional technology was important because if Tidewater Community College was to require English composition instructors to use instructional technology within their classrooms, TCC would have the research to determine by percentages if English composition instructors were embracing technology or being resistant.

Limitations

This research was limited to English composition instructors at the four campuses of Tidewater Community College (TCC): Chesapeake, Portsmouth, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach. Instructors that participated in the study had at least one-year post-secondary teaching experience, and the survey was completed by English composition instructors at TCC exclusively. Although instructors of other courses or disciplines could have contributed meaningful input, their opinions were outside the scope of the study. The types of

technology used included word processing software, presentation software, web pages, the Internet, Blackboard (BB), and additional technologies used by individual instructors.

Assumptions

In order to teach English composition courses, the instructor must have a master's degree and at least 18 credit hours in their discipline and in this case, those hours would be English. Instructors may have attended technology training within Tidewater Community College (TCC) for basic knowledge. Some instructors may have attended ongoing Blackboard training within TCC. Overall, instructors have been exposed to technology in order to accomplish their day-to-day tasks for fulfilling their jobs. For example, they must have been capable in using email and the Internet for access to school information. In regards to the use of technology in the composition class, it was not mandatory for English instructors to use instructional technology in the classroom. Some instructors have incorporated Blackboard as an added tool in their classrooms, but again this was not mandatory as of yet.

Procedures

In order to conduct the research, an effective research instrument was developed. The instrument for this study was an online questionnaire. The questionnaire's goal was to gather attitudinal information related to the research goals as stated above. The questionnaire was sent via e-mail to Tidewater Community College's full-time and part-time English composition instructors.

After the data were collected, it was statistically analyzed for a solution to the research problem.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined to guide the reader through this study:

- *Instructional technology:*
The use of technological developments, such as computers, audiovisual equipment, and mass media, as tools to enhance and optimize the teaching and learning environment in all school subjects, including technology education (ITEA, 1995).
- *Blackboard (BB):* Blackboard is an online course management system that allows professors to post grades, information, and assignments. They can also hold discussions and assignments can be sent via Blackboard.
- *Discussion Board:* Accessed through Blackboard where a topic or forum can be discussed asynchronously between students within the classroom.
- *E-mail:* Short for electronic mail; the transmission of messages over communications networks
- *TCC:* Tidewater Community College; included Chesapeake, Portsmouth, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach campuses.
- *Technology:* Human innovation in action that involved the generation of knowledge and processes to develop systems that solve problems and extend human capabilities. The innovation, change, or modification of the natural environment to satisfy perceived human needs and wants (ITEA, 2000).

- *Word Processing:* A word processor enabled you to create a document, store it electronically on a flash drive, display it on a screen, modify it by entering commands and characters from the keyboard, and print it to a printer.

Overview of Chapters

Chapter I introduced the reader to the need to include instructional technology into the post-secondary, English composition courses. The goals were to determine if technology was being used in English composition courses, if instructors felt they had the skills to use technology, and their opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of using technology, or not. The background and significance discussed the divide between English composition instructors in regards to using or not using instructional technology in the classroom. The research showed there were many opinions and obstacles for the resistance in using instructional technology. Chapter I provided an overview of the limitations and assumptions of the study, the procedures in using an online survey as an instrument for the research, and the definition of terms for the study.

Chapter II provides a review of the literature in regards on how instructional technology has been evolving over the past decade and why it has or has not been accepted and used within the English writing courses. Chapter III provides information on how the instrument of the online survey was designed and the methods of data collected. Chapter IV reports the findings of the study and Chapter V presents the summary of the research and presents recommendations for additional consideration.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

The purpose for this review of literature was to report background information related to this study. The first goal was to ascertain if instructors were using instructional technology in the post-secondary, English composition courses. The second goal was to determine what types of technologies were being used in their courses. The third goal was to examine instructor's previous experience with technology. The fourth goal was to determine both the level of satisfaction and skill of using multiple technologies within their courses. The fifth goal was to determine their opinion in regards to the advantages of using technology as an instructional tool in their courses. The sixth goal was to determine the disadvantages of incorporating technology into their courses. The last goal was to determine the overall attitudes of English instructors towards incorporating technology in their courses.

Instructional Technology and English Composition

The literature that has been written in the last decade showed some enthusiasm by "early adopters" (Selfe, 2005, p. 9) of instructional technology within English composition courses. These instructors tended to have previous experience with technology and were incorporating instructional technology within their courses. According to some instructors that were interviewed by Richards (2000), they have always been fascinated with computers and had begun to find ways to use these machines in their classrooms as long as ten years ago (p. 41). Due to the instructors' exposures to technology, "early

adopter” instructors were less likely to have anxieties about exploring and incorporating technology in the classroom.

However, “in our (English instructors) race to improve our methods of teaching English, too many of us still avoid using technology in our classrooms” (Hill, 2000, p. 22). Some veteran instructors felt that “change is difficult, involves risks, takes time, and does not guarantee success or satisfaction” when it came to incorporating technology into the writing classroom (Richards, 2000, p. 28).

As technology increased in all aspects of our daily lives, the problem with English and language arts instructors not using instructional technology in the classroom was that “not all English and language arts teachers have been able to identify an active role for themselves in managing technology or shaping computer-supported teaching and learning environments” (Selfe, 2005, p. 7).

Selfe (2005) recognized the problem on two levels. On one level, English instructors “lack[ed] the professional development they need [ed] to be confident participants in setting technology policy and shaping technology practices” (p. 7). On another level, “...many English studies, composition, and language arts teachers [were] most comfortable maintaining the culture’s conventional separation of the arts and technology” (Selfe, 2005, p. 7).

Selfe’s (2005) term “dynamic of blame” (p.10) was used to describe why English instructors were not using instructional technology in their classrooms. He identified five groups in the “dynamic of blame” and they included: early adopter teachers, mainstream teachers, administrators, students, and techies/staff. Selfe (2005) explained the dynamics that existed between these

five groups and how there were many reasons for the lack of instructional technology in the English classroom.

Selfe (2005) described “dynamic of blame” as individual’s feeling powerless to shape teaching and learning environments. He stated “most often the dynamic of blame started with individuals, often teachers” (p.10). For example, early adopter teachers may have felt they did not have the support from administrators or a help desk to trouble shoot for them; therefore, they felt powerless. Then there were mainstream instructors who were “less enthusiastic about computer-supported classes” (Selfe, 2005, p. 10). As a result, these teachers “blamed computer-using instructors for raising the expectations of students who demanded more technology in all their classes” (Selfe, 2005, p. 11). This “dynamic of blame” could result in “paralysis, misdirection, and a lack of productive action” in trying to incorporate technology in the English classrooms (Selfe, 2005, p.11). The attitude of English instructors toward instructional technology may vary because of each individual’s different levels of experience and perceptions about technology.

Types of Technology and Its Uses

Just 15 years ago it was an exciting day when the instructor had a filmstrip to show in class because students were being exposed to a different medium of learning (Hill, 2000, p. 23). As we fast forward to the 21st century, today’s “students are accustomed to a world that runs the fast-paced race of music videos, action-packed video games, and instant access to information” (Hill, 2000, p. 23). Therefore, because the new generation of students was using

technology, they would expect to use technology in their education and learn new technologies.

In today's classrooms a variety of technological mediums can be used and benefit both students and instructors alike. Some examples of technology included but were not limited to the Internet, online course management systems, discussion boards, e-mail, and word processing software.

The Internet was an essential instructional tool in the English classroom because it allowed students and instructors immediate access to information. The Internet enabled students and instructors to have access to other types of technology such as online course management systems (e.g., Blackboard). Universities around the world were using this tool to manage their courses. Within Blackboard, students had access to their course syllabi, course assignments, e-mails, discussion boards, etc. This tool could be used in an online class as a means of communication from the instructor to the student and vice versa. It could also be used in a face-to-face class as an additional tool for students to complete the course.

Another type of software that could be used to complete writing assignments was a word processing program, such as Microsoft Word™. For example, "the standard research paper [was] relatively linear in scope; but with the use of current technology students [could] add hyperlinks, to outside sources, include sound clips of interviews with experts, include pictures and video clips about various aspects of the topic" (Hill, 2000, p. 22). As a result, students' research papers "not only demonstrated their ability to support their thesis and

synthesize other's ideas, but they could show with greater clarity the complexity of the very concepts they have researched" (Hill, 2000, p. 22).

The possibilities with technology were endless and exciting. Never had there been a time when students could access so many different voices and types of people. English instructors need to find monitored ways for students to be able to use these valuable communication tools (Hill, 2000).

Advantages of Using Instructional Technology

The literature showed there were some advantages of using instructional technology; however, they were opinions rather than real scientific studies of how instructional technology may or may not aid in using it in the classroom. Due to the lack of research, early adopters have embraced technology with little support and direction; and on the other hand, veteran instructors resisted instructional technology for a variety of reasons.

The advantage of using instructional technology that has been expressed over and over in the research was preparing students for the real world.

Hawisher and Selfe (2004) expressed their opinions about

the ability to write well...and to write well with computers and within digital environments ...we believe students having the ability to write well within digital environments will continue to play an increasingly important role in determining if students will be able to participate and succeed in school, work, and community (p. 243).

Another advantage of instructional technology was that it allowed "students to step beyond their limitations" (Hill, 2000, p. 22). Using different

types of technology such as “e-mail, real-time chat, messaging, discussion boards, listservs, etc. provided amazing ways for students to access other people and their ideas” (Hill, 2000, p. 23). Students could also use the Internet and have immediate access to resources to develop in-depth writing assignments.

Another benefit with technology included unlimited and unrestricted communication. For example, students had access to the instructor via e-mail and instructors had access to their students by posting assignments, quizzes, handouts, and announcements on Blackboard or through the instructor’s web page. As a result of this communication, students had the ability to be better prepared and had access to the instructor at all times. However, some instructors may say that being available all the time was a disadvantage. Therefore, it was important to discuss some of the disadvantages of using instructional technology in the classroom.

Disadvantages of Using Instructional Technology

The research discussed some of the reasons why English instructors were not using instructional technology. Some of these reasons included lack of technical and administrative support, equipment, and time. For example, if “labs were not maintained and technical support was unreliable,” then instructors were on their own (Gerard, 2006, p. 215). Another drawback was the lack of time instructors had “in order to discover new ways to use technology in the changing English classroom” (Hill, 2000, p. 24). There was also the issue of spending too much time teaching the technology and not having enough time to teach the required subject.

Another obstacle for using instructional technology within the classroom included finding the meaning for using technology because “instructional technology was experimental; it changes; there were guidelines but few rules (Selfe, 2005, p. 164). Instructors may have felt “nervous teaching 20 or more students who obviously had more technological expertise than they did” (DePew, 2004, p. 112). As a result, instructors may have worried about losing control. For example they may have felt “that our institutions will control our computer-based teaching” and instructors might have felt “overwhelmed by the size of the task they have undertaken” (Gerard, 2006, p. 215).

Fear of the unknown or not accepting changes seemed to be the underlying factor for instructors’ lack of interest in instructional technology. Some instructors have used instructional technology; however, it was limited because of their lack of experience and confidence with technology. Instructors have been left on their own with little support and motivation because of the lack of research on the benefits of using instructional technology.

Summary

Selfe (1999), a pioneer in the study of technology in the classroom, stated, “...the pace of technological change was unprecedented. Computer-mediated communication (CMC) was reconfiguring the ways in which scholarly knowledge was produced and disseminated” (p. 139). However, many departments of English and language arts have responded to short-term strategies that answer immediate technology initiatives to be used in the classrooms (Selfe, 2005). According to Selfe (2005), “these departments needed to plan for long-term

sustainable efforts that will support teachers of English and language arts on an ongoing basis by taking up the difficult task of changing the way departments think about teaching literacy with technology” (p. 24). With this type of support for instructors, the attitudes of using instructional technology in the classroom could very well be different in five years in comparison to today’s attitudes.

The next chapter titled, Methods and Procedures, will explain the participants included in the study and what type of sampling technique was used. Chapter III will also introduce and explain the type of instrument that was used, and how it was designed to collect data that will then be statistically analyzed.

Chapter III

Methods and Procedures

This chapter explains the methods and procedures used while undertaking this study. This chapter discusses the population, instrument design, methods of data collection, statistical analysis, and summary.

Population

The population in this study included a combination of 70 full-time and part-time English composition instructors from Tidewater Community College's Virginia Beach, Norfolk, Chesapeake, and Portsmouth campuses. After approval from Tidewater Community College's Institutional Review Board and with the assistance of the English Department Deans, the participants were given a voluntary and an anonymous survey via e-mail and interoffice mailboxes.

Instrument Design

The instrument design used in this research was a self-made closed and open formed question survey. When measuring attitudinal data, the scores were calculated according to the 5-point Likert scale rating from 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. As a result of this framework, it allowed identification of general factors that predicted attitudes toward using instructional technology at the post-secondary level in English composition courses.

Comparisons of instructors' attitudes were measured according to years of teaching experience. The survey questions were based on the research goals established in this research and from the review of literature specifically for this topic. For an example of the survey used, see Appendix A.

Methods of Data Collection

Once approved, a date for conducting this study was established. The method of data collection used for this study was delivered via Tidewater Community Colleges e-mail system to English composition instructors. Participants were informed within the cover letter that their participation was voluntary and that their participation and responses would be kept confidential. After the survey was distributed, participants that completed the survey online returned the completed survey via e-mail. These identifiers were kept confidential and password protected until the data was gathered from the surveys. After it was processed and aggregated, the surveys and their identifiers were destroyed.

Statistical Analysis

The collected data were presented by number, percentile, and mean scoring of surveys according to instructor's years of experience with instructional technology. A 5-point Likert scale was used to rate participant's responses from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. The mean scoring values were described for each teaching group according to the number of years of teaching experience. The mean scoring values were also described for the teaching group as a whole as well as their related percentage values.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to explain the methods of procedures for conducting this study. The researcher's goal for this study was to analyze post-secondary English instructors' attitudes toward incorporating instructional technology in their composition courses. Also addressed in this chapter were the

participants, method of collecting data, and the instrument and its design that was used for this study.

The next chapter, Findings, reports the data and findings that were collected for this study. After data was collected, the results were presented in accordance with the research goals for this research.

Chapter IV

Findings

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings of the survey. Seventy English composition instructors from Tidewater Community College were selected to complete the survey with 43 instructors responding or 61 percent. The problem of this study was to determine post-secondary level, English composition instructors' attitudes toward using instructional technology within their courses. Answers to the attitudinal survey were categorized in this chapter by instructors' years of teaching experience. The survey contained responses from a variety of participating instructors at Tidewater Community College ranging from 1- 30 years experience teaching English composition courses. The responses of the survey questions were categorized by years of teaching experience. The survey data were reported in terms of mean, and in terms of frequency of responses on a percentile basis. The findings of the open-ended question were presented.

Instructor Survey Response Rate

Of the 43 surveys received, seven surveys were turned in by instructors with 1-5 years of teaching experience and made up sixteen percent of the survey population. Eight surveys were turned in by instructors with 6-10 years of experience and consisted of nineteen percent of the survey population.

Seven surveys were turned in from instructors with 11-15 years of experience and consisted of 16 percent of the survey population. Twelve surveys were turned in by teachers with 16-20 years of experience and consisted of

twenty-eight percent of the survey population. In the last category, 21-30+ years of teaching experience, nine surveys were completed and consisted of twenty-one percent of the survey population.

Survey Results

Survey Questions 1-11 were designed to answer Research Goals 1 through 7 of this study. The 5-point Likert scale was used to rate participants' responses from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. The mean scoring values were described for each teaching group according to the instructors' years of experience as well as percentage values.

Question 1 was designed to ensure the participants taking the survey had at least one-year experience teaching English composition at the post-secondary level. The question asked if the instructors (either full-time or part-time) had at least one year of teaching English composition at the post-secondary level. One hundred percent of the 43 instructors that responded to the survey answered strongly agree.

Question 2 was designed to categorize each instructor group by years of teaching experience. This question asked how many years of teaching experience they had in post-secondary, English composition course. Out of the 43 participants each group was categorized by years of teaching experience. Within the category of 1-5 years of teaching experience, there were seven participants and made up sixteen percent of the population. In the category of 6-10 years of teaching experience, there were eight participants and made up nineteen percent of the population. The category of 11-15 years of teaching

experience included seven participants and made up sixteen percent of the population. The category of 16-20 years of teaching experience included 12 participants and made up twenty-eight percent of the population. The last group's category was 21-30 years and included nine participants and twenty-one percent of the population. See Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Participating Instructors' Surveys According to Years of Teaching Experience

| <i>Years of Teaching</i> | <i>% Of Instructors</i> | <i>Instructor mean by years of experience</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 1-5 | 16% | n=7 |
| 6-10 | 19% | n=8 |
| 11-15 | 16% | n=7 |
| 16-20 | 28% | n=12 |
| 21-30 | 21% | n=9 |
| | 100% | Total: 43 Surveys |

Research Goal 1 was to identify if English composition instructors were using instructional technology within their classrooms. Question 4 asked if the participants were using instructional technology as an instructional tool in at least one of their composition courses. If participants were using technology, participants had the option of listing the types of technology they were using within their classrooms. The findings to Question 4 showed forty-three percent (3) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed that they were incorporating instructional technology within their classrooms and fifty-seven

percent (4) agreed. Fifty percent (4) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience strongly agreed and fifty percent (4) agreed. Fifty-seven percent (4) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience strongly agreed and forty-three percent (3) agreed. Forty-two percent (5) of the participants with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; forty-two percent (5) agreed; eight percent (1) disagreed; and eight percent (1) strongly disagreed. The overall mean score was a 4.26, indicating that the average participants' responses agreed with using technology as an instructional tool in their composition courses. See Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. Classroom Use of Instructional Technology

| <i># Of years Teaching</i> | <i>Strongly Agree</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>Uncertain</i> | <i>Disagree</i> | <i>Strongly Disagree</i> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (1-5) | 43% | 57% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 4 | -- | -- | -- |
| (6-10) | 50% | 50% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 4 | -- | -- | -- |
| (11-15) | 57% | 43% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 3 | -- | -- | -- |
| (16-20) | 42% | 42% | -- | 8% | 8% |
| # Of Surveys | 5 | 5 | -- | 1 | 1 |
| (21-30) | 44% | 33% | -- | -- | 22% |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 3 | -- | -- | 2 |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 4.26 | | | | | |

The types of instructional technologies that were being used included

Blackboard, Computer software including Microsoft Word, Excel, Access, PowerPoint, and instructional material from textbooks. Other technologies being used included the Internet, CD's, DVD's, digital cameras, and email. Websites were also being incorporated into the classroom for grammar mechanics, online writing lab services, online audio and video, and completing research.

Research Goal 3 was to examine the instructor's previous experience with technology. Question 3 asked if the participants had any personal or professional experience with instructional technology. Forty-three percent (3) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed that they had either personal or professional experience with instructional technology and fifty-seven percent (4) agreed. Thirty-eight percent (3) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience strongly agreed and sixty-three percent agree. Fifty-seven percent (4) of the participants with 11-15 years experience strongly agreed and forty-three percent agreed. Forty-two percent (5) of the participants with 16-20 years experience strongly agreed; forty-two percent (5) agreed; eight percent (1) were uncertain; and eight percent (1) disagreed. The overall mean score was a 4.42, indicating that the average participants' responses agreed with having personal or professional experience with instructional technology. See Table 4.3. Questions 5, 6, and 7 were designed to answer Research Goal 4 and determine the instructor's level of satisfaction and skill of using multiple technologies within their English Composition courses. Question 5 determined what population felt they were satisfied with their knowledge of instructional technology. The question asked if the participant was satisfied with their level of instructional

Table 4.3. Experience with Instructional Technology

| <i># Of years Teaching</i> | <i>Strongly Agree</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>Uncertain</i> | <i>Disagree</i> | <i>Strongly Disagree</i> |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 43% | 57% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 4 | -- | -- | -- |
| (6-10) | 38% | 63% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 5 | -- | -- | -- |
| (11-15) | 57% | 43% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 3 | -- | -- | -- |
| (16-20) | 42% | 42% | 8% | 8 | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | -- |
| (21-30) | 56% | 44% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 5 | 4 | -- | -- | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 4.42 | | | | | |

technology knowledge. The findings to Question 5 showed twenty-nine percent (2) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their knowledge of instructional technology and twenty-nine percent (2) agreed. Eighty-eight percent (7) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience agreed and thirteen percent (1) were uncertain.

Questions 5, 6, and 7 were designed to answer Research Goal 4 and determine the instructor’s level of satisfaction and skill of using multiple technologies within their English Composition courses. Question 5 determined what population felt they were satisfied with their knowledge of instructional technology. The question asked if the participant was satisfied with their level of

instructional technology knowledge. The findings to Question 5 showed twenty-nine percent (2) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their knowledge of instructional technology and twenty-nine percent (2) agreed. Eighty-eight percent (7) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience agreed and thirteen percent (1) were uncertain. Forty-three percent (3) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; forty-three percent (3) agreed; and fourteen percent (1) were uncertain. Twenty-five percent (3) of the participants with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; sixty-seven percent (8) agreed; and eight percent (1) were uncertain. Forty-four percent (4) strongly agree; and fifty-six percent (5) agreed. The overall mean score was a 4.13, indicating that the average participants' responses agreed with being satisfied with their level of instructional technology knowledge. See Table 4.4

Question 6 was also designed to answer Research Goal 4 and asked if they felt they were integrating technology successfully into their composition courses. The findings to Question 6 showed twenty-nine percent (2) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed that they were integrating instructional technology into their lessons successfully; forty-three percent (3) agreed; and twenty-nine percent (2) were uncertain. Seventy-five percent (6) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience agreed and twenty-five percent (2) agreed. Forty-three percent (3) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; twenty-nine percent (2) agreed; and twenty-nine percent (2) disagreed. Thirty-three percent (4) of the participants

Table 4.4. Satisfaction with Instructional Technology Knowledge

| # Of years Teaching | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 29% | 29% | 38% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 2 | 3 | -- | -- |
| (6-10) | -- | 88% | 13% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | -- | 7 | 1 | -- | -- |
| (11-15) | 43% | 43% | 14% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 3 | 1 | -- | -- |
| (16-20) | 25% | 67% | 8% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 8 | 1 | -- | -- |
| (21-30) | 44% | 56% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 5 | -- | -- | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 4.13 | | | | | |

with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; fifty percent (6) agreed; and seventy percent (2) were uncertain. Eleven percent (1) of the participants with 21-30+ years of teaching experience strongly agreed; forty-four percent (4) were uncertain; and forty-four percent (8) disagreed. The overall mean score was a 3.71 indicating that the average participants' responses was to agree they were integrating instructional technology successfully into their lessons. See Table 4.5.

Question 7 was also designed to answer Research Goal 4 and it asked if the instructors felt they had the necessary skills to design lessons that combine multiple technologies. The findings to Question 7 showed twenty-nine percent (2) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed that they

Table 4.5. Successfully Integrating Instructional Technology

| # Of years Teaching | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 29% | 43% | 29% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 3 | 2 | -- | -- |
| (6-10) | -- | 24% | 25% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | -- | 6 | 2 | -- | -- |
| (11-15) | 43% | 29% | -- | 29% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 2 | -- | 2 | -- |
| (16-20) | 33% | 50% | 17% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 6 | 2 | -- | -- |
| (21-30) | 11% | -- | 44% | 44% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 1 | -- | 4 | 4 | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 3.71 | | | | | |

had the necessary skills to design lessons that combined multiple technologies; twenty-nine percent (2) agreed; and forty-three percent (3) were uncertain. Twenty-five percent (2) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; thirty-eight percent (3) agreed; thirteen percent (1) were uncertain; and twenty-five percent (2) disagreed. Forty-three percent (3) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; fourteen percent (1) agreed; and fourteen percent (1) were uncertain. Thirty-three percent (4) of the participants with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; thirty-three percent (4) agreed; and thirty-three percent (4) were uncertain. Thirty-three percent (3) of the participants with 21-30+ years of teaching experience

strongly agreed; forty-four percent (4) were uncertain; and twenty-two percent (2) disagreed. The overall mean score was a 3.60, indicating that the average participants' responses were uncertain if they had the necessary skills to design lessons that combined multiple technologies. See Table 4.6.

Table 4.6. Skills to Design Lesson with Multiple Technologies

| <i># Of years Teaching</i> | <i>Strongly Agree</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>Uncertain</i> | <i>Disagree</i> | <i>Strongly Disagree</i> |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 29% | 29% | 43% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 2 | 3 | -- | -- |
| (6-10) | 25% | 38% | 13% | 25% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | -- |
| (11-15) | 43% | 14% | 14% | -- | 29% |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 1 | 1 | -- | 2 |
| (16-20) | 33% | 33% | 33% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 4 | 4 | -- | -- |
| (21-30) | -- | 33% | 44% | 22% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | -- | 3 | 4 | 4 | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 3.60 | | | | | |

Question 8 was designed to answer Research Goal 5 and determined what population of instructors felt there were advantages to using instructional technology in their courses. This question asked if the participants felt there were advantages to using instructional technology in their courses.

The findings to Question 8 showed seventy-five percent (5) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed and twenty-nine percent

agreed. Sixty-three percent (5) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience strongly agreed and thirty-eight percent (3) agreed. Fifty-seven percent (4) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience strongly agreed and forty three percent (3) agreed. Thirty-three percent (4) of the participants with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; forty-two percent (5) agreed; and twenty-five percent (3) strongly disagreed. Twenty-two percent (2) of the participants with 21-30+ years of teaching experience strongly agreed; thirty-three percent (3) agreed; and forty-four percent (4) were uncertain. The overall mean score was a 4.17 indicating that the average participant was to agree that there were advantages to using instructional technology in their courses. See Table 4.7.

The population that agreed with Question 8 had the following comments about the advantages of using instructional technology:

1. 24/7 access to course materials.
2. Computer literacy is essential as a basic skill.
3. Technology (such as Blackboard) can help with practical/logistical issues.
4. Students are able to do more steps in the revision process between classes by using technology.
5. Students are tech savvy and it's the way we do things now.
6. Access to grade books, handouts, and syllabus.
7. Online resources.
8. Computer literacy is essential

The population that disagreed that there were advantages to using

Table 4.7. Advantages of Instructional Technology

| # Of years Teaching | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 71% | 29% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 5 | 2 | -- | -- | -- |
| (6-10) | 63% | 38% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 5 | 3 | -- | -- | -- |
| (11-15) | 57% | -- | 43% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | -- | 3 | -- | -- |
| (16-20) | 33% | 42% | -- | -- | 25% |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 5 | -- | -- | 3 |
| (21-30) | 22% | 33% | 44% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 3 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 4.17 | | | | | |

technology had the following comments:

1. Technology does not allow for immediate feedback.
2. Technology seldom is actually instructional.
3. Students are tech savvy and know more than the instructor.

Research Goal 6 was to identify if participants thought there were disadvantages to using instructional technology. Question 9 asked if there were disadvantages in using technology in their courses. The findings showed fourteen percent (1) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed; fourteen percent (1) agreed; fourteen percent (1) were uncertain; forty-three percent (3) disagreed; and fourteen percent (1) strongly disagreed. Thirty-

eight percent (3) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; thirty-eight percent (3) agreed; and twenty-five percent (2) disagreed. Twenty-nine percent (2) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience agreed; forty-three percent (3) were uncertain; and twenty-nine percent (2) disagreed. Seventeen percent (2) of the participants with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; forty-two percent (5) agreed; seventeen percent (2) were uncertain; and twenty-five percent disagreed. Sixty-seven percent (6) of the participants with 21-30+ years of teaching experience agreed; and thirty-three percent (3) disagreed with this statement. The overall mean score was a 3.28 indicating that the average participant response was uncertain if there were disadvantages in using technology in their courses. See Table 4.8.

The second part of Question 9 asked “why or why not?” This sought if they agreed that there were disadvantages, if so, they had space to list them. The population that strongly agreed or agreed had the following comments about disadvantages of using instructional technology:

1. Problems with student access to course materials.
2. Many students rely on an instructor’s use of technology to replace real one-on-one communication.
3. There are more misunderstandings and forgotten assignments when students do not see the instructor regularly.
4. There is a lack of personal touch and students relying on one another.

Table 4.8. Disadvantages of Instructional Technology

| <i># Of years Teaching</i> | <i>Strongly Agree</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>Uncertain</i> | <i>Disagree</i> | <i>Strongly Disagree</i> |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 14% | 14% | 14% | 43% | 14% |
| # Of Surveys | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| (6-10) | 38% | 38% | -- | 25% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 3 | -- | 2 | -- |
| (11-15) | -- | 29% | 43% | 29% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | -- | 2 | 3 | 2 | -- |
| (16-20) | 17% | 42% | 17% | 25% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | -- |
| (21-30) | -- | 67% | -- | 33% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | -- | 6 | -- | 3 | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 3.28 | | | | | |

5. Some students are not self-disciplined and teacher cannot gauge understanding during instruction with the use of technology.

6. Students often have questions and they do not ask for answers.

The population that disagreed that there were disadvantages with using instructional technology had the following comments:

1. Technology is essential in preparing students for the world of work.
2. Everyone in the field uses computers; therefore, instructors are preparing the student for life-prep.

Question 10 asked if the participants felt their employer provided adequate training with technology in order to incorporate it into their composition courses.

The findings to this question showed twenty-nine percent (2) of the participants

with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed; fourteen percent (1) agreed; twenty-nine percent (2) were uncertain; and twenty-nine percent (2) strongly disagreed. Twenty-five percent (2) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; thirty-eight percent (3) agreed; and thirty-eight percent (3) disagreed. Fifty-seven percent (4) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; fourteen percent (1) agreed; and twenty-nine percent (2) were uncertain. Forty-two percent (5) of the participants with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; fifty percent (6) agreed; and eight percent (1) disagreed. Sixty-seven percent (6) of the participants with 21-30+ years of teaching experience strongly agreed; twenty-two percent (2) agreed; and eleven percent were uncertain that their employer provided adequate training with technology. The overall mean score was a 3.96, indicating that the average participant response agreed with this statement. See Table 4.9.

Question 11 was designed to answer Research Goal 7 and determined overall attitudes of English composition instructors toward incorporating technology in their course. Question 11 asked if they felt instructional technology should be mandatory within composition courses at the post-secondary level.

The findings to this question showed fourteen percent (1) of the participants with 1-5 years experience strongly agreed; forty-three percent (3) agreed; twenty-nine percent (2) were uncertain; and fourteen percent (1) disagreed. Twenty-five percent (2) of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; twenty-five percent (2) agreed; twenty-five percent (2) disagreed; and twenty-five percent (2) strongly disagreed. Forty-three percent

Table 4.9. Adequate Training by Employer

| # Of years Teaching | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 29% | 14% | 29% | -- | 29% |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 1 | 2 | -- | 2 |
| (6-10) | 25% | 38% | -- | 38% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 3 | -- | 3 | -- |
| (11-15) | 57% | 14% | 29% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 1 | 2 | -- | -- |
| (16-20) | 42% | 50% | 8% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 5 | 6 | 1 | -- | -- |
| (21-30) | 67% | 22% | 11% | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 6 | 2 | 1 | -- | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 3.96 | | | | | |

(2) of the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience strongly agreed and fifty-seven percent (4) agreed. Thirty-three percent (4) of the participants with 16-20 years of teaching experience strongly agreed; seventeen percent (2) agreed; twenty-five percent (3) were uncertain; eight percent (1) disagreed; and seventeen percent (2) strongly disagreed. Sixty-seven percent (6) of the participants with 21-30+ years of teaching experience were uncertain and thirty-three percent (3) disagreed with this statement. The overall mean score was a 3.42, indicating that the average participant response was uncertain about making instructional technology mandatory within the composition courses at the post-secondary level. See Table 5.1.

Table 5.1. Making Instructional Technology Mandatory in Composition Courses

| <i># Of years Teaching</i> | <i>Strongly Agree</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>Uncertain</i> | <i>Disagree</i> | <i>Strongly Disagree</i> |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1-5) | 14% | 43% | 29% | 14% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | -- |
| (6-10) | 25% | 25% | -- | 25% | 25% |
| # Of Surveys | 2 | 2 | -- | 2 | 2 |
| (11-15) | 43% | 57% | -- | -- | -- |
| # Of Surveys | 3 | 4 | -- | -- | -- |
| (16-20) | 33% | 17% | 25% | 8% | 17% |
| # Of Surveys | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| (21-30) | -- | -- | 67% | 33% | -- |
| # Of Surveys | -- | -- | 6 | 3 | -- |
| Overall Mean Score | | | | | |
| 3.42 | | | | | |

Summary

This chapter presented the responses to the Instructional Technology Attitudinal Survey at Tidewater Community College campuses including Norfolk, Chesapeake, Virginia Beach, and Portsmouth. The mean scoring values described each teaching group according to teaching years of experience and determined if the five research goals were achieved in this study. Chapter V provides information on the summary and conclusions based on the results of this study. Chapter V also includes recommendations for future studies about

using instructional technology within the post-secondary level English composition courses.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize what has been accomplished in this research. Conclusions will be derived to answer the research goals established for this study. Recommendations for implementation and future research will be drawn from the findings.

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine the attitudes of English composition instructors toward using instructional technology in a post-secondary composition course(s). This research aimed to determine the following goals:

1. Ascertain if instructors were using technology in the English Composition course.
2. Identify what types of technologies were being used.
3. Examine instructor's previous experience with technology.
4. Determine instructors' level of satisfaction and skill of using multiple technologies within their English composition courses.
5. Determine instructors' opinions in regards to the type of advantages when incorporating technology into their courses.
6. Identify any disadvantages in using instructional technology in the English composition classroom.
7. Determine the overall attitudes of English instructors towards incorporating technology into the course.

This study explained that this research was limited by the use of the population of instructors at Tidewater Community College's four campuses: Norfolk, Portsmouth, Chesapeake, and Virginia Beach. The research was based upon the assumption that veteran instructors may feel inadequate in using instructional technology within their courses and that instructors with fewer years experience would embrace the use of instructional technology.

The instrument used to gather data for this study was a survey designed with eleven questions, with questions four, eight, and nine being open-ended to gather additional information from the participants. The data were used for determining teacher attitudes toward instructional technology being used in the composition classroom. The attitudinal measuring technique used for this survey was the Likert Scale. The mean scoring values were described for each survey question according to years of experience teaching.

The survey was delivered to 70 instructors via e-mailed and interoffice mailboxes at all four of the Tidewater Community College campuses. Their anonymous responses were collected and used to determine research findings. The data from the surveys were used to determine teachers' attitudes toward using instructional technology within their composition courses.

The participants were chosen according to two factors: they were to be post-secondary English composition instructors and have at least one year of teaching experience. Out of 70 surveys, the researcher received 43 completed surveys or 61 percent from instructors with at least one year of teaching experience.

Sixteen percent (7) of the participants had 1-5 years teaching experience. Nineteen percent (8) of the participants had 6-10 years experience, 16 percent (7) had 11-15 years of experience, 28 percent (12) had 16-20 years of experience, and 21 percent (9) had 21-30 years of teaching experience.

The mean score values were categorized for each question as well as percentage values. An analysis of each research goal and survey question is explained in the conclusion.

Conclusion

In conclusion, survey Question 1 was to establish that the participant had at least one year of teaching experience. One hundred percent (43) of the participants did have at least one year of teaching experience. Survey Question 2 was to categorize each participant with how many years of teaching experience they had. The researcher aimed to analyze seven Research Goals in this study. The data for Research Goals 1-7 were explained as follows:

1. *Research Goal 1 of this study was to ascertain if instructors were using instructional technology in the English Composition course.*

Question 4 addressed if participants were using instructional technology in their classrooms. The results of this question determined that forty-seven percent of all participants strongly agreed, fifty percent agreed, eight percent were uncertain, and eight percent disagreed with this question. The overall mean of 4.42 indicated that the participants were using instructional technology within their composition course.

2. *Research Goal 2 was to identify types of technologies being used.*

Question 4 allowed the participants to list the types of technologies they were using. The results of this study determined that many instructors used Blackboard for listing their syllabi, course outlines, assignments, and using grade book. Other types of technology being used in the classroom included websites, online writing lab services, digital cameras, CD's, DVD's, and the Internet for completing all types of research.

3. Research Goal 3 was to examine instructor's level of satisfaction and skill of using multiple technologies within their English composition courses.

Question 5 asked the participants if they were satisfied with their level of knowledge of technology. The results of this question determined that 28 percent of all instructors strongly agreed, 56 percent agreed, and 18 percent were uncertain with this question. The overall mean of 4.13 indicated that the instructors agreed that they were satisfied with their level of instructional technology knowledge.

Question 6 asked the instructors if they felt they were integrating technology successfully in their composition courses. The results of this question determined that 29 percent of all instructors strongly agreed, 49 percent agreed, 29 percent were uncertain, and 37 percent disagreed with this question. The overall mean of 3.09 indicated that the instructors were uncertain if they were integrating technology successfully in their composition courses.

Question 7 asked the instructions if they felt they had the necessary skills to design lessons that combined multiple technologies. Thirty-two percent of all instructors strongly agreed, 29 percent agreed, 29 percent were uncertain, 24

percent disagreed, and twenty-five percent strongly disagreed with this question. The overall mean of 3.00 indicated that instructors were uncertain if they had the necessary skills to design lessons using multiple technologies.

4. Research 5 was to determine instructors' opinions in regards to the type of advantages when incorporating technology into their courses.

Question 8 asked instructors if they felt that there were advantages to using technology in their courses. Forty-nine percent of all instructors strongly agreed, 35 percent agreed, 44 percent were uncertain, and 25 percent strongly disagreed. The overall mean of 3.47 indicated that participants were uncertain that there were advantages of using technology in their courses.

5. Research Goal 6 was to identify any disadvantages in using instructional technology in the English composition classroom.

Question 9 asked instructors if they felt that there were disadvantages to using technology in their courses. Twenty-three percent strongly agreed, 38 percent agreed, 25 percent were uncertain, 31 percent disagreed, and 14 percent strongly disagreed with this question. The overall mean score of 2.74 indicated that participants were uncertain if there were disadvantages to using technology within their courses.

6. Research Goal 7 was to determine the overall attitudes of English instructors towards incorporating technology into their courses.

Question 11 asked if the instructors felt technology should be mandatory within composition courses at the post-secondary level. Twenty-nine percent of the instructors strongly agreed, 42 percent agreed, 14 percent were uncertain, 24

percent disagreed, and 21 percent strongly disagreed with this question. The overall mean score of 3.42 indicated that participants were uncertain if technology should be mandatory within composition courses at the post-secondary level.

Recommendations

Based on the finding and conclusion of this study, the research makes the following recommendations:

1. Tidewater Community College English composition instructors were using instructional technology in their classrooms, were satisfied with their level of knowledge of technology, and agreed their employer provided adequate training. Therefore, TCC should continue to provide technology training for English composition instructors in order to continue keeping their attitudes positive about using instructional technology within the classrooms.
2. English composition instructors, overall, were uncertain about how well they were integrating technology in their classrooms. Therefore, English departments should have group meetings to discuss how to use instructional technology in the classrooms in innovative ways. As a result, instructors would feel they have the support and guidance they need to incorporate technology in their classrooms.
3. The instructors were also uncertain they had the necessary skills to design lessons; therefore, the English department should create and implement new instructional plans to include multiple technologies within the English composition courses.

4. Future research should examine student benefits of using instructional technology within the English composition classroom. This type of research should be examined because according to a study done by Susan Kirtly, she states, “student narratives suggest that English departments and writing programs can play an important role in assisting students who are unfamiliar with computer technologies, helping them to gain the computer literacy they need to succeed at the university” (2005, p. 209).
5. Other areas of study to be examined are the following: How are English composition instructors using technology? What types of technology are being used? And, how well they incorporate the technology into their lessons? Based on this information and previous research, new instructional plans can be created including multiple technologies.
6. A sample English composition instructional plan that includes multiple technologies can be implemented at the post-secondary level. As a result of this instructional plan, an evaluation of how technology aided in the students’ learning can be done as a result of student feedback. This would be an important and helpful study because it would be an actual measure of how students learn with technology and according to Hill (2000, p. 22), “when students manipulate concepts and ideas via a technological medium, they intrinsically interact with those concepts and skills on multiple levels and across diverse intelligences.”

References

- Boston, G. (2008, January 20). Getting it just write; Technology has helped improve written word. *The Washington Times*, p. D01. Retrieved on February 10, 2008, from LexisNexis database.
- DePew, K. (2004). The body of Charlie Brown's Instructor: What instructors should know about constructing digital subjectivities. *Computers and Composition*, 21(1) 103-118.
- Gerard, L. (2006). The evolution of the Computers and Writing Conference, the second decade. *Computers and Composition*, 23(2), 211-227.
- Hawisher, G.E., Selfe, C. L., Moraski, B., & Pearson, M. (2004). Becoming literate in the information age: Cultural ecologies and the literacies of technology. *College Composition and Communication*, 55(4), 642-692.
- Hill, L.G.C. & Ford, K. (2000). Cross conversations: To what extent should English Instructors embrace technology? *The English Journal*, 90(2), pp. 22-26.
- International Technology Education Association (ITEA). (1995). http://www.iteaconnect.org/TAA/Resources/TAA_Glossary.html. Retrieved on March 1, 2008.
- Jennings, J. (2007, September 17). Rise of the digital classroom. *The Age*, p. 4. Retrieved on February 8, 2008, from LexisNexis database.
- Kirtley, S. (2005). Students' views on technology and writing: The power of personal history. *Computers and Composition*, 22(2), 209-230
- Paslay, C. (2006, June 8). Computers distract from craft of writing. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, p. B02. Retrieved on February 10, 2008, from LexisNexis database.
- Richards, G.A. (2000). Why use computer technology? *The English Journal*, 90(2), 38-41.
- Selfe, C., & CCCC Committee on Computers and Composition. (1999). Promotion and tenure guidelines for work with technology. *College Composition and Communication*, 51(1), pp. 139-142.
- Selfe, R.J. (2005). *Sustainable computer environments: Cultures of support in English studies and language arts*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Appendices

Appendix A.

Sample Survey

Appendix B.

Sample of Cover Letter

Appendix A: Sample Survey

Instructional Technology in English Composition Survey

Purpose: To determine the attitudes of English composition instructors towards using instructional technology at the post-secondary level.

Survey Instructions: Please select the most appropriate answer or number. Please place an X next to your answer-- five if you agree the most and one if you agree the least. After completing the survey, save it and send it as an attachment to tcferrl@tcc.edu

1. I am an English composition instructor (either full-time or part-time) and have one year of teaching English composition at the post-secondary level.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

2. How many years of teaching experience in post-secondary English composition do you have?

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-30

3. I have personal or professional experience with instructional technology.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

4. I am using instructional technology as an instructional tool in at least one of my composition courses.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

Please list technologies:

5. I am satisfied with my level of instructional technology knowledge.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

6. I feel I am integrating technology successfully into my composition classes.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

7. I feel that I have the necessary skills to design lessons that combine multiple technologies.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

8. I feel that there are advantages to using instructional technology in my courses.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

Why or Why not

9. I feel there are disadvantages using technology in my courses.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

Why or Why not

10. I feel that my employer provides adequate training with technology in order to incorporate it in my composition courses.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

11. I feel instructional technology should be mandatory within composition courses at the post-secondary level.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

Thank You!

Appendix B: Sample Cover Letter

July 7, 2008

Tidewater Community College
300 Granby Street
Norfolk, VA 23510-1910

Dear Survey Participant,

I am an adjunct faculty member teaching English composition for Tidewater Community College. As part of a research project I am conducting to earn my M.S. degree through Old Dominion University, I must complete a graduate research study. The purpose of my project is to explore the attitudes, opinions, and behaviors of Tidewater Community College English composition instructors toward using instructional technology as part of their composition courses.

Participation in this study is voluntary; however, you need to have been an English composition instructor with at least one year of teaching experience at the post-secondary level. Your participation is critical to the success of this study, so I urge you to participate and complete the attached survey. A high response rate is necessary to accurately identify the views and attitudes of faculty toward instructional technology and your participation will add value to my study.

Please be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential. After collecting data from the surveys, all e-mails will be deleted, any printed material will be shredded, and the collected data will be reported as aggregated information. The survey is based on a five-point Likert scale, with five representing strongly agree and one representing strongly disagree. Please answer the items as accurately as you can and note there are no correct or incorrect answers. Your views are important, regardless of their nature. Again, this is a voluntary survey and if at any time you wish to opt out of this study, you are free to do so.

Completing the survey should only take 5 to 10 minutes. Would you please take just a few minutes to click on the following link to complete a survey and return it to be by hitting the submit button at the end of the survey? Instructions on how to complete the survey and how to return it are explained on the survey itself.

<http://jotform.com/form/81541819139>

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,
Linda M. Ferrara
Graduate Student
Old Dominion University

