Annotated Bibliography

Chickering, A.W. & Ehrmann, S.C. (1996). Implementing the Seven Principles: Technology as Lever. American Association for Higher Education Bulletin, 49(2), 3-6. Retrieved online 1 July 2009 from http://www.aahea.org/bulletins/articles/sevenprinciples.htm.

Chickering's and Ehrmann's article acknowledges the changes in new technology and uses Chickering's article *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* to show how new technology can be used effectively in the classroom. They suggest ways to use technology with each principle. Principles include student/faculty interaction, student interaction, active learning, feedback, timeliness, expectations, and diversity. They suggest using online resources, asynchronous communication, computer programs, research, and virtual classes to achieve interaction, collaboration, and active learning. Instructors use computers to deliver feedback while promoting high expectations and diversity. Furthermore, Chickering and Ehrmann suggest the principles must be supported by faculty, students and the institution.

Chickering and Ehrmann use past academic research regarding the principles to conclude that new technology can be used with the seven principles. Furthermore, they reviewed a project, called the Flashlight, which evaluated claims over three years and supported Chickering and Ehrmann's claims.

Overall, this article outlines important teaching principles and suggests how instructors can use technology to adhere to these guidelines. This article relates to other articles in the field regarding the necessity of faculty and student support or training. However, there are limitations to this article such as the implication that students know the principles and understand their importance. This article substantiates my claim that technology can enhance learning if students and faculty are supported by stakeholders. I have also found faculty support and training important to the success of my own literacy classroom.

Chickering, A.W. & Gamson, Z.F. (1987). Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin, 39(7)*, 3-7. Retrieved online 1 July 2009 from http://www.aahea.org/bulletins/articles/sevenprinciples1987.htm.

Chickering's and Gamson's article suggests seven key principles that students and teachers need to create an environment of good teaching and learning. These principles include student/faculty interaction, student interaction, active learning, feedback, timeliness, expectations, and diversity. They claim these principles are guidelines that must be supported by stakeholders and that the principles work in different types of classes. The article suggests students learn best in groups with real life situations.

Finding in this article are based on extensive educational research over 50 years; however, the details of the research are not given. Created by higher education professionals, this article has been used extensively in the field of educational technology and is referred to in Chickering's and Ehrmann's article *Implementing the Seven Principles: Technology as Lever*. Their focus on real life examples to make learning meaningful appears in other articles about literacy and educational technology. Also, the authors suggest faculty and students must make the changes; however, changes may need to be made to the curriculum itself. The principles were developed on reports of higher education and not written for a technological classroom but they can be redefined to apply to literacy learners using technology. This article is based on undergraduate education but the principles of good education still apply.

Overall, the research base of this article leads me to believe that these principles would work in a literacy classroom using technology. In fact, many of the principles of adult learning adhere to these guidelines such as active learning, feedback, assessment, teaching to diversity and using real life to make learning meaningful. Similar issues appear in the course readings of Palloff and Pratt and Tapscott. Therefore, these guidelines will be a basis for my article on implementing technology into the literacy field. Furthermore, instructors should follow pedagogical guidelines instead of using new technology without a reason.

Ginsburg, Lynda. (2004). *Adult Literacy Practitioners' Readiness to Use Technology in the Classroom: A Five State Survey in 2002-2003. NCAL Policy Report.* Philadelphia, PA: National Center on Adult Literacy. Retrieved July 1, 2009 from http://www.literacy.org/products/T21SurveyRpt-jcs14-feb13.pdf.

Ginsburg's report looks at whether teachers are ready to use new technology in literacy classes. Traditionally, literacy classes are routed in English and math instruction. However, we now live in an electronic world. The article suggests that educational institutions should provide computer access and teach the computer skills necessary to succeed in today's society. Practitioners must be aware of new issues regarding computers, teacher knowledge, professional development and course material creation. Technology can be used in the class or at a distance which helps learners overcome time and distance barriers. This article analyzes whether teacher comfort and computer accessibility influence how teachers use computers in the classroom.

Research for this article includes assessment of K-12 teachers to determine computer accessibility and teacher comfort levels. They refer to a past study by the National Center on Adult Literacy (NCAL) in the 1990s which looked at planning, access and technological structure. Then they survey instructors in 5 states to assess their comfort levels using computers. Researchers found most teachers were comfortable using computers and their comfort level affected how they used computers in the class. The more comfortable they were, the more they used computers. Also, they found teachers needed training support and not all learners had accessibility. Although this article is a

small sample American study that only looks at K-12 instead of adult education, the study makes a good point about schools being responsible for computer literacy. Also, the article is fairly current and written by Lynda Ginsburg of the National Center on Adult Literacy and sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

I agree with Ginsburg's main article that adult literacy learners need computer literacy to succeed and adult education classes should fill this need. Their conclusion supports my thesis which states teachers need support in order to teach effectively with new technology. Our course reading by Tapscott further describes our changed computer society. Also, I have witnessed teachers who will not use computers in literacy classrooms because they are not comfortable with the computer.

Herod, L. (2000, March). *Integrating Technology into Canadian Adult Literacy Programs: The Need for a Curriculum Deliberation Process*. Retrieved June 15, 2009 from the NALD web site: http://www.nald.ca/fulltext/herod/march/cover.htm

Herord's article evaluates the use of integrating technology into the literacy curriculum. The report suggests using collaboration and investigation to determine curriculum needs. This inclusive model includes the views of all stakeholders who would investigate issues including funding, curriculum content and whether computers improve learning. Adversaries suggest the financial cost is too high; whereas, proponents suggest schools must teach computer literacy to avoid computer illiteracy. Furthermore, Herod suggests using a curriculum specialist to determine needs because literacy curriculum is developed by practitioners who have not been trained in pedagogy. Secondly, he suggests curriculum deliberation to discuss how to use educational technology in the field.

Statistical research is not mentioned in this article but the authors conclude that hiring a curriculum specialist and deliberating over curriculum is necessary for success. I agree that computer literacy should be taught because people use computers in every day life. Furthermore, I agree with hiring a curriculum specialist who can look at the needs of faculty, staff and students. However, I believe instructors may have difficulty developing a literacy curriculum since lessons are supposed to be individualized and learner centred. Also, there might not be money for hiring a specialist.

Overall, this article supports my argument to redefine literacy. However, I am surprised that in the year 2000, the author is wondering if technology should be in the literacy classroom instead of how it should be used effectively. In our course notes, Jacobsen and Goldman suggest the importance of teaching students how to use computers properly.

Sabatini, John P. (2001). *Designing multimedia learning systems for adult learners: Basic skills with a workforce emphasis. NCAL Working Paper WP00-01. Philadelphia*, Pennsylvania: National Center on Adult Literacy. Retrieved online June 30, 2009 from http://literacy.org/products/ncal/pdf/WP0001.pdf.

Sabatini's paper evaluates the research results and the process involved in a literacy initiative called the LiteracyLink. The author analyzes the process instead of the end result looking at design issues around technology and pedagogy. The report will help designers develop effective programs. The article addresses adult learning theory including lifelong learning, attributes of adult students, goals and relevant material. They suggest that course designers need to look at the different kinds of media available and apply the adult learning principles to the best media. Findings suggest courses did need redesigning and that teachers needed implementation support. Changes were made to reflect these findings.

Research includes using formative assessment to evaluate the design and determine what changes are needed. Authors used the Litereacylink project funded by the U.S. Department of Education as a summative assessment to show the benefits of using technology to learn. This project is a combination of 25 other community and private literacy sites. The formative assessment included collecting questionnaires, ratings and reflections from students and teachers to determine the everyday issues and concerns during development.

Overall, looking at the design process of another project will help designers of the future develop effective courses. The Literacylink project resembles current literacy programs and included collaboration, interaction and goals which gave the study validity although research was based in 1998. Similarly, Palloff and Praff mention collaboration and interaction. Furthermore, this article reminded me to include theories of adult learning and not just pedagogies around educational technology. It was useful how they described the things they tried first, how they changed them and why instead of just describing what worked in the end.