Moving from face-to-face to online classrooms: The reflective university teacher

Faye Wiesenberg
Faculty of Education
University of Calgary

Elizabeth Stacey
Faculty of Education
Deakin University

This study explores the similarities, differences and possible interaction between two small groups of Canadian and Australian university teachers' face-to-face and online teaching approaches and philosophies. The paper compares their perspectives on teaching face-to-face and online at two comparable Canadian and Australian universities, both of which offer instruction in these two modes. Teaching philosophy data were gathered with the 'Teaching Perspectives Inventory' developed by Pratt and Collins at the University of British Columbia, which assessed participants' teaching approaches and philosophies in terms of their beliefs, intentions and actions in both modalities. The study upon which this paper is based builds upon a well established research partnership of the two authors who have previously explored emerging philosophies of learner centred teaching in distributed classrooms in Canada and Australia.

Keywords: philosophy of teaching, teaching perspective, theory of practice, cultural differences, face-to-face and online teaching, institutions of higher education

Introduction

Today's rapidly changing communication technologies are enabling, indeed pushing, teachers in higher education to move from traditional face-to-face classrooms to online classrooms. In order to make this transition successfully, they need to re-think their underlying assumptions about teaching, about the learning process and, most fundamentally, about their role as educators (Comeaux & McKenna-Byington, 2003; Garrison, 2006; McShane, 2006; Palloff & Pratt, 2000; Torrisi & Davis, 2000; Wiesenberg, 1999, 2002). This paper adopts Jarvis' (1999) concept of the 'reflective practitioner' and utilizes Pratt and associates' (1998) model of five teaching perspectives to describe the experiences of academics from two different countries (Canada and Australia) who are making this transition from teaching face-to-face to teaching online.

Jarvis (1999) conceptualizes the relationship between professional practice and one's personal theory of practice as a continuously evolving learning process, starting with the formulation of a personal theory that is initially untested (when a professional enters the profession), and then gradually moves towards a more complex meta-theory over time with a series of informal and formal learning experiences within the profession. Each time the personal theory is challenged with a new practical experience, it evolves and deepens conceptually. Underlying this process is the assumption that this meta-theory is driven by the demands of the profession, and that it becomes more complex and context-driven as it evolves over time.

Related to this idea of the evolving meta-theory of practice is Pratt's (1989) conceptualisation of increasing professional competence that occurs in three developmental stages: initial mastery of skills and procedures (in one's initial professional education or training); clinical problem-solving (in the novice professional's application of academic theory to actual professional practice; and critical reflection on knowledge and values (in the experienced professional's ongoing professional growth over the course of a professional career). The most important requirement for reaching this third developmental stage is the conscious and intentional interaction between critical thought, professional practice, and professional philosophy or ideology. Pratt and associates (1998) conceptualize one's theory of practice within the profession of teaching as a 'teaching perspective' or inter-related set of beliefs and intentions that directs a teacher's classroom practice.

The importance of having a clearly articulated philosophy or approach to teaching has been a focus in the teaching literature for over two decades (Elias & Merriam, 1980, 2005; Jarvis, 1999; Mott, 1996; Zinn, 1998). Elias and Merriam's 1980 seminal publication on this topic (now in its third 2005 edition) became an important text for educators engaged in training teachers of adults over 20 years ago (Wiesenberg, 1999). Elias and Merriam believe that "the knowledge of philosophy of education …distinguishes a professional educator from a paraprofessional or a beginning teacher" (Elias & Merriam, 2005, page 11). They carefully delineate seven distinct perspectives on the teaching/learning process grounded in western European and North American concepts of the teaching/learning process.

Mott (1996) calls this process of consciously and continuously reflecting on the challenges of practice as "reflective theory building". Her rationale is simple – having a clearly articulated 'theory of practice' enables one to more successfully address the constantly changing and uncertain nature of professional practice. Grounded in Schoen's multi-dimensional model of reflection in practice, Mott describes this process as starting with problem posing, moving onto data gathering, acting on new knowledge, evaluating one's new actions, and then sharing new knowledge with colleagues. Jarvis' (1999) concept of the 'practitioner-researcher' comes very close to this description, with the additional element of meta-theory development over time within a continuous and life-long learning cycle.

Inevitably, these discussions gave rise to attempts to facilitate this transfer of theory to practice, beginning with the development of various instruments to measure one's philosophy or perspective on teaching (Pratt and associates, 1998; Zinn, 1998). Originally as part of her doctoral dissertation, Zinn (1998) developed a commercially available instrument called the 'Philosophy of Adult Education Inventory' based on Elias and Merriam's initial five philosophical perspectives. At about the same time, Pratt and colleagues (1998) developed an instrument called the 'Teaching Perspectives Inventory' (TPI) which was grounded in North American concepts of the teaching/learning process, but validated cross-culturally in China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Canada and the United States. It is available online for research purposes only.

This paper discusses the teaching perspective preferences expressed by university teachers from two different cultures who teach in both face-to-face and online classrooms in comparable institutions of higher education, the similarities and differences between their Teaching Perspective Inventory scores by modality, and the significant correlations between these scores within each modality. The paper concludes with a discussion of the importance of reflection on one's teaching philosophies when shifting from a traditional face-to-face classroom context to a virtual classroom context. Some directions for future research on this important issue are offered, as more and more institutions of higher education offer online programs cross-globally and demand that teachers make this shift.

By exploring the multiple interactions between face-to-face and distributed teaching philosophies, as well as differences and similarities in teaching philosophies between cultures, the authors hope to add to the growing body of knowledge about teaching pedagogy in general, and about the transitions that occur philosophically when moving from traditional face-to-face classrooms to virtual classrooms within institutions of higher education within these two cultures in particular.

Method

The study used a mixed qualitative (data collected with an open-ended survey) and quantitative (data collected with the TPI) case study approach (Stake, 2002) with each university acting as a separate case providing data from two different cultural contexts. This paper discusses the results of the quantitative TPI data analysis only. Discussion of the qualitative data collected in the survey is discussed elsewhere (Stacey &Wiesenberg, 2006).

The Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI), which was developed and validated by Pratt and Collins (Pratt & associates, 1998), measures teachers' orientations to their roles as managers of the learning process (Pratt & Collins, 2006). The 45-item Likert-type inventory yields five alternative points of view (or perspectives) on teaching by asking structured questions about their actions in the teaching setting, their intentions as to how they organize the learning situation, and their beliefs about fundamental principles of teaching and learning. These five perspectives are: Transmission (lecture and teacher-centred); Apprenticeship (experiential and coaching-oriented); Developmental (facilitation and learning-

centred); Nurturing (focused on building learners' self-esteem); and Social Reform (focused on changing students' beliefs and actions-oriented). The TPI also yields three sub-scores within each perspective called Beliefs, Intentions and Actions which assess these three elements within each perspective, as well as consistency across each perspective (the TPI can be accessed at www.teachingperspectives.com).

This conceptual model of teaching adults was developed for face-to-face teaching contexts with over two decades of research in Canada, China, Hong Kong, Singapore, and the United States. Pratt & associates (1998) interviewed more than 250 teachers in different settings about what 'teaching' meant to them (i.e. their beliefs), observed their teaching (i.e. their intentions), and evaluated it in terms of how they reached their teaching goals (i.e. actions). One of the sub-goals of this study was to test whether or not the TPI was able to assess respondents' philosophies about teaching online as well as face-to-face, and to see if it could distinguish between teaching philosophies that are generally quite different in these two modalities.

In this study, participants were asked to complete the TPI twice, once from their perspective on face-to-face teaching and then again from an online teaching perspective. Half of the participants completed the TPI with their face-to-face teaching in mind first, while the other half completed it with their online teaching in mind first in order to reduce an 'instrument familiarity' response bias. Using paired *t*-tests, these 2 sets of TPI scores (one for each modality) were analysed for similarities and differences between perspectives by teaching modality, as well as by university (i.e. culture).

Participants

University of Calgary
The University of Calgary at 40 years old is a relatively new single-campus post secondary institution located in a large western Canadian city offering primarily face-to-face classes on campus. It is only within the past 10 years that a few of its 15 faculties have been offering degree programs in a distributed format. Recently the university has made a strong commitment to offering distributed classes and technically supports this by utilising the computer conferencing system called Blackboard, enhanced with the audiovisual conferencing system called Elluminate Live. In 2005 there were almost 28,000 students studying full or part time at the University of Calgary, the vast majority attending on campus classes.

The Faculty of Education evolved from Calgary's Normal School for teacher training that was originally established one hundred years ago. Today this Faculty offers more distributed programs than any other in the University of Calgary, primarily to a mature student group consisting of working professionals who access these programs online on a non-residential and often part-time basis typically on weekends and evenings.

Participants in this study were all tenured or tenure-track full-time academics drawn from two of the three divisions within the Faculty of Education, the Graduate Division of Educational Research and the Division of Applied Psychology. They teach in several course-based masters level programs ranging from Workplace and Adult Learning to Counselling. They also teach in two course-based doctoral programs in Educational Leadership and Higher Education Administration. Twelve of the potential pool of 70 faculty invited to participate because they teach both face to face and online (representing a response rate of 17%) returned two sets of TPI scores, one for face-to-face and one for online teaching contexts. Nine were female and three were male, teaching an average of 4.73 half-courses per academic year, with 47.09% of these courses face to face and 52.09% online. The average face-to-face class size for this participant group was 20 students, while the average online class size was 18.5 students. Nine of the 12 participants were teaching primarily online courses, which are generally smaller than face-to-face classes.

The course load for Faculty of Education academics is 5 13-week courses per academic year unless one holds an administrative role, which generally results in a reduced teaching load. This small group of participants had taught an average of 19.3 years face-to-face, and 6.3 years online, and could be described as 'early adopters' of online teaching who chose to teach online out of a professional interest in moving to this modality. They held an overall positive attitude towards the use of advanced communication technologies and stories of how it had enhanced many aspects of their teaching role were reflected in the qualitative data collected from the surveys.

Deakin University

Deakin University was incorporated in 1975 and has a longer history of distance education; since the early 1990s it has been a multi-campus university with two capital city campuses as well as three regional campuses in Victoria with a reliance on a university wide infrastructure for information and communication technologies. The university offers the same programs on and off campus, using the Learning Management system, WebCT, as a basis for its online system called Deakin Studies Online, which also provides other forms of electronic communication with the possibility of synchronous audio and text communication through Elluminate Live and other media. Since 2002 there has been a policy of required online presence for all subjects, with some courses using interactive online technologies. All undergraduate students now take one subject in their degree completely online to prepare them for graduate level professional development which is offered only online learning. In 2005 there were 32,354 students enrolled at Deakin University, with 20,940 on campus students and 11,414 off campus students enrolled in the Faculty of Education.

The ten participants in this study were from the Faculty of Education and were selected to include teachers who taught both online and face-to-face classes. They taught in the main undergraduate teacher education studies major program, in a range of teaching method areas including mathematics, science education, physical education, literacy and information technology. All had some experience teaching online at the postgraduate level in courses catering to the professional education of teachers in all subject areas in schools, as well as courses in teaching in higher education (two participants) and in teaching English as a second language (one participant). The participants were primarily based at the metropolitan campus of Deakin where the largest proportion of face-to-face education classes (mainly undergraduate) are held. Most postgraduate teaching in the faculty is done online and six of the teachers in this sample were reflecting on their experiences of graduate level online teaching.

Five participants were female and five were male, teaching an average of 7.8 thirteen week long courses per academic year, with 52.89% of these courses face to face and 37.8% online. The average face-to-face class size for this participant group was 26.7 students, while the average online class size was 21.8 students. The average teaching load for Faculty of Education academics is eight courses per academic year unless their administrative or research role reduces this teaching load. They had taught an average of 24.8 years face-to-face, and 4.9 years online, and could be described as 'new adopters' of online teaching with a stronger orientation to face-to-face teaching than to this new modality. Five of the participants had just begun teaching a fully online unit to on campus undergraduate students for the first time and held ambivalent attitudes about Deakin's new policy of integrating online communication technologies with face-to-face teaching. This attitude is reflected in some stories of difficulties adapting to this new teaching context in the qualitative data collected from the surveys.

Discussion of findings

The findings of the data analysis are discussed in terms of participants' five TPI main scores (indicating teaching preferences) for face-to-face and online classrooms, and significant correlations between the five TPI main scores and overall sub-scores. Findings for the total group of participants from both universities, as well as for each group of participants from each university are discussed when appropriate.

TPI main scores and sub-scores

Paired *t*-tests on main TPI scores revealed that participants' teaching preferences were remarkably similar across both modalities, as well as for both universities. There were no significant differences between four of the five teaching preferences, while the Social Reform TPI scores (the lowest for both participant groups) were significantly higher for the University of Calgary group than for the Deakin University group (t=2.25; p<0.05; see Table 1).

The University of Calgary participants' strongest teaching preference for both modalities was Developmental, followed by Nurturance and Apprenticeship (tied in face-to-face classrooms), then Transmission, and Social Reform which was significantly lower as the fifth preference. Deakin University participants' strongest teaching preference for both modalities was Developmental, followed by Apprenticeship, Nurturance, Transmission, and Social Reform (significantly lower than the other 4, as well as the University of Calgary group).

Table 1. Independent-samples *t*-test results for TPI scores by modality and university

TPI	University	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Online-Tr	UofC DU	12 10	31.75 31.10	4.77 4.68	.32	20	.75
Face to face-Tr	UofC DU	12 10	31.50 30.20	4.34 4.26	.71	20	.49
Online-Ap	UofC DU	12 10	36.00 34.90	3.54 5.17	.57	20	.58
Face to face-Ap	UofC DU	12 10	35.75 36.90	4.07 4.43	-.63	20	.54
Online-Dv	UofC DU	12 10	37.75 38.20	3.28 3.65	-.30	20	.77
Face to face-Dv	UofC DU	12 10	38.00 37.80	3.74 4.05	.12	20	.91
Online-Nu	UofC DU	12 10	36.67 34.60	4.23 4.55	1.10	20	.29
Face to face-Nu	UofC DU	12 10	35.75 35.80	3.28 5.55	-.03	20	.98
Online-SR	UofC DU	12 10	30.00 25.30	6.28 3.27	2.25	20	.04
Face to face-SR	UofC DU	12 10	30.33 25.70	6.71 5.12	1.84	20	.08

The finding that teaching preferences did not differ significantly for these two modalities is inconsistent with the research literature that describes considerable differences in teaching approaches between face-to-face and online classrooms for those teachers who have successfully made this transition (Comeaux & McKenna-Byinton, 2003; Palloff & Pratt, 2000; McShane, 2006). A small but growing body of largely anecdotal literature describes teaching beliefs and actions that contain aspects of Pratt's Developmental/Apprenticeship/Nurturance perspectives as more effective in online classes than the traditional teaching beliefs and actions that contains aspects of Pratt's Transmission perspective, which is typical of many institutions of higher education that offer primarily face-to-face programs (Garrison, 2006).

The finding that Social Reform is the least preferred teaching preference for Canadian teachers is consistent with the literature that describes this perspective as standing "outside the mainstream of educational philosophy" in North America (Elias & Merriam, 2005, p 147). Rather, this literature describes strong underlying 'nurturing' and 'socially supportive' teaching beliefs and actions in North American institutions of higher education. The finding in this study that the Canadian Social Reform scores were significantly higher than the Australian Social Reform scores may be explained by the fact that this Canadian group of teacher teach graduate level classes only, which tend to emphasize a more critical analysis of the literature and its application than do undergraduate classes, which made up half of the Australian participant groups' teaching load.

The fact that the TPI main scores were not significantly different by modality may be explained by the possibility that this tool, developed for face-to-face teaching contexts, cannot accurately assess teaching philosophies for online teaching contexts. The authors' analysis of the TPI items indicates that some of the 15 'action' items may be applicable to face-to-face teaching contexts only. The authors' analysis of the survey data did reveal apparent differences in participants' teaching perspectives in these two modalities, as well as a great deal of conscious application of their newer online teaching approaches to their face-to-face teaching contexts (Stacey & Wiesenberg, 2006). It is possible that the study participants' responses reduced any real differences between their face-to-face and online beliefs, intentions and actions due to TPI items that were not developed to take differences in these two modalities into account.

The initial paired *t*-tests of TPI sub-scores revealed a significant difference within the 'Action' sub-score indicating that what the two participant groups actually did within their classrooms differed. Further analysis revealed three distinct sub-scores differences between the two participant groups (see Table 2). The University of Calgary participants appeared to be significantly more 'nurturing' in their actions online than were the Deakin University participants, as well as significantly more 'social reform' oriented in their actions in both face-to-face and online classrooms.

Table 2. Independent-samples *t*-test results for TPI sub-scores

TPI	University	*N*	Mean	Standard Deviation	*t*	*Df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Nu-Online-Action	UofC DU	12 10	11.83 9.90	1.95 2.18	2.17	20	.043
SR-face to face-Action	UofC DU	12 10	9.92 7.80	2.57 2.15	2.10	20	.048
SR-Online-Action	UofC DU	12 10	9.42 7.80	2.31 1.40	2.02	20	.058

This finding is consistent with the discussion of the TPI main scores above, perhaps pointing to cultural differences in teaching beliefs and intentions between the two participant groups. The authors' experiences within both cultures indicates that North American teachers tend to believe that building students' self-esteem is the key to successful classroom learning, while Australian teachers, particularly in teacher education, focus more strongly on developing students' construction of their own knowledge. Australian teachers' communication style is often perceived as more direct, with fewer overt affective references, which can be interpreted as less nurturing than North American teachers' communication style. Though the affective aspect of teaching is considered important, it may be communicated differently in both face-to-face and online classrooms.

Correlations between TPI scores and sub-scores
All of the five teaching preference main scores for teaching in both modalities were strongly inter-correlated for the total participant group. This was expected given that there were no significant *t*-test differences by modality or by university on these TPI scores (except for Social Reform). Specifically, moderate to strong correlations were found between:

- online Developmental and face-to-face Transmission (.51; *p*>.05)
- face-to-face Developmental and face-to-face Social Reform (.49; *p*>.05).
- face-to-face Transmission and face-to-face Developmental (.48; *p*>.05)
- face-to-face Transmission and face-to-face Apprenticeship (.56; *p*>.01)
- online Transmission and online and face-to-face Apprenticeship (.63; *p*>.01; .63; *p*>.01)
- online Apprenticeship and online and face-to-face Developmental (.58; *p*>.01; .63; *p*>.01)
- face-to-face Apprenticeship and face-to-face Developmental (.72; *p*>.01)
- online and face-to-face Nurturance and face-to-face Social Reform (.45; *p*>.05; .50; *p*>.05)

The moderate correlations between the Developmental and Apprenticeship perspectives for both modalities make theoretical sense, given that the underlying key philosophical assumptions for these approaches are conceptually complementary (Pratt & associates, 1998). Both are grounded in a 'constructivist' learner-centered and active epistemology of learning and consistent with literature describing effective online teaching approaches (Garrison, 2006; Palloff & Pratt, 2000; McShane, 2006). The fact that this correlation was evident for teaching in both face-to-face and online classrooms indicates that these participants' beliefs, intentions and actions appeared to be consistent regardless of the modality in which they were teaching. The moderate correlations between Transmission and Apprenticeship perspectives also makes theoretical sense, given that apprenticeship teaching contexts often require explicit instruction making a combination of these two approaches complementary in teaching situations requiring the application of theory to practice. These participants, teaching in professional faculties of education, would have a strong 'application of theory to practice' orientation to their teaching with a great deal of modelling and 'expertise' underlying their classroom practices regardless of modality.

The moderate correlations between Developmental and Transmission, as well as between Development and Social Reform perspectives appears to be inconsistent with the literature on teaching philosophies generally (Elias & Merriam, 2005; Zinn, 1998) or effective teaching approaches in online classrooms in particular**.** These findings may reflect the Deakin University groups' somewhat newer status to online teaching, as they may be 'in transition' from familiar traditional face-to-face teaching approaches (typically more transmission-oriented) to less familiar online teaching approaches (typically more developmentally/nurturing-oriented). The Developmental-Social Reform correlation may reflect the larger University of Calgary groups' postgraduate level teaching load which generally focuses on a more critically analytical approach to theory and its application to practice.

The moderate correlations between the Nurturance and Social Reform perspectives is not consistent with the literature on effective teaching approaches generally, or with teaching in online classrooms in particular. Again, this may reflect the larger University of Calgary groups' graduate level teaching load, which would combine a North American nurturing perspective with a Social Reform orientation.

Across all five teaching perspectives there were a number of noteworthy significant correlations between the three sub-scores for the total participant group, indicating that for the most part, beliefs, intentions and actions were all consistent. The finding of no significant correlations between online beliefs and online actions is consistent with the *t*-test results for three TPI Action sub-scores (see Table 2). This finding is interesting in light of the moderate correlations between the five TPI main scores discussed above. If this combined group of participants held consistent beliefs, intentions and actions in terms of their teaching approaches, the literature, and the authors' experiences, would predict that Developmental, Apprenticeship and possibly Nurturance (in North American teachers) main scores would be correlated. While this was true for the two former, there were no significant correlations between the Developmental and Apprenticeship and Nurturance. On the other hand, the literature and the authors' experiences would predict that Transmission and Social Reform main scores would be correlated, given that both of these approaches are grounded in a 'teacher-centered' and more passive epistemology of teaching (Pratt & associates, 1998). This was not true, perhaps reflecting the 'in transition' status of the Deakin University group of participants in particular.

Conclusions

This study's findings present an interesting and intriguing picture of the teaching preferences of two small groups of teachers in two culturally different settings, and within two different teaching modalities. On the one hand, the many similarities between these two groups may indicate that these two groups hold remarkably consistent beliefs about their teaching across cultures and for both face-to-face and online teaching contexts. Or, it may indicate that the TPI, developed to assess face-to-face teaching perspectives, was unable to distinguish between teaching perspectives within face-to-face and online teaching contexts. It may be that the tool requires revision in order to be sensitive to the sometimes subtle shifts in beliefs, intentions and action required to make a successful transition from face-to-face to online classrooms. Or, it is possible that this tool's underlying conceptual framework, developed over 10 years ago, does not fit with current thinking about effective online teaching and learning processes.

The few significant differences between these two groups may indicate true cultural distinctness between Canadian and Australian philosophies of teaching in institutions of higher education. The presence of true cultural differences between these two groups in terms of having a 'nurturing' versus 'knowledge building' focus to one's teaching approach in particular requires further study. Another possible explanation for the apparent different orientations to these two teaching contexts may be due to the two cultural groups' varying amounts of experience teaching in online classrooms. It is also possible that the differences in class sizes demanded a higher frequency of Deakin teacher pedagogical responses, which may have translated into less time for 'nurturing' from this group.

In terms of Jarvis and Pratt's concept of having a continually evolving philosophy of teaching, the practitioners in this study did not have a period of time in which to reflect on their teaching approach in the two different modalities because they completed the TPI for each of these teaching contexts in one short time period. While the TPI has been demonstrated to be an effective tool for promoting reflection on one's teaching philosophy (Hubbal, Collins & Pratt, 2005) with a group of 44 university teachers, the

study took place over an extended period of time within a structured faculty development program. While no significant differences between the five TPI perspectives were apparent at the beginning of this program, significant differences did emerge at the end, suggesting that their philosophies did indeed evolve over time.

Overall, the findings of this small and exploratory study clearly indicate a need to further explore the reasons for both the similarities and differences revealed between these two cultural groups of participants teaching within two different teaching modalities. Further investigation into the relevance of the TPI as a tool for assessing teaching perspectives, as well as promoting reflection on one's perspective, within online classroom contexts is also indicated.

References

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Comeaux, P. & McKenna-Byington, E. (2003). Computer-mediated communication in online and conventional classrooms: Some implications for instructional design and professional development programs. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 40*(4), 348–355.

Elias, J.L. & Merriam, S. B. (1980). *Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education*. First Edition. Malabar, Florida: Krieger.

Elias, J.L. & Merriam, S. B. (2005). *Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education*. Third Edition. Malabar, Florida: Krieger.

Garrison, R. (2006). *Online collaboration principles*. The Learning Commons, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.

Hubbal, H. Collins, J. & Pratt, D. (2005). Enhancing reflective teaching practices: Implications for faculty development programs. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, XXXV* 30, 57–81.

Jarvis, P. (1999). *The practitioner-researcher: Developing theory from practice*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

McShane, K. (2006). Integrating face-to-face and online teaching: Academics' role concept and teaching choices. *Teaching in Higher Education, 9*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/1356251032000155795

Mott, V. (1996). Knowledge comes from practice: Reflective theory building in practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, #72*, 57–63. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.36719967209

Palloff, R.M. & Pratt, K. (2000). Making the transition: Helping teachers to teach online. *Proceedings from EDUCAUSE 2000*, Nashville, TN, October 10–13. see http://www.educause.edu/conference/e2000/proceedings.html

Pratt, D. (1989). Three stages of teacher competence: A developmental perspective. In E.R. Hays (Ed.). Effective Teaching Styles. *New Directions in Continuing Education, #43*, 77–87.

Pratt, D. & Associates (1998). *Five perspectives on teaching in adult and higher education*. Malabar, Florida: Krieger.

Pratt, D. & Collins, J. (2006) *Teaching perspectives inventory website* http://www.teachingperspectives.com (Accessed 11 May, 2006)

Stacey, E. & Wiesenberg, F.P. (2002). Learning collaboratively in a web-based environment. *Proceedings of the Tel E-learning 17th World Computer Congress*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Stacey, E. & Wiesenberg, F.P. (2006). A cross-cultural study of face-to-face and distributed teaching philosophies in Canada and Australia. *Paper presented at the Conference of the Canadian Association of Distance Education,* Montreal, Canada. 23–26 May.

Stake, R. (2002). Case studies. In N.L. Denzin (Ed.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Torrisi, G. & Davis, G. (2000). Online learning as a catalyst for reshaping practice – the experiences of some academics developing online learning materials. *The International Journal for Academic Development*. See http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals

Wiesenberg, F.P. (1999). Teaching online: one instructor's evolving 'theory of practice'. *Adult Basic Edcation,9*(3),149–161.

Wiesenberg, F.P. (2002). Quality online participation: Conceptualizing my practice. Chapter 12 in *Research in Distance Education 5*. Deakin University, Melbourne, Au.

Wiesenberg, F.P. & Stacey,E. (2004). An online cross-global educational partnership. In S. Mitchell, P. Klinck & J. Burger (Eds.). *Worldwide Partnerships for Schools with Voluntary Organizations, Universities, Companies and Community Councils*. Lewiston, NY: Mellon Press.

Zinn, L. (1998). Identifying your philosophical orientation. In M.W. Galbraith (Ed.). *Adult Learning Methods: A Guide for Effective Instruction.* 2nd Edition. Malabar, Florida: Krieger.

Bionotes

Faye P. Wiesenberg, PhD is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Calgary. She teaches in the Graduate Division of Educational Research (Workplace Learning) and Division of Applied Psychology (Counselling) researching the topics of: adult career /continuing professional development; program development and evaluation; and teaching/learning via distance technology.

Elizabeth Stacey, PhD is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at Deakin University. She teaches postgraduate distance education coursework and supervises students researching online learning and studies relating to use of computer and communication technologies. Her research and publications include learning with computers, and the use of interactive technologies, particularly for collaborative group learning online.

Author contact details

Faye Wiesenberg, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada, Alberta, T2N 1N4. Email: fwiesenb@ucalgary.ca

Elizabeth Stacey, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood, VIC 3125, Australia. Email: estacey@deakin.edu