

Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17 U.S. Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials. Persons using this material are liable for any infringement. Users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Making the Transition to E-Learning: Strategies and Issues

Mark Bullen
British Columbia Institute of Technology, Canada

Diane P. Janes
University of Saskatchewan, Canada



Information Science Publishing

Hershey • London • Melbourne • Singapore

Acquisitions Editor: Michelle Potter
Development Editor: Kristin Roth
Senior Managing Editor: Jennifer Neidig
Managing Editor: Sara Reed
Copy Editor: Larissa Vinci
Typesetter: Cindy Consonery
Cover Design: Lisa Tosheff
Printed at: Integrated Book Technology

Published in the United States of America by
Information Science Publishing (an imprint of Idea Group Inc.)
701 E. Chocolate Avenue
Hershey PA 17033
Tel: 717-533-8845
Fax: 717-533-8661
E-mail: cust@idea-group.com
Web site: <http://www.idea-group.com>

and in the United Kingdom by
Information Science Publishing (an imprint of Idea Group Inc.)
3 Henrietta Street
Covent Garden
London WC2E 8LU
Tel: 44 20 7240 0856
Fax: 44 20 7379 0609
Web site: <http://www.eurospanonline.com>

Copyright © 2007 by Idea Group Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored or distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher.

Product or company names used in this book are for identification purposes only. Inclusion of the names of the products or companies does not indicate a claim of ownership by IGI of the trademark or registered trademark.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Making the transition to e-learning : strategies and issues / Mark Bullen & Diane P. Janes, editors.
p. cm.

Summary: "This book provides insights and experiences from e-learning experts from around the world; it address the institutional, pedagogical, and technological issues that higher education institutions are grappling with as they move from conventional face-to-face teaching to e-learning in its diverse forms"--Provided by publisher.

ISBN 1-59140-950-0 (hardcover) -- ISBN 1-59140-951-9 (softcover) -- ISBN 1-59140-952-7 (ebook)

1. Education, Higher--Computer-assisted instruction. 2. Education, Higher--Effect of technological innovations on. I. Bullen, Mark, 1954- II. Janes, Diane P., 1960-

LB2395.7.M3 2007
378.1'758--dc22

2006018828

British Cataloguing in Publication Data

A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

All work contributed to this book is new, previously-unpublished material. The views expressed in this book are those of the authors, but not necessarily of the publisher.

Chapter XIV

A Framework for Choosing Communication Activities in E-Learning

Tannis Morgan, University of British Columbia, Canada

Karen Belfer, British Columbia Institute of Technology, Canada

Abstract

In this chapter, we present a framework for planning communication activities according to the level of structure and potential dialogue desired in a given course. This framework serves as a tool for making decisions about how to give students more or less autonomy, how a series of course activities can be scaffolded, and the amount of structure or instructor facilitation that is needed. The framework we have developed uses each variable of the transactional distance theory as a dimension, which displayed as a quadrant allows us to represent instructional strategies and various communication activities for e-learning. This framework is beneficial as a tool for planning the instructional design process, informing pedagogy, and conducting research.

Introduction

Over the past 10 years, the use of discussion forums or bulletin boards to support asynchronous learning communications has become a common practice within mixed-mode and online courses. Both pedagogy and context serve to drive and influence the use of this technology. The interest in constructivist approaches in the design of learning contexts has resulted in the creation of communication spaces where interaction, participation and negotiation of meaning can take place. At the same time distance education has increasingly moved online, the choice to use an asynchronous tool for communication seems to be well suited to this mode of delivery where teacher-student (TS), student-student (SS), and student-content (SC) interaction is influenced by geography, time zones, and personal scheduling conflicts.

In distance education, course development can be an individual or collaborative effort involving instructors, course authors, and instructional designers. For the purpose of this chapter, we will refer to the role of the instructional designer, since that is the perspective that we occupy in our own institution. However, regardless of whether development adopts a solo or team approach, there are a myriad of decisions to make when constructing online communication activities that support the TS/SS/SC interactions. These include decisions around how the activity will be organized, the kind of facilitation that is needed, and the type of assessment and feedback that will be provided. Furthermore, the use of technology enables the implementation of collaborative practices, and with a greater emphasis on learner-centered approaches, online learning technologies have evolved considerably in the last ten years. In 1998, Bonk and King recognized the challenge that the new educational landscape presented and noted that “with all these new learning channels, educators are faced with unprecedented educational opportunities and challenges. Without question, the formats for electronic collaboration are proliferating” (Bonk & King, 1998, p. 5). Almost ten years later, while text-based discussion forums still dominate as a means of class communication, these communication spaces now might include voice or video. Although there are many innovators exploring new technologies and approaches, it is still a challenge for instructors to find ways to enable the best potential of the technologies and strategies available.

As instructional designers, in developing courses for online learning we know that learning activities should not be used indistinctively, since each one of them has the potential of being pedagogically effective and enhance the quality of the learning experience for a particular set of course objectives and needs of the students. When instructional designers work with subject matter experts they often offer a choice of different delivery models in an effort to find an approach that will address the needs of the course objectives and content while taking into

account the teaching style of the instructor (Belfer, Chu, & Nesbit, 2000). Therefore, how do developers choose between all the options? How can instructional designers ensure that their decisions are pedagogically grounded?

Background

For the purpose of this chapter, we adopt the framework developed by Zemsky and Massy (2004) and define e-learning as distance education. Our planning framework has been developed through the course of our work as instructional designers in the Centre for Distance Education and Technology (DE&T) at the University of British Columbia (UBC). Initially we began compiling asynchronous communication activities into a matrix format, identifying the type of activity, the structure that was needed, the role of the students and the instructors in that activity, and strategies for assessment. The matrix grew to a size that became unmanageable and suffered from two major flaws—although it was useful as an activity selection tool for an instructional designer, (1) it didn't leave much room for consideration of an instructor perspective or their teaching style, and (2) was not able to visually show how activities could potentially evolve during the delivery of the course.

For example, we were able to give recommendations around the components of an instructor-lead class discussion activity, but this said little about the level of control that the instructor might exercise in the facilitation of that discussion activity—an instructor who preferred controlled discussions might take more control of the discussion than an instructor who over time preferred students to take the lead role in the facilitation. We also recognized that the same activity (such as class discussion) could look very different depending on how it was structured, the role the instructor would take, and the role the students might take in that discussion. We also observed that an activity that adopted the same structure and roles for instructors and students could play out very differently depending on who the instructor was, or if students came from different programs. In our personal experience as instructors we know that this is hardly surprising, since instructors recognize that with every group of students the same activity is rarely predictable, even if the instructor remains the same. But it challenged us to attempt to identify the variables that need to be considered in designing communication activities.

This current work has been influenced by dominant ideas in the areas of teaching perspectives and distance education, by Moore (1973), Pratt (1998, 2002), and Saba (2003), as well as current research on student perceptions of asynchronous discussions.

Transactional Distance Theory

Transactional distance theory was introduced by Michael Moore to the field of distance education. This theory dates from 1973 and was developed at a time when distance education was characterized by correspondence courses (usually paper based), where a geographic separation between the student and instructor allowed few opportunities for interaction. However, rather than focusing on the geographic characteristic that defines distance, Moore attempted to identify the psychological distance in distance education.

In his theory, Moore focuses on the interplay of three variables that define the learning transaction between teacher and students—structure, dialogue, and autonomy. Structure refers to the design of the course and the level of control that the instructor or students have within that structure. Dialogue refers to the positive or constructive interactions between the student and the instructor and/or the internal dialogue of the student with him or herself. Autonomy refers to the ability of the student to take responsibility for his or her own learning. Therefore, a learning context that has a high level of structure and little dialogue would have a large transactional distance. A context that had a low level of structure and low level of dialogue would also have a large transactional distance and would additionally require a higher level of autonomy on the part of the learner. However, the same context with a high level of dialogue would potentially be less distant.

There are potentially many secondary variables that have an influence on the transactional distance. These include the mode of communication or communication tools, the characteristics of the learners, the instructor characteristics, and the institutional context. In the context of the student, the mode of communication is particularly relevant since it directly relates to the language of instruction. For example, research indicates that students who are interacting in a second language will benefit more from asynchronous communication (typically text discussion forums) since it allows them more time to process the message, the option to reread or replay, and to construct responses on their own time (Carey, 1999, Carey & Guo, 2003).

It is not difficult to see how asynchronous communications provide a potentially important role in facilitating dialogue and thus reducing distance. Yet, we often see courses that have not adequately considered the relationship between dialogue, autonomy, and structure. In an online context where students are at a distance, we know that some structure needs to be provided in order for students to be able to locate themselves within the environment. When students are left fumbling to understand what is expected of them and how to go about doing it, more autonomy is needed on the part of the student. This is not to say that encouraging students to be more autonomous is detrimental to learning; rather

we are suggesting that the push to be more autonomous also needs to be properly planned.

Research has shown asynchronous online discussions do improve students' perceptions of learning, motivation, enjoyability (Wu & Hiltz, 2003), and content mastery (Alavi, 1994). Riddle, Pearce, and Nott (1997) suggest that the reasons behind increased involvement and learning relies on the connectivity between students and teachers. If that is the case, one would expect that any of the implementations that have been documented in the literature regardless of whether they are teacher-lead (Maor, 2003), student-lead (Hara, Bonk, & Angeli, 2001), case-based (Benbunan & Hiltz, 1999), discourse-based (Pincas, 1998), and/or brainstorming-based (Belfer, 2001) would offer the same positive results.

We believe that good implementation relies in part on the course design, since it speaks to how activities should be constructed and facilitated, but that the instructor's facilitation strategies for course activities are an important factor in influencing student perception of the learning experience.

Teaching Perspectives

As instructional designers, we work with course authors who are also instructors in the courses they are developing with us. We are aware that course design should also include some discussion of the instructor/course author's own teaching styles or preferences. In our role it is very important that we are able to communicate with instructors about who they are as teachers and all the options available, both in terms of educational strategies and the available technologies that can enhance and inform the teaching and learning practices. Dan Pratt has written extensively on teaching and his research suggests that teaching styles (actions) are the observable piece of a very complex framework based on a set of beliefs and intentions, that are rarely directly observed by people when we teach. His research suggests that it is useful to think about teaching in five fundamentally different ways, what he calls five perspectives on teaching. These perspectives include transmission, developmental, apprenticeship, nurturing, and social reform.

The transmission oriented teacher focuses on accurately delivering content to the learners and the relationship is largely uni-directional—the teacher delivers content and the student passively receives it. With a developmental approach, the teacher facilitates the learner's cognitive structure and their understanding of the content. In this way, the developmental perspective is more concerned with cultivating ways of thinking. The apprenticeship perspective is concerned with revealing the inner workings of skilled performance in which the teaching

event is situated in an authentic learning environment. The nurturers promote a positive climate and use encouragement and support to help students' achieve the learning goals. Finally, as the name suggests, the social reform perspective is characterized by a need to seek a better society. In the social reform model good teachers challenge the status quo and encourage students to reconsider their position in the construction of discourse and practice: their social, political or cultural ideals are an essential focal point of their teaching perspectives (Pratt & Associates, 1998).

In his article, Pratt (2002) emphasizes the fact that no one perspective is better than another, since they only represent an individual's view of teaching. Successful instructors reflect on their experience and evaluate what they do, why they do it, and on what grounds their actions and intentions are justified. In reflecting on this statement, we are reminded that increasingly instructional designers are encouraged to design courses with more constructivist approaches, since this is what is currently valued in our institutions. Yet, how do you create a course with a collaborative approach if the instructor does not want to monitor or facilitate discussions, and prefers a more direct or transmission approach to instruction?

The Framework

The framework we have developed seeks to integrate the dimensions of Transactional Distance theory. In conceptualizing this framework, we began with Saba's (2003) interpretation of the structure component of this construct (see Figure 1). Structure describes the course design, teaching strategies (activities), learning objectives, and evaluation methods (scoring criteria). Structure is a continuous variable for which the instructor holds direct or indirect control. Students normally perceive it as more or less flexible or more or less rigid.

We then incorporated Saba's interpretation of the dialogue construct (see Figure 2). Dialogue describes the level of interaction between the learner and the teacher, the learner and his/her peers, and the learner and the content. Some

Figure 1. Saba's (2003) interpretation of the structure variable of Moore's theory



Figure 2. Saba's (2003) interpretation of the dialogue variable of Moore's theory




elements that influence the students' perception and ability to interact are the language of interaction, the size of the group, and the medium used to mediate the communication. Dialogue is a continuous variable for which the instructor designs activities that require that the student be more active or passive in his/her interactions. Students normally perceive it as more or less interactive.

The third component, autonomy, describes the learner's capacity to self manage, self-regulate and be intrinsically motivated to engage with the content to the level of depth needed. Autonomy is a continuous variable over which the instructor has little control. This component is not visually reflected in our framework, since instructional designers and teachers can only work with those variables over which they have some control (e.g., structure and dialogue). Nonetheless, there are some processes that can be put in place to help and support students that are more or less autonomous, by providing more structure or more opportunities for dialogue.

The quadrant (see Figure 3) is our representation of the structure and dialogue dimensions. As we started working with it we realized that the left lower side of the quadrant represents the teacher-centered approaches with which the instructor has direct control of the structure and students are passively receiving

Figure 3. Our adaptation of Moore's model for ID purposes



information. In contrast, the top right represents the learner-centered approaches for which the instructor has indirect control of the structure. Students exercise their autonomy and follow their interests, actively participating in the learning process while interacting with the content, peers, and/or the instructor).

The quadrant representation allowed us to begin mapping the different types of communication activities in a given e-learning course onto the quadrant, while considering the teaching perspectives of the instructor. For example, one of the most common learning activities that is present in many online courses is a forum for announcements, which an instructor can use to remind students of deadlines, important events, or to clarify concepts or points that are not clear. This type of activity logically fits into quadrant 1 because it has a particular function of presenting information to students; the structure is very direct, and little or no dialogue is expected of students.

Another common learning activity is an asynchronous class discussion, where a question is discussed over a certain period of time and involves the instructor and the students. Depending on the structure of the activity, this activity would find itself in any of the quadrants. For this activity to be in quadrant 1 or 2 we would expect:

1. The instructor begins the discussion with a pre-established question.
2. Students respond once to the discussion according to very specific guidelines.
3. The instructor closes the discussion after a specified period of time.

For this activity to be in quadrant 8 or 9 we would expect:

1. A student or group of students presents a question to the forum.
2. The question is discussed for a period of time or indefinitely.
3. Students can participate in the discussion and shape the path of the discussion with relative freedom.

As instructional designers, the decision to structure the activities in any of the previous examples is influenced by the instructor's own teaching perspective or style. We would anticipate that different instructors would have a preference for more or less direct control. We might also see a class discussion look more like the first example at the beginning of a course, and then once trust has been established and the community has been built, later class discussions might look more like the second example.

Of course, the location of the activities in the quadrants is also dependent on how the learner approaches the activities. An activity can aim to accomplish and achieve a certain level of activity, but the student can be more active or passive based on his own learning style and willingness to follow the activity as planned, or not as planned. For example, a seemingly passive reading activity can be active if the student is taking notes, chatting with their classmates about the reading, or blogging their thoughts to a wider community of practice. As instructional designers, we often try to activate these types of passive activities by including pre-reading questions, reflective questions, or other cognitive strategies. However, ultimately it is the student's own level of autonomy that determines how the student activates their learning within or outside of the course structure. This is why autonomy and self-direction are important characteristics of learners.

Benefits of Using This Framework


In our recent work as instructional designers for distance education, we have tested the framework as a conceptual tool for course design, as well as a diagnostic tool for understanding why certain activities are not successful in some of our courses. We have found this framework to be beneficial as a tool for planning the instructional design process, informing pedagogy, and conducting research, as discussed next:

A Planning Tool for the ID Process

Although we have stated that there is no correct or incorrect way of recording activities into the quadrants, it provides a visual way of mapping ideas during course planning. It allows multiple types of e-learning communication activities to be presented using one visual aid, making it easier to understand what each of them mean, how they are situated within an entire course, and how, based on the consideration of the different variables and desired learning outcomes, they should be best structured and implemented. For example, when different activities are mapped onto the quadrants, it can help us explain how very structured learning activities can be scaled up to become more learner centered, indirectly structured, or active by increasing dialogue and reducing direct control over the structure (see Figure 4).

When designing and choosing activities for an online course, we are constantly considering the following components: learning outcomes, content, media, teach-


Figure 4. Recording different e-learning communication activities into the framework for ID purposes



ing perspectives, and learner characteristics. However, we have found in our own work that we often under-emphasize the importance of teaching perspectives and learner characteristics and focus too much on the learning outcomes, content and the media. The framework forces the consideration of these components and adds an additional dimension to transactional distance—instead of trying to find ways to reduce distance, the framework attempts to show how the manipulation of some of these variables can shift an activity to be more or less learner centred. Instructional designers can then decide what variables to work with to increase (or decrease) learner centeredness. For example, if an instructor preferred a transmission approach, online exam activities, and little dialogue with students, the addition of student study groups would be one way of providing more student centered learning within the structure of the course.

The framework is also a tool for facilitating the conversation between instructional designers and instructors when developing or revising online courses and activities. In our own work, we have used this framework as a way to describe the characteristics of a target group of learners whose prior educational experiences were largely transmission oriented and instructor-centred (see Figure 5). We were then able to understand why some of the very constructivist, learner-centred activities that we had introduced failed to produce good results, while the more structured, direct activities were well received.

Figure 5. Prior educational experiences of a group of learners



Pedagogical Tool

In some cases, we have found that the framework helps to remind instructors what the key elements of the learning process are and helps them focus on the elements that are most important. Most instructors are willing to try new pedagogical strategies in their courses provided that they will allow their learners to be successful. But many are confounded by a lack of time and a need for specific and clear step-by-step guidelines that they can use or adapt to their own practice without a significant investment of time. The framework could be a tool for assisting the instructor in developing and delivering a successful and engaging learning experience by encouraging them to reflect on their own teaching practices as key design elements, which are often left out of the design process or simply taken for granted.

Research Tool

As a research tool, the framework can allow both instructors and instructional designers to track how the learning activities evolve and gain insight into how instructors and students cope with changing and evolving systems. In our own research, we are looking at the role of teaching presence in the shift from more teacher centred activities to highly learner-centred activities. The framework provides a way of comparing different activities and identifying important variables that shape these activities (Belfer, Morgan, & Underhill, 2005).

As with all course planning tools, the success of any plan is only as good as the learning community that implements it and makes it work. We argue that careful planning provides a foundation on which to build a successful learning community, but our framework does not attempt to illustrate the action components of the learning community. To this end, we can refer to the considerable research that Terry Anderson and colleagues have conducted around the dynamics of course-related asynchronous communication. They have developed a community of inquiry model that attempts to identify some of the factors (teacher presence, social presence, and cognitive presence) that facilitate these dynamics during course implementation (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000).

Our framework facilitates planning of single course activities but at this point in time does not consider the more informal (and largely unstructured) learning spaces that students engage in parallel to course activities, such as their own communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) or affinity spaces (Gee, 2004). We believe that these informal spaces are important to the development of learning, identity construction, and learner autonomy, and should perhaps be given more consideration in course or program planning.

Future Trends and Conclusion

It is difficult to ignore how communication technologies have influenced teaching and learning environments by providing greater and more varied TS, SS, and SC communication. Until recently, these technologies have been mainly asynchronous text tools such as email and discussion forums, but in the last couple of years we have witnessed the arrival of various additional asynchronous and synchronous tools. Voice tools such as Wimba and Skype and text tools that allow synchronous and asynchronous collaboration (wikis, blogs, synchronous text editing tools such as Writely) offer functionality and collaboration in ways that the early tools couldn't provide. These tools challenge us to rethink course activities and serve to redefine our teaching and learning spaces in positive ways.

It is our belief that the merging of technologies with teaching and learning will become more and more seamless, where a distinction between e-learning and learning will no longer be necessary. Therefore, course design will become increasingly more complex by virtue of the fact that there will be more technological options for the teaching and learning transactions. With this comes the need for a strong awareness of pedagogy and the complexities of learning in different types of learning environments. Instructional designers have a role in ensuring that instructors understand their teaching perspectives, and have an awareness of how activities can be designed to support more learner-centered

approaches (flexible structure, active dialogue, and room for learner autonomy) while considering all the components necessary to the development of an engaging learning environment.

References

- Alavi, M. (1994, June). Computer-mediated collaborative learning: An empirical evaluation. *MIS Quarterly*, 18(2), 150-174.
- Belfer, K. (2001, June). *De Bono's six thinking hats technique: A metaphorical model of communication in computer mediated classrooms*. Paper presented at Ed-Media World Conference in Multimedia Hypermedia and Telecommunications, Tampere, Finland.
- Belfer, K., Chu, S., & Nesbit, J. (2000). *Delivery model specifications*. Unpublished technical report, Technical University of British Columbia, Canada. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <http://www3.telus.net/public/kbelfer/doc/DMSpeccs.pdf>
- Belfer, K., Morgan, T., & Underhill, C. (2005, May). CARNet/UBC: Three approaches to a case study in an international collaboration. *CADE 2005 Conference: Learning Virtually...Anywhere*. UBC, Vancouver, Canada.
- Benbunan, R. F., & Hiltz, R. S. (1999). Educational applications of CMCS: Solving case studies through asynchronous learning networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4(3). Retrieved January 27, 2006, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol4/issue3/benbunan-fich.html>
- Bonk, C. J., & King, K. S. (1998). Computer conferencing and collaborative writing tools: Starting a dialogue about student dialogue. In C. J. Bonk & K. S. King (Eds.), *Electronic collaborators: Learner-centered technologies for literacy, apprenticeship, and discourse* (pp. 3-23). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carey, S. (1999). The use of WebCT for a highly interactive virtual graduate seminar. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 12(1), 85-98.
- Carey, S., & Guo, XG. R. (2003). Conditions for ESL acquisition on WebCT. *The International Journal of Learning*, 9, 491-498.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2-3), 87-105.
- Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. New York: Routledge.

- Hara, N., Bonk, C. J., & Angeli, C. (2000). Content analysis of online discussion in an applied educational psychology course. *Instructional Science*, 28(2), 115-152.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Maor, D. (2003). The teacher's role in developing interaction and reflection in an online learning community. *Educational Media International*, 40(1-2), 127-138.
- Moore, M. G. (1973). Towards a theory of independent learning and teaching. *Journal of Higher Education*, 44(9), 661-79.
- Pincas, A. (1998). Successful online course design: Virtual frameworks for discourse construction. *Educational Technology & Society*, 1(1). Retrieved January 26, 2005, from http://ifets.ieee.org/periodical/vol_1_98/pincas.html
- Pratt, D. D. (2002). Good teaching: One size fits all. In J. Ross-Gordon (Ed.), *An up-date on teaching theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pratt, D. D. & Associates (1998). *Five perspectives on teaching in adult and higher education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Riddle, M. D., Pearce, J. M., & Nott, M. W. (1997). *Re-examining "interactive multimedia" in tertiary science teaching*. Paper presented in ASCILITE.
- Saba, F. (2003). Distance education theory, methodology, and epistemology: A pragmatic paradigm. In M. G. Moore & W. G. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 3-20). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wu, D., & Hiltz, S. R. (2003, August 4-6). Online discussions and perceived learning. *Proceedings of the 9th Americas Conference on Information Systems* (pp. 687-696). Tampa, Florida. Retrieved January 5, 2005, from [http://www.alnresearch.org/Data_Files/articles/full_text/wu_Hiltz\(2003\).pdf](http://www.alnresearch.org/Data_Files/articles/full_text/wu_Hiltz(2003).pdf)
- Zemsky, R., & Massy, W. (2004). *Thwarted innovation. What happened to e-learning and why*. The Learning Alliance at the University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved January 5, 2005, from <http://www.irhe.upenn.edu/WeatherStation.html>