A DISSERTATION PROPOSAL:

Computer Mediated Technology (CMT)
And the
Online Community of College Students

By

Robin Y. Mabry Hubbard

A dissertation proposal in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the course of

A456: Qualitative Research Methods I
English 162: Professional Writing

University of Missouri-Columbia

Fall 2003

http:/ / rrchubbard.org/ portfolio/ 2003/ research/ journey/ Journal/ dissproposal.pdf

Chapter 1 Introducion

Introduction

Students walk into the classroom; some scan looking for a friendly face or just the perfect seat; others stop and poise as if to announce their presence. Whether it is the first time or the 100th time, the same student will enter tentatively and shyly while other students enter as if they own the classroom. Once in the classroom, some students immediately begin a conversation with their neighbor, the teacher or the entire class while at least one student visibly tries to appear invisible in their silence. As the class progresses over the semester, the "leaders," "follower," "talkers," "sleepers," "obsessive note takers," and other student types emerge as we all watch each other's social behavior. What social behaviors do we see in the online learning environment?

The purpose of this ethnological, qualitative research study is to describe and understand the social behaviors of college students within a closed, secured learning environment requiring a login and password. By ethnological, my study intention approach is as one of the five traditions of qualitative research Creswell defines in his book, **Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Traditions,** (as cited by Fulmer, 2001).

For purposes of this study, the definition of **social behavior** is the *social processes, social interactions, and communications* of college students enrolled in a specific course with requirements for online group activities. For purposes of this

study, ***group work*** for the accomplishment of educational objectives and ***learning communities*** are used interchangeable. The general research question is what are the social behaviors of college students within computer mediated learning environment? Specific research question include:

- What are the social behaviors of this community of learners within their assigned **virtual study groups** (**VSG**)?
- What are the social behaviors of this community of learners within their assigned **peer-review** (**PRG**)?
- What are the social behaviors of this community of learners outside of their assigned groups (VSG and PRG) while still login to the closed learning environment.
- Do the formally assigned groups exhibit the same group dynamics processes as face-to-face (**f2f**), physical groups (***tasks***, ***maintenance***, and ***egocentric*** social behaviors)?
- Are the informal groups' memberships stable over the length of class or shifting?
- Are the informal groups' dynamics similar to online public groups or virtual communities such as USENET or topic-specific LISTSERVS?
- Based on the "open-ended" questions from the mid-course feedback surveys, what are the students' perceptions of their virtual group experiences?

- What parallels exists (if any) between these students' perceptions of online group work and research of other students' perceptions of online group work?

- What parallels exists (if any) between findings from this study and current thinking about synchronous group dynamics (f2f, teleconferencing, and/or video-conferencing)?

- What do the findings suggest (if any) about virtual groups and virtual communities?

- What do the findings contribute (if any) to the debate over differing operational definitions of social groups, community and community studies within the discipline of sociology

These research questions fall into three major theoretical lines of inquiry:

1. **Collaborative learning**: Group work / learning communities' pedagogy and computer mediated technology.
2. **Group Dynamics**: Group behavior and electronic or computer mediated technology.
3. **Community Studies**: Sociological debate defining social groups, community, and computer mediated social groupings.

Like any researcher, I do not expect to answer all the above questions with this single study proposal. My focus and proposal centers on the learning communities and computer mediated technology. A basic understanding of these major theoretical areas is summarized in the next section.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

The general research question is what are the social behaviors of college students within computer mediated learning environment? This ethnological study falls into three major theoretical lines of inquiry:

1. Collaborative learning
2. Group Dynamics
3. Community Studies

The first theoretical area of investigation is what constitutes a community according to sociologist. In short, how do random strangers become a community? The second theory area of inquiry is what online social behaviors this researcher might expect to see among these learners from the published research of others. After reviewing the research of others, what social behaviors might the researcher observe indicating learning occurred within the virtual study groups, peer-review groups, and other portions of the online environment?

Definitions of Community

According to Komito's historical analysis examining the debate regarding whether electronic or computer-mediated social groups are a community, he suggest the disagreements represent a value-laden, intellectual perspectives and research paradigm (1998, p97). He argues the concept of community itself is neutral and the foundation for defining computer/electronic mediated groups and Internet communities

as ***virtual communities*** originates in pre-industrial, pre-agrarian societies existing before the economic concept of land ownership.

"Community is a concept that has a long history of research and debate in the social sciences; the theoretical sophistication that has developed over the course of such research and debate is usually not applied to discussions of virtual community (Komito, 1998, p97)." Komito divides the theoretical discussions and subsequent definitions into four categories representing perspectives regarding community. These four perspectives are moral, normative, social and fluid communities (Komito, 1998, p97). Within each of these categories, he discusses whether virtual communities meet the parameters for inclusion.

1. **Moral Communities:** members are "united by a sense of purpose and commitment … is a moral bond … emphasizing mutual benefit above self-interest, [for example, clubs and associations] (Komito, 1998, p98)."
2. **Normative Communities:** members abide by rules for appropriate behavior and common interest or practice, for example professional groups and societies (Komito, 1998, pp100-101).
3. **Proximate Communities:** members may have shared norms or reciprocal obligations because of the social interaction resulting from physical proximity. These are physically based communities comprised of number of dense overlapping, networked relationships. Memberships in these social networks are both voluntary and involuntary associations. Proximate communities have boundaries; consequently, an individual is part of the community or not.

4. **Fluid or Flexible Communities:** members are united for a variety of reasons including a shared sense of purpose or commitment (moral communities); shared values or common interest (normative communities); or networked, social interactions (proximate communities). Unlike the proximate communities, virtual communities have no fixed boundaries and individuals are free to come and go as they please. Individual identity is valued over the collective identity although collective solidarity is quite strong. The collective (discussion groups) does not value the individual's external accomplishments and status. The collective only appreciates what is of intrinsic value to virtual community. Individuals maintain ties with multiple virtual communities with varying levels of loyalty and allegiance. These are similar characteristics to the foraging, nomadic communities of the past. (Komito, 1998, pp102-103).

The debate about the definition of virtual communities centers on the issue of proximity and the lack of boundaries (Komito, 1998, pp104). Komito concludes the element of topography or land is not required to define community. Furthermore, nomadic communities, temporary collectives of individuals, existed long before proximate societies became common. Therefore, electronic/computer mediated environments do support virtual communities (Komito, 1998, pp104-105).

Group Dynamics Theory

Collaborative or group learning is a basic tenet of American educational system and a quality attribute resulting from the using the seven best practices for undergraduate education (Chickering and Gamson, 1999, p78). However, group dynamic theory tells us the social behaviors people exhibit within a group environment

affect the interaction of members, the effectiveness of the group process, and the group's performance. Consequently, group dynamics of collaboration can

> "*exert powerful influence both to advance and to obstruct learning. A group can be an environment in which people invent and explore symbolic structures for understanding the world, learning from each other, and trying out for themselves the discourse of the domain of knowledge they seek to acquire. Alternatively, groups can encourage conformity, squander time and energy on ritual combat, revel in failure, and generally engage in all sorts of fantasy tasks that have little or nothing to do with learning* (Imel and Tisdell citing Knight, 1996, p15)."

Imel and Tisdell summarize and discuss group dynamic theory with regard to several factors from size to culture and gender issues and the impact of learning. Relevant to this proposal is their discussion of the two most widely known models of group dynamics:

- **Group development model** cited from the works of several theorist including Tuckman (1965); Mennecke, Hoffer and Wynne (1992)
- **Individual member roles** model cited from the works of several theorist including Cragan and Wright (1991), Jaques (1991)

The group development model simply states that all groups go through five stages: forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. The group member roles (functions) consist of two specific group processes: maintenance and tasks. More often than not, the model is further refined for three functions: tasks, maintenance, and egocentric behaviors. The group's productivity, harmony, and effectiveness are

influenced by balancing task behaviors and social-emotional supportive behaviors (maintenance) and minimizing egocentric behaviors.

Table 1. Individual member roles, responsibilities and behaviors

	Task Behaviors (generally positive)	**Social-Emotional Behaviors Maintenance (**positive/negative**)**	**Egocentric Behaviors** (negative)
1	**Initiating** – proposing tasks , goals, procedures	**Encouraging** - showing or stating positive regard	**Dominating** –lack of respect
2	**Information Seeking** – request facts, suggestion, ideas	**Expressing** group's feelings; sensing moods and relationships	**Controlling** – not listening
3	**Information Giving** – offers facts, suggestion, ideas	**Harmonizing** – resolving differences and reducing tensions	**Blocking** – squelching topics or points of views
4	**Clarifying** – Interprets, indicates alternatives, examples	**Compromising** – offer alternatives	**Manipulating** – self-serving behavior
5	**Bringing Closure** – summarizes, restates, offers solutions	**Gate-keeping** – keep communication going; encourage participation	**Belittling** – put-downs of others
6	**Consensus Testing** – checks for agreement; trial balloons	**Standard Setting** – remind members of norms, rules and roles	**Nitpicking** to delay or undermine

Source: www.cedresources.nf.net/ppt/GroupDynamics.ppt
http://www.peopleandplanet.org/groups/guide/guide.meetings.dynamics2.php

At minimum, group dynamic theory suggest the online virtual study groups and peer-review groups will exhibit behaviors associated with one of the five group developmental stages. Depending on the number of messages within the groups, group dynamic theory may lead to a coding scheme for member roles.

Group Dynamics and Student Resistance

Researchers have written much about student resistance to changed instructional methods particularly student-centered, active learning strategies. "Woods (1994) observes that students forced to take major responsibility for their own learning go through some or all of the steps psychologists associate with trauma and grief: [shock, denial, strong emotion, acceptance, exploration, confidence and success] (R. Felder & R. Brent citing Woods, 1995)." Interesting enough, these eight

stages of grief and trauma regarding student resistance parallel the five stages of group development.

Table 2. Student Resistance	Parallel to Group Work
Woods (1994) identified the eight stages (and example responses) students go through when confronted with new instructional methods.	Group dynamic theory suggests groups go through five stages
1. Shock: "I don't believe it-we have to do homework in groups and she isn't going to lecture on the chapter before the problems are due?"	**1. Forming:** Learning the task; Getting to know each other; Relies on external assistance
2. Denial: "She can't be serious about this-if I ignore it, it will go away."	**2. Storming:** Conflict over roles, responsibilities, mandate, procedures
3. Strong emotion: "I can't do it-I'd better drop the course and take it next semester" or "She can't do this to me-I'm going to complain to the department head!"	
4. Resistance and withdrawal: "I'm not going to play her dumb games-I don't care if she fails me."	
5. Surrender and acceptance: "OK, I think it's stupid but I'm stuck with it and I might as well give it a shot."	**3. Norming:** ' Social agreements reached; Group norms established; Cohesion begins
6. Struggle and exploration: "Everybody else seems to be getting this-maybe I need to try harder or do things differently to get it to work for me."	**4. Performing:** Goals and roles are understood; Group matures; Self-reliant; task orientated
7. Return of confidence: "Hey, I may be able to pull this off after all-I think it's starting to work."	
8. Integration and success. "YES! This stuff is all right-I don't understand why I had so much trouble with it before."	**5. Adjourning:** Task completed; Closure is sought via rites, rituals, ceremonies, or celebrations
Source: www.cedresources.nf.net/ppt/GroupDynamics.ppt ; http://ltde.tripod.com/firstclass/resist.html.	

Student Resistance: One Instructor's View

The individual I selected to interview is a doctoral student in the English Department and a Graduate TA I will call CP for her perspective as the instructor. The research study course also employed online discussion forums with peer reviewing for the writing-intensive section of the course. Like the study course, CP also supplemented her writing courses with asynchronous, computer-mediated communications (CMC) for general class communications, instruction and as a peer reviewing technique.

She began using LISTSERV (subscription email groups) with her English 20 course in the fall 1997 as a method for digitally capturing the students' peer-reviews.

Since CP is visually impaired, she required this format for use with her adaptive equipment such as “text –to-speech” and “magnifying features” of software. The first English 20 class of twenty students was extremely enthusiastic and encouraging. Neither students nor she was “technology buffs” to quote CP. The majority of the students had never heard of email and had only a vague idea about Internet computing technology. The students were eager to learn and to teach each other.

Three years later, 2000, the last time CP taught English 20, the attitude of the students was much different. Some students resented the use of computers as part of the course and students generally knew how to use email. CP’s analysis of student’s resistance to the LISTSERV was the changed function of their familiar, fun email to a professional, educational purpose. Furthermore, many students were accustomed to GUI (graphical, point and click interface) of their home computers. At the time, MU was still using the text-based BENGAL system. She also believed, they resented their “entertainment/fun/play” computer becoming a “work, educational, graded element/factor in their lives now.” However, those students who had little or no experience with email thought the LISTSERV “was cool as hell.” CP believes “student do not like to change how their mental models” of how classes should be structured, operated and what they ought to know. She said, “It was much easier to work with students with no expectations.” This instructor’s experience suggests amount time to move from the beginning stages to latter stages (acceptance, confidence, integration, and success) may take more than a single class or semester.

Computer-mediated Group Learning (Collaboration)

"Demands from university stakeholders have continued to place special emphasis on the development of strong communications skills … Collaboration is essential in workplace activities (Eveleth and Baker-Eveleth, 2003, p 231)." Therefore, despite student resistance, researcher-instructors persist with integrating collaborative learning into their courses. Eveleth & Baker-Eveleth investigates the use of computer-mediated technology within a secure environment similar to WebCT to help students improve collaborative communication skills. **Dialogue** is the technical linguistic term for collaborative communications skills necessary to reach shared meaning and understanding for purposes of planning, problem solving, teamwork, coordination, and consensus (Eveleth and Baker-Eveleth, 2003, 228)." These researchers reasoned they would observe effective dialogue behaviors skills during group activities within the computer mediated environment after training students in the proper techniques. These techniques include (Eveleth and Baker-Eveleth, 2003, 229)":

1. Questioning: information gathering; clarification
2. Checking comprehension: restatement or paraphrasing
3. Contributing insight or information to conversations
4. Respect, honor and personal connection statements
5. Shared understanding or agreement statements

Eveleth and Baker-Eveleth found the threaded discussions were useful for teaching collaborative communication technique, dialogue, while completing course assignments (Eveleth and Baker-Eveleth, 2003, p 231). For purposes of this

proposal, a salient point is this researcher expects to observe these same behaviors by the study course participants working in the more effective groups. Furthermore, effective dialogue skills parallel effective group role behaviors.

Table 3. Group Dynamic Roles and Effective Dialogue Skills

	Dialogue	Task Behaviors	Maintenance Behaviors	Dialogue
1	Questioning	**Initiating** – proposing tasks , goals, procedures	**Encouraging** - showing or stating positive regard	Respect; Personal Connection
2		**Information Seeking** – request facts, suggestion, ideas	**Expressing** group's feelings; sensing moods and relationships	
3	Contributing	**Information Giving** – offers facts, suggestion, ideas	**Harmonizing** – resolving differences and reducing tensions	
4	Checking	**Clarifying** – Interprets, indicates alternatives, examples	**Compromising** – offer alternatives	
5		**Bringing Closure** – summarizes, restates, offers solutions	**Gate-keeping** – keep communication going; encourage participation	
6	Shared Agreement	**Consensus Testing** – checks for agreement; trial balloons	**Standard Setting** – remind members of norms, rules and roles	

Source: www.cedresources.nf.net/ppt/GroupDynamics.ppt
http://www.peopleandplanet.org/groups/guide/guide.meetings.dynamics2.php
(Eveleth and Baker-Eveleth, 2003).

The dialogue behaviors identified by Eveleth and Baker-Eveleth provide another potential coding strategy as well.

Developing an understanding of Computer-mediated Collaborative Learning

Observing, coding and analyzing the social behaviors of collaborative learners may only tell us in the end, student group behavior is consistent or diverges radically from predicted behaviors of group dynamic theory. Ultimately, what is useful and beneficial to know is what if anything does this community of learners learn? Treleavaven and Cecez-Kecmanovic (2001) investigated this question with their

qualitative study that assesses and codes the collaborative-learning process. These researchers developed a model called the Communicative Model of Collaborative Learning (CMCL) based on the theory collaboration is mediated by language. Furthermore, collaboration is a social process and by analyzing language, researchers can determine the "mechanisms for producing collaborative learning and knowledge co-creation processes (Treleavaven and Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2001, p 171)." In other words, Treleavaven and Cecez-Kecmanovic believed by analyzing the discussion forum message of the online groups, they could approximate when learning was occurring through collaboration.

Conclusion

Based on a review of the literature, this researcher expects to see social behavior among college students in secure, computer-mediated environment to approximate behaviors similar to those of fluid communities and within discussion groups to parallel those consistent with group dynamic theory.

Chapter 3 Study Setting

Institutional Environment

The research study took place at the University of Missouri-Columbia (MU), a designated a Doctoral/Research Extensive institution. MU is composed of 21 major academic units including the College of Business, which offered the course that provided the participant sample. MU a predominantly residential campus and its enrollment reflects a worldwide and diverse student body of 26,200 students from every state and over a 100 different countries and this diversity is reflected in the course population but not necessarily in participant sample.

Student Profile and Learning Environment

The ethnological research study took place within the second most popular program among undergraduates, Business Administration. Participants of the study were students already enrolled in the Business Administration course, ***Fundamentals of Management*** (MGT202). MGT202 is an undergraduate class with a prerequisite minimum 45-credit hour's sophomore standing (typically, second year undergraduate students). The course is a required for all Business Administration undergraduate degree students and for undergraduate students from other academic units as diverse as Family Studies, Forestry, and Engineering. Sixty percent of the students are Business Administration students, 21% are from Arts & Science and almost 10% from the College of Human Environmental Sciences (programs like Family Studies and Fashion Design); the remaining students are from other units listing in Table II. Normally, American undergraduates are supposed to finish their baccalaureate

program within four years. Sophomores (second year undergraduates) average 20% of the MGT202 enrollment and upperclassman (juniors and seniors) comprise 40% each. Total enrollment is approximately 600 students for the sixteen-week semester and COB offers MGT202 twice during the academic year: fall and winter.

The University of Missouri requires all undergraduates to take two writing intensive classes before graduation – one within their disciplinary area and one outside their discipline. Business Administration students can meet their disciplinary WI requirement by taking the special 50-student WI section 1 MGT202 class. The course content is the same; the mid-term evening exams are the same and at the same time, but the WI section students have additional written case study assignments during the 16-week semester. The MU Writing Center provides graders to assist the WI students with their writing and to grade their case reports. The section 2 students meet later in day in a 500-seat auditorium to hear the same lecture or participate in the same activities as the WI students. The writing portion of the class occurs as an external or adjunct function of MGT202.

During1997, the University of Missouri installed WebCT online course management software. For a large, multi-section course like MGT202, the immediate benefits of adoption were two fold:

1. Online distribution of syllabus, handouts, and other documents reduced wasted classroom time, money, and paper and solved other course management issues of associated with the distribution of course materials for large class when enrollment normally does not stabilize for at least two weeks.

2. Use of the online course management software permitted electronically loading of enrollment data directly to the WebCT grade book and permitted direct uploading of scanned exam sheets results directly into WebCT grade book as well reducing tedious and potential for error resulting from manual gradebook recordkeeping.

Before WebCT, MGT202 had already developed a rather unique course structure. Some years before, the faculty re-organized the course into three mini-sessions of approximately five weeks each called modules. Three faculty members taught one module using a common syllabus and textbook. At the end of the module, an evening exam is given and the faculty member free for other projects and research. For the most part, each professor relied on the traditional lecture format common to many large and small college courses; they illustrated their key points with modern equivalent of the chalkboard (the whiteboard, overhead transparencies, or PowerPoint presentations) and at the end of the module, each professor used a mid-term test to assess student's learning. Even the textbook remained the same although updated regularly by the text authors and recent additions included cd-rom with student learning activities and online links to additional enrichment and help.

However, the University's own admission statistics indicated the students were smarter then ever but the mid-term exam scores for MGT202 were showing a steady decline. The course director and professor for Module I determine that perhaps it was time for a change in teaching strategy, making better use of WebCT features and contemporary pedagogy research.

During the course of the study, some or all the course organization was subject to major changes and thus confound the analysis of students' behaviors. As the researchers, will the behaviors I observe result from the student's "normal online social interaction style" or the result of instructional changes? The issue of student resistance may be more important then the study setting, computer mediated learning environment.

Participants and Sampling

Participation was required for the discussion group activities a normal, routine part of the course work; however, certain percentage of students opted not to participate in the online groups and forfeited those course points. I divided the class of over 550 students into 65 random virtual study groups (VSGs) of 8 – 10 students. Each member's tasks were to write a minimum of five posts: an introduction; a study question; answer another's study question; comment on an external link and respond or follow-up to group postings. I also assembled the 50 students receiving writing-intensive credit into peer-review groups (PRGs) of three students each with additional tasks. Participation for the mid-course feedback was voluntary and thus a sample of convenience.

Chapter 4 Methodology

Data Collection

Data collection consists of approximately 4,000 archived online messages and postings from the Winter2002 semester of MGT202, archived survey data from mid-course Student Instructional Feedback forms from both the Fall2001 and Winter2002 and expert interviews. Initial IRB #10004044 was granted September 2001 with continuing reviews each subsequent year. Once the analysis of the archived, secondary data is finished, I plan to interview several experts including professors of educational technology and professors who have successfully integrated online discussion forums into their courses. My purpose for interviews is to obtain their observations of the types of behaviors they have noticed over the course of the 16 week semester versus the five week period this study takes place.

Data Analysis

My primary method of analysis is Treleavaven and Cecez-Kecmanovic's use CMCL model discussed in the Literature Review section of this proposal. CMCL model provides a methodology for analyzing and interpreting the social interaction occurring from the student postings and approximating learning resulting from student collaboration.

I anticipate refining their procedure of coding and classifying online conversations and learners. To summarize, however, the researcher-observer establishes a minimum criterion for defining a "social interaction" for a given thread or assignment. For a given "social interaction," Determine the individual learner's

orientation (motivation) and domains of knowledge. The domains of knowledge parallel or are similar to the group functions discussed in the literature review. Although the CMCL model uses different terminology, when the group dynamics theory is overlaid with the Communicative Model of Collaborative Learning (CMCL), the table works nicely for a coding scheme for classifying and understanding the social behaviors of the MGT202 community of learners.

Table 4. CMCL	*Group Dynamics Overlay	**Domains of Knowledge**		
Learner Orientation		**1. Content Matter**	**2. Group Norms & Rules**	**3. Personal Experiences, desires & feelings**
A. Learning	Desire to know; develop mutual understandings; cooperative construct knowledge	A1 Task	A2 Social	A3 Task
B. Achieving Ends	Motivated by a desire to succeed; pass course; get the best grade in class	B1 Task	B2 Social/ Ego	B3 Social
C. Self-Promotion	Attempts to impress others; concern with self-image and self-portrayal	C1 Ego	C2 Ego	C3 Ego

According to the CMCL developers, the model:

1. *"… enables an inside view of the productivity of the web-mediated environment;*
2. *. . . interpret the meaning of student postings and understand the way students interacted and learnt collaboratively;*
3. *. . ., and understand how students use linguistic acts to express their beliefs and experiences, to govern the interaction process and achieve cooperative meaning-making, knowledge sharing, and co-creation."*

The analysis of the survey data and expert interviews will occur after the analysis of the archived message data to provide another means of seeking insight regarding students' online social behavior.

Appendices

A. Informed Consent Notice

B. Digital Informed Consent

A. Informed Consent Notice

Management 202: Fall 2001
Informed Consent Notice
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA
CAMPUS INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

***Purpose of the research.**
To study the seven variables outlined in the Model for Understanding Teaching and Learning Model (Groccia & Miller, 1998) in a large technology assisted college class.

***Benefits of the research:**
To improve the quality of undergraduate education; revise future Management 202 curriculum and improve the grades and satisfaction of the participating students.

***All foreseeable risks or discomforts to the subject.**
None.

***Length of time subject is expected to participate.**

Mid-Module Survey: one 15 minutes or less session of their choosing.

Automated Peer Review Trial: Trial runs from September 5, 2001 12:01 am to September 18, 2001 9:00 pm. The average individual's time required for participation varies too much based on each student's own individual characteristics to be predicted.

***Person to contact.**

Compliance : University of Missouri - Columbia's IRB Office
Mary Hurt, Campus IRB Assistant, hurtm@missouri.edu
Phone: (573)882-9585 Fax Number:(573)884-4078
483 McReynolds Hall; Columbia, MO 65211

Researchers: Robin Y. Mabry Hubbard, UMC Graduate Student, <ryh352@mizzou.edu>
Dr. Charles Franz. UMC Professor <franzc@missouri.edu

Statement of participation:** Management 202 Student participation is voluntary and that refusal to participate will not result in any penalty or any loss of benefits that the person is otherwise entitled to receive. However, students must complete the ***Mid-Term Survey to receive the 10 bonus points (or the alternate assignment) and students must complete the ***Automated Trial Peer Review Assignments*** for the 1% extra credit (or the alternate assignment)

Student must be eighteen (18) years or older to participate or provide written consent from parent or guardian.

***Subjects' right:** Student has the right to withdraw from the study at any time

B. Edited Screenshot of Digital Informed Consent Document

How are you doing?

Mid Course Survey

Number of questions: 6

Finish Help

You're Responses are ANONYMOUS & CONFIDENTIAL

The purpose is to channel student perceptions into an opportunity for instructional improvement. Studies show receiving feedback from the students, midway results in more outcomes that are positive for students and instructors.

Question 1

What is going well in this class so far?

Question 5

What is your class level?

○ a. Fresh ○ b. Soph ○ c. Junior ○ d. Senior ○ e. Grad

Question 6

I am at least 18 years old, have read, and understand my rights as outlined in the Informed Consent Notice.

○ a. Yes

Save answer
Bottom of Form

Revised: 2001.08.28 Release: Mgt202-Fall'01-Released 2001.09.04-.10

Finish Help

References

Chickering, A. W., and Gamson, Z.F. (1999). "*Development and adaptations of the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education.*" ***New Directions for Teaching & Learning***. 80, pp77-81. Academic Search Elite accessed December 15, 2003 http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=9367062&db=afh&site=ehost

Connie L. Fulmer. (2001) *Colorado Education Online Web Page, University of Colorado at Denver, Administrative Leadership, and Policy Studies (ALPS) Lab Webpage*. Accessed 11/17/2003. http://ceo.cudenver.edu/alpsonline/methodology.htm

Cragan, J. F., and Wright, D. W. (1991). **Communication in Small Group Discussions: An Integrated Approach**. (3rd Ed.) St. Paul, Minn.: West.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). **Qualitative Inquiry And Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions**.(p. 65) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Groccia, J.E. and Miller, M.S. (Eds). 2001. **College Teaching: A Sourcebook of Essential Readings**. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Custom Publishing.

Eveleth, D. M. and Baker-Eveleth, L. J. (2003). "*Developing Dialogue Skill--A Qualitative Investigation of an On-Line Collaboration Exercise in a Team Management Course.*" ***Journal of Education for Business***, 78 p228, 6p. Academic Search Elite accessed October 16, 2003 http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=10300892&db=afh&site=ehost

Felder, R. and Brent, R. (1995). "*Navigating the bumpy road to student-centered instruction.*" ***Chemical Engineering Education***. 29. pp32-33. Google cache accessed December 16, 2003 http://ltde.tripod.com/firstclass/resist.html.

Imel, S. and Tisdell, E. J. (1996) "*The relationship between theories about groups and adult learning groups.*" ***New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education,*** 71. p. 15-24. Wilson Web Education Full Text accessed December 15, 2003.

Jaques, D. (1991). **Learning in Groups**. (2nd ed.) London: Kogan Page

Kenny, A. (2002). "*Online learning: enhancing nurse education?*" ***Journal of Advanced Nursing***, 38 p127, 9p Academic Search Elite accessed October 15, 2003 http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=6467358&db=afh&site=ehost

Knights, B. (1993). "*Hearing yourself teach: Group processes for adult educators.*" ***Studies in the Education of Adults***. 25. pp184-198.

Komito, L. (1998). "*The Net as a foraging society: Flexible communities.*" ***Information Society***, 14, p97, 10p. Academic Search Elite accessed October 18, 2003 http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=775787&db=afh&site=ehost

Mennecke, B. E., Hoffer, J. A., and Wynne, B. E. (1998). "*The implications of group development and history for group support system theory and practice*." ***Small Group Research***. 23. pp524-572.

Porter, C. (2003). Interviews and interview papers. archived at www.missouri.edu/~ryh352/archive/diss_data/cp.html

Treleavaven, L. & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2001). "*Collaborative Learning in a Web-mediated Environment: a study of communicative practices*." ***Studies in Continuing Education***, 23, p169, 15p. Academic Search Elite accessed October 16, 2003 http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=5655191&db=afh&site=ehost

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). "*Developmental sequence in small groups*." ***Psychological Bulletin***. 63, pp384-399.

University of Missouri-Columbia. (2003*). eIRB Continuing Review Report No. 26806* accessed 11/17/03 09-03-2003 Approved Exempt 09-08-2003 until 10-30-04 https://irb.missouri.edu/eirb/main.php?action=Show_History&proj_num=1004044#