

SIMILE: Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education

Evaluating a Wireless Course Feedback System: The Role of Demographics, Expertise, Fluency, Competency, and Usage

Ronald E. Rice
University of California, Santa Barbara

Ulla Bunz
Florida State University, Tallahassee

Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education
Volume 6, Issue 3 (August 2006)
© University of Toronto Press
Article number: 80

SIMILE
Editor
Editorial
Table of Contents
Sample

BUSINESS
Advert
Rights & Permissions

Author

Submit

Current
Part I

ABSTRACT

Current pedagogical theory emphasizes convergent, collaborative and participative learning, and the use of new computer-based instructional technologies to support these approaches. However, it is necessary to evaluate these technologies, especially to identify any student factors that might foster digital divides or differential outcomes. This study analyzes the influences on the student evaluation of a wireless course feedback system in two Master's classes, using a baseline influence survey, two later evaluation surveys, system data about answering review questions, and ratings and open-ended comments on the final course evaluation. Influences studied include demographics, variety of computer usage, web expertise, computer-email-web fluency (three dimensions), computer-mediated competency (eight dimensions), levels of exposure to the system, and use of the system for in-class reviews and discussions. The four evaluation dimensions (training, easy to use, validity, fun, overall) were predicted (from 25% to 51%) by different combinations of prior web use, computer classes, exposure to the system, and dimensions of computer-mediated competency.

...

The use of technology in general (Chu & Schramm, 1967), and computer-based technology in particular, in classrooms is not a new phenomenon. Whether it is the use of overhead transparencies or Powerpoint presentations in public speaking (Bunz, 2002) or browsers and graphics programs in website design (Bunz, 2003b), computer-mediated technology for instructional purposes (Althaus, 1997), a mediated classroom designed as a virtual team (Leidner & Jarvenpaa, 1993; Walther & Bunz, 2005), an online/virtual classroom (Hiltz, 1994), integrated learning management systems (Alavi & Dufner, 2005), or asynchronous learning networks (Hiltz & Goldman, 2005), almost all modern university classrooms include at least some use of computer-based technology. By 2002, as many as 80% of higher education institutions offered some forms of virtual or computer-mediated education (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Online courses, curricula and degrees are being offered by a wide variety of university and institutions in the U.S. and Europe, including the U.S. Army and university consortia (Hiltz & Goldman, 2005). Courses may now combine face-to-face, traditional media, text-based CMC media and new digital media to deliver materials, coordinate group projects, provide access to processible information and discussions from the local as

well as international institutions, and foster interaction among students and external participants (Coppola, Hiltz & Rotter, 2002; Rice, Hiltz & Spencer, 2005). Crucial to the increasing wide-spread use of such technology are appropriate evaluations in a variety of settings.

After a review of relevant pedagogical concepts, the potential role of computer-mediated instructional technology, and a brief introduction to classroom response systems, this study seeks to find out how students assess a wireless course feedback system and what factors influence those evaluations.

Applying Instructional Technology

Collaboration, Constructivism and Convergence

The concept and application of technology-mediated education in general and distance education in particular has shifted over the past 30 years (Rumble, 2001) -- from a conveyance model of education towards a more convergence model. Collaborative (group- or team-based) learning (Alavi & Dufner, 2005), grounded in constructivist learning and social learning theories, emphasizes the fundamental roles of direct interaction with information, and of social interaction in learning, suggesting that pedagogies and media that foster participation and collaboration will improve learning. Collaborative learning requires interaction, interdependence and feedback to create a joint outcome (Dillenbourg & Schneider, 1995; Verdejo, 1996), while also supporting greater student autonomy (Henri & Rigault, 1996). Johnson and Johnson (1996; cited by Curtis & Lawson, 2001) identify theoretical justifications for more collaborative learning approaches in cognitive development, behavioral learning, and social interdependence research.

Dede (1996), among others, emphasizes the importance of "learning-through-doing," which involves individualized presentational and "constructivist" experiences in problem-solving, case-based contexts, available to students on demand. Gold (2001) identifies central points of the constructivist approach:

Humans are active, knowledge-searching creatures that transform and interpret experience using developed biological and mental structures. They assimilate new knowledge by producing cognitive structures that are similar to the experiences they are engaged in. They then accommodate themselves to these newly developed knowledge structures and use them within their collection of experiences as they continue to interact with the environment....Knowledge then is about interpretation, and making meaning of the environment....To learn, therefore, is to communicate and demonstrate understanding of the world....Students' exposure to multiple perspectives and authentic situations enables them to combine their learning experiences and transform them into personal meaning. These meaningful structures, "schemata", are then used to interpret and create meaning when new knowledge is introduced.

Specifically relevant to this study, he argues that a central process of a constructivist approach involves "incorporating the proper assessment activities that are derived from the content."

Computer-Mediated Instructional Technology

As have others, we note the paradox of using computer-mediated instructional technology to foster more collaborative, convergent and constructivist learning. The objective machine nature of computer technology, and its initial uses for objective testing and programmed instruction, would seem to reinforce a traditional conveyance/objectivist (teacher-led, fixed-content) approach. Thus it is important to distinguish between the effects of the delivery (conveyance) technology vs. those of

the instructional (convergence) technology. Using new technologies simply to convey current content does not take advantage of pedagogical possibilities provided by new media. Teachers and students will have to understand the possible new roles and responsibilities that come with these technological developments -- they cannot just rely on "using" the medium in a traditional way for a direct effect (Bunz, 2004).

Hiltz and Shea (2005) (see also Hiltz, 1994) and argue that the most significant role of technology, through the personalization, programmability, networked, multi-media, and communicative support aspects of computers, is to foster opportunities for interaction among the participants, which emphasizes the convergence aspect. Computer-based instructional technologies can facilitate communication among participants while structuring group dialogue and decision making. Student involvement can be enhanced through managing interaction with resources, teachers, and fellow students (Moore, 1993). Computer-mediated class technology may foster all of these processes as well as, or better than, traditional face-to-face instruction (Berge & Collins, 1995; Harasim, Hiltz, Teles, & Turoff, 1995; Hiltz, 1994).

For example, Alavi (1994) found that MBA students who used information technologies to support their synchronous collaborative learning process rated their learning and satisfaction with the classroom experience higher, and obtained higher final test grades, than did students who did not use the system. Alavi and Dufner (2005) call for research of "technology-mediated collaborative learning environments that may be pedagogically superior to alternative forms of learning environments." Indeed, Hiltz's foundational book, *The Virtual Classroom* (1994) emphasizes the role of computer-mediated technology in fostering interaction, participation, and communication between instructor and students, and among students - what she calls "active dialog", rather than on any specific technology or the value of mediation per se.

Gold (2001) suggests features and components of computer-mediated instructional technology (see his Table 1) that correspond to four central principles of a constructivist approach (derived from Piaget). Examples relevant to this study include, for each principle: assimilation (pre-testing, course testing and revision, non-graded starter activities, facilitative questions); accommodation (behavior modelling, quizzes for reinforcement, compare and contrast activities, discussion feedback by instructor and other students, modularize content to introduce new concepts quickly); equilibrium (auto-marked quizzes, open student evaluation to instructor); and disequilibrium (student and facilitator feedback, post-test). Gold (2001) provides an explicit set of operationalizations of constructivist pedagogy principles for the computer-mediated course environment.

Influences on Use and Access

However, it is not always clear how appropriate any particular technology is for all students. Various factors might influence the evaluation of a new classroom technology apart from its actual use. Possibly there are pre-existing differences, or variations in expertise and capabilities, that would make some students less receptive toward, or able to take full advantage of, new instructional technologies; or there are pedagogical and technological factors that make the most difference (Chu & Schramm, 1967; Clark, 2001).

Demographics such as age and gender are important controls, though such factors seem to be playing a smaller role in general computer-mediated communication and personal technology use (see Katz & Rice, 2002, for example, showing that there is no longer a gender digital divide in Internet usage in the U.S.) It can be argued that previous experience with technology would be a prime influence on how students will respond to the usage of this particular technology in their classroom. It is possible that students with less technology experience shy away from using a new one, and those with more experience are more comfortable with such technology, more likely to become more involved and participative in the course by using such technology, and

thus more likely to positively evaluate the technology. It may be that certain kinds of technology knowledge or comfort - expertise, fluency, or competency - have differential influences on evaluation of the system. For example, greater expertise might sustain more positive evaluations of the ease of use or fun of a system. Greater computer-email-web fluency would allow users to integrate this new technology into their mental models more quickly, leading to more positive evaluations of training and ease of use. Greater competency with mediated communication, which is more oriented toward convergence than simply using computer tools to convey information, may lead to more positive assessments of the worth of the system.

Especially due to convergence of traditional media (e.g., news print) and information technologies (e.g., the web), digitized media sources (e.g., online newspapers, blogs) have long entered the media landscape. Tyner (1998), in her book *Literacy in a digital world* clearly included the use of emerging communication tools in her approaches to media education and media literacy (as have Brown, 1998, and Correia & Teixeira, 2003). Olson and Pollard (2004) argue that media education programs ought to address all available media, as well as consider both practical and philosophical skill sets. Concepts related to media education and literacy have been defined by various disciplines to address the new literacies required of the current-day media consumer, including computer literacy (Computer Science), digital literacy (Art), and information literacy (Library Studies) (see Markauskaite, 2006). In addition, some authors (e.g., Thoman & Jolls, 2004; Webber & Johnston, 2000) argue that other concepts such as competence, comfort with technology, effective communicating, critical thinking, and managing information all are part of an evolved media literacy. The study at hand addresses this expanded conceptualization through the use of a skill-oriented computer-email-web fluency scale that measures people's "tool" or "practical" capabilities of dealing with information technologies, and the more communicatively oriented computer-mediated communication competency scale.

Other predictors of success and completion in online courses include prior computer skills, number of prior distance learning courses, college GPA, accessibility to the equipment, comfort and confidence with computer technology, responsibility toward completing assignments, interaction with instructor, internal locus of control, self-efficacy, independent learning style, convergers, time management skills, support from family and friends, etc. (Hiltz & Shea, 2005).

Digital divides - most generally defined as the difference between those who "have" technology and those who "have not" - are associated with various socio-economic factors (i.e., gender, ethnicity, social networks), education, and economics (Bunz, 2002). Ideally, schools and universities ought to strive towards closing any pre-existing digital divides among their students. The use of a classroom performance system can only be justified if it does not disadvantage those students who have to be classified as digital "have nots," or do not have sufficient computer competency, based on any or all of the above factors.

Thus, student success in a technology-intensive class is a combination of personality factors, technological ability, and related digital divide factors that include access to technology to develop not just technological ability, but also a positive attitude toward technology. Research on the influences on use, evaluation and learning can be used to help identify students who might need additional training, which courses might be most appropriately aided by such technology, how such systems might be best used in courses, and how to improve their design.

For example, the New Jersey Institute of Technology, which offers many courses in both online and face-to-face sections, provides prospective students a self-scoring survey to find out if they are suited to an asynchronous course (Hiltz & Shea, 2005). This survey includes 10 questions, including assessments of one's computer skills, and comfort with using new technologies. "Students who score below a certain cutoff point are told to speak to an advisor before selecting an online course, and those who score below a second cutoff point are told 'e-learning does not appear to be right for you'."

Wang and Newlin (2002) provide a more psychologically-oriented checklist (self-efficacy, locus of control, participation in class) for potential online students.

Classroom Response Systems

One recent addition to the range of computer-based classroom instructional technologies are classroom response systems. These are designed to improve both interactivity and collaboration to supplement already existing content in a pedagogically sound manner, but in a different way than most "distance education" or "instructional technology" systems. It has been referred to as "classroom communication system," "classroom performance system," or "instant feedback system."

The instructor enters multiple-choice type questions into the program either before the class, or during the class. The system has a wireless receiver linked to the program. Students are provided remote control response units. The program projects selected questions onto a screen at various times during the class, and students use the remote control units to transmit their answers to the questions (either anonymously or identified) in real time. The system can be set to display how many of the students have submitted a response. The distribution of responses, and the correct answer (if desired) are then projected on the screen..

This procedure provides feedback to both the instructor and students. Since the correct answer can be displayed for all to see, students can confirm to themselves whether they chose the correct answer, and if not, they have an immediate review of what it should have been. Simultaneously, instructors can see how many students chose incorrect answers and may want to repeat a learning unit if the majority of students seems to have problems as indicated by incorrect answers. In addition, the class can engage in discussion about the reasons for the correct or incorrect answers, or related questions. Though a database in the software collects information on which student answered what question correctly, the system and the classroom display can be set to be completely anonymous and not face-threatening to students. A number of companies currently offer this kind of technology, but the one used for this study and discussed here is called the Classroom Performance System (CPS) by a company called eInstruction (<http://www.eInstruction.com>).

Such systems have the potential to facilitate several classroom processes consistent with a more constructivist and convergence learning context:

- participation (all class members participate in the use of and publicly displayed results of the system)
- collaboration (the class configures the system for team use, and class members can develop questions as part of the in-class review, and debate both the questions and the answers)
- physical activity (provides a break from the more passive traditional class, allowing members to switch focus, engage in physical activity and social interaction)
- cognitive involvement (requires everyone to engage the questions, rather than just one or two who raise their hands)
- self-assessment (allows students to privately check whether they understand the concepts or not; provides some indicator to the instructor as to how well the concepts have been explained or presented)
- shared knowledge (reaffirms joint understanding of a term or concept, as well as

identifying common misunderstandings)

- review (engages students in real-time summary and review of class material)
- discussion (raises or rates topics for discussion by and among class members)

Several preliminary studies have been reported, all concluding that there is considerable promise in the technology. Abrahamson's (2002) review of "five years of CCS research with pedagogical techniques in a range of disciplines, educational levels, and institutional settings," concludes that

Good questions asked in the right context have a remarkable property to transform a classroom. The environment becomes more lively and active. The atmosphere changes and becomes more "happy"! Students report that they understand the subject better, which is confirmed by quantitative studies. They work harder in class, but enjoy it more. There is also evidence that they do more out of class. Teachers become more aware of student problems with the subject matter. The benefits of a classroom communication system (CCS) extend over a remarkable range of disciplines, educational levels, and institutions.

Cox and Junkin (2002) found that faculty using eInstruction systems report that both faculty and students confirm greater student engagement in the classroom, high satisfaction, and gains in student learning across the disciplines. Everett and Ranker (2002) argue that "the theoretical and intuitive benefits seem to outweigh the preparation and set up costs. CPS use appears to increase active learning by devoting some classroom time to student involvement in active feedback such as quizzes on lectures....The student endorsement of CPS use was strong, and the time studies indicate that the [time] commitment [required] for other faculty to use the CPS will have been significantly diminished. The major intuitive benefit for the researchers is a feeling of connecting with classes of traditionally very passive students and the time it makes available for other higher-order thinking." And Horowitz (2002), assessing a system called "Instant Feedback" at IBM's Corporate Management Development Center, reported that IBM's managerial students liked it very much (ranked it 6.6 out of 7), and their test scores improved by 27%.

There are of course various aspects of any system evaluation, including the level of training, how easy or enjoyable it is to use, and whether it helps or interferes with the primary task. As the CPS is a different kind of instructional technology, in ways that should foster collaborative, convergent, and participatory learning, it is important to identify how the actual participants assess the system.

Research Questions

Based upon the preceding review, three basic research questions guide the current study:

RQ1: How do students evaluate the Classroom Performance System?

RQ2: How do demographics, computer/web technology experience, fluency and competency, along with use of the system, influence the evaluation of the Classroom Performance System?

RQ3: How does CPS use and evaluation influence evaluation of the course?

We emphasize that the current study considers only a very narrow aspect of the potentiality of computer-mediated technology for a more constructivist approach to class process, however: influences on students' evaluation of a wireless response system, and how that evaluation influences overall course evaluation, as Figure One shows.

----- RQ2 ----- RQ1 -----

Figure 1

Influences on, Usage of, Evaluation and Outcomes of, Computer-Mediated Class Response System

Methods

Participants

Participants in this study were graduate students enrolled in one or two courses (Research Methods, and Mediated Communication in Organizations) in a Master's program at a large Northeastern research university. A total of 61 students were enrolled in both courses (37 and 24, respectively). However, 10 students were enrolled in both courses so were asked to complete only one of the surveys. Also, a few others completed only one of the baseline or evaluation questionnaires. For these reasons, the number of responses varies between 42 and 46, a maximum response rate of 90% (46 of 51, which is 61 minus 10).

In the first class in which the CPS system was used, students chose their own numbered CPS wireless remote unit (ranging from 01-32) and corresponding numbered adhesive tags they could stick to their notebooks to remind them of their specific respondent ID and CPS unit number throughout the semester. These numbers were not seen or recorded by the instructors. Students in "Mediated Communication in Organizations" added a "1" in front of their randomly chosen CPS unit number, so their identification numbers ranged from 101 to 132. Students in "Research Methods" added a "2" in front of their CPS unit numbers for a range from 201 to 232. Thereafter, at the beginning of sessions where the CPS was used, students passed around the box of CPS units and selected their own numbered unit. This procedure guaranteed anonymity, while allowing tracking of responses across time, and matching of questionnaire with student review data.

Measures

Course participants completed three questionnaires, one baseline and two evaluation surveys; the study tracked two kinds of CPS usage during the semester; and the participants completed the normal, university-wide instructional ratings course evaluation forms at the end of the semester.

Questionnaire 1.

The first questionnaire consisted of 114 items and was administered during the second week of classes, one week before the CPS technology was first used. This baseline survey contained four sets of questions: (1) demographics and usage, (2) a web expertise scale, (3) a computer-email-web fluency scale, and (4) a computer-mediated communication competency scale. Table One provides descriptive information of these four scales and subscales, including scale reliabilities, from question sets 2-4. Appendix A provides the specific wording of the demographic, usage, and constituent scale items, details about which items represent which subscales, and which items were reverse-coded.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for GT Web Expertise, CEW Fluency and CMC Competency

Computer/Web	Mean	S.D.	Alpha
GaTech Web expertise (novice - 0%, intermediate - 13%, experienced - 49%, expert - 38%)	8.5 activities	2.0	
CEW Fluency	4.69	.34	.94

Computer	4.88	.21	.77
Email	4.69	.46	.92
Web	4.49	.50	.88
CMC Competency, excluding contextual factors	3.83	.48	.90
Comfort	3.94	.59	.72
Medium factors	3.93	.71	.81
General usage	3.86	1.04	.87
Effectiveness	3.94	.74	.63
Rapport	3.50	.71	.80
Efficacy	3.94	.70	.85
Interaction management	3.74	.72	.52
Contextual factors	2.90	.45	.11

***Note:** Fluency items were scaled from 1 = very difficult to 5 = very easy. Competency items were scaled from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. See Appendix 1 for item wording.

Q1: Demographics and computer use. Set (1) included nine questions asking for gender, age, years of Internet usage, number of computer classes taken, and frequency of web access from a number of locations (home, work, school, public terminal, other).

Q1: Web expertise. Set (2) included 12 questions taken from the Georgia Tech (1998) web survey that asked whether one has performed a particular activity or not (such as changed one's browser startup page) and were used to classify subjects in web expertise groups. The total number of these activities was used to group respondents, according to the Georgia Tech operationalization, into four levels of expertise based on the number of the listed tasks that respondents had done via the Web: 0-3, novice; 4-6, intermediate; 7-9, experienced; and 10-12, expert.

Q1: Computer-email-web fluency. Set (3) included 50 items comprising the CEW fluency scale (Bunz, 2004), consisting of three subscales (computer, email, and web). The CEW fluency scale is oriented toward technical and applied skills. It focuses on one's ability to use the technology itself. It does not focus on purposes for which a technology can be employed, for example in mediated communication. Following the lead of the Committee on Information Technology (1999), the term "fluency" was used during development of the scale as it implies at least three concepts of increasing importance as information technology is becoming more and more prevalent in our society. The three concepts are: (1) fluency entails a lifelong learning process, (2) fluency implies personalization of skills on levels of sophistication, and (3) fluency is composed of three kinds of knowledge: contemporary skills, foundational concepts, and intellectual capabilities (Committee on Information Technology, 1999). A measure that goes beyond general computer skills to also tap into email and web fluency seems an important potential influence on evaluating a new instructional technology.

A scale-development study by Bunz (2004) reported a principal-component factor analysis with varimax rotation resulting in a four-factor solution: computer skills (Eigenvalue = 2.3, 10.8% of variance, alpha = .85), email skills (8.9, 42.3%, .89), web editing skills (1.3, 6.2%, .82), and web navigation skills (1.7, 8%, .84). Combining the two web subscales resulted in a higher reliability alpha of .92 (a result found in follow-up scale development tests).

Q1: Computer-mediated communication competency. Set (4) included 43 items comprising the CMC competency scale (Bunz, 2003a), consisting of eight sufficiently reliable subscales (comfort, contextual factors, efficiency, interaction management, medium factors, general usage, effectiveness, and rapport). In the current study, all were

sufficiently reliable except for the contextual factors subscale, so it was excluded from further analysis.

The CMC competency scale is a more applied measure than the CEW fluency scale, as it indicates how adept people are at using computer-mediated technology for various communication and interaction purposes. The underlying model and initial item inventory (114 items representing 17 constructs) were originally conceptualized by Spitzberg (1997; see also Morreale, Spitzberg, & Barge, 2001; Spitzberg, 2006). Bunz (2003a) tested, revised, and shortened the instrument to 41 items in eight constructs. When submitted to a principal component varimax rotation factor analysis, these eight constructs loaded as seven constructs with Eigenvalues above 1, as one of them combined two of the previous constructs, forming the construct re-labeled comfort. Finally, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on all items deleted from the original eight constructs. Four constructs emerged, but only one of these constructs showed acceptable reliability. Interpretation of the items, describing issues of enthusiasm, leadership, and connectedness, lead to the labeling of this construct as rapport. The remaining constructs use the original labels proposed by Spitzberg in his model.

Exposure to the CPS. Depending on their enrollment, students were classified in the data into three CPS exposure groups: group 1 ($n = 22$) was the "low exposure" group and consisted of students only enrolled in "Research Methods" where they used the CPS technology in four classes. Group 2 ($n = 15$) was the "medium exposure" group and consisted of students only enrolled in "Mediated Communication in Organizations" where they used the CPS technology in six classes. Finally, group 3 ($n = 10$) was the "high exposure" group and consisted of students enrolled in both courses and thus exposed to the CPS technology in a combined 10 classes.

Applications of the CPS. Of the many possible uses of a CPS system, the two courses applied CPS in the following ways:

- have the system present a small set of questions prepared in advance to review specific concepts in the class lecture, have the students transmit their responses, have the system display the distribution of responses, and then have the students discuss the correct and incorrect answers
 - allow students to devise a small set of questions themselves about concepts they want to review or discuss, enter those into the system during class, and then follow the same display, response and discussion processes
 - to demonstrate content analysis, provide a short transcript and have the students "vote" on which of five *a priori* themes best represent the text, and, based on the disagreements across the five themes, revise the operationalization of the themes and revote until acceptable convergence
 - to stimulate discussion, present various answer choices for a controversial topic that has no correct answer, allow students to cast their opinion vote, and discuss the merits of each answer choice
- However, we did not measure the durations of any of these specific kinds of exposures, or perceptions by the students of these specific activities.

CPS collection of in-class reviewing answers. Whenever CPS is used for a classroom interaction, the database can keep a record of answers transmitted by each specific CPS unit, and the actual correct answer for a particular question. If students are identified through their remote control unit ID number, instructors can track individual learning, devise individualized study guides, and gauge attention and involvement throughout any given class period. Since data collection was anonymous in our study and the ID numbers of the remote control units were not linked in the CPS database to specific student names, we cannot connect any external data (such as course grades) to review answers provided through the CPS units. However, analyzing the frequencies

of the data collected through the use of the CPS units, for purposes of reviewing the particular class material, helps recognize tendencies in involvement from which instructional strategies can be developed. We gathered the system data on whether each individual user provided a correct or incorrect answer to each question in each respective class, and then computed the overall percent of review questions answered correctly throughout the course, and entered that into the questionnaire database for the respective ID number.

Questionnaires 2 and 3: Evaluation of the CPS. The second and third questionnaires both consisted of 20 questions evaluating the CPS along four dimensions: training, ease of use, perceived validity of responses given, and fun (see Appendix B). The CPS evaluation questionnaire was developed for a study that compared automatic grading sheets (students mark multiple choice answers on a grid sheet, which is scanned into a computer system that can then compute and provide examination/quiz grades) and CPS for the administration of survey questionnaires (Bunz, 2005). Acceptable to high reliability alphas in that study (ease of use .86, perceived validity .65, fun .93, training .97) warranted using the questionnaire for the current study.

The CPS evaluation questionnaire was administered once after approximately seven weeks (Q2), and again after approximately 14 weeks (Q3). Table Two provides the descriptive statistics, as well as the alpha reliabilities, and correlations and t-tests across time, of each of the four dimensions and the overall mean CPS evaluation scale at both time periods. Because the measures were equally reliable at both time periods, were very highly correlated across the time periods, and did not significantly differ in mean values across time, we used the Q2 values in the regression analyses because of the slightly higher sample size. These similarities also imply that the students had had sufficient exposure to, and use of, the CPS, by the time of the first evaluation survey. Put another way, learning the system was very easy so that participants were able to evaluate the system reliably after several uses in the classroom. A related interpretation is that participants form their evaluations of this system very quickly and thereafter do not revise those evaluations.

Table 2

Reliabilities, Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations for CPS Evaluation Scale and Subscales, Across the Two Measurement Periods, with Open-Ended Comments Concerning CPS

Evaluation	Alpha		Mean/ S.D.		T- test	Correlation
	7 weeks	14 weeks	7 weeks	14 weeks		
Overall CPS Evaluation	.88	.89	1.77 / .47	1.74 / .48	n.s.	.67 ***
Training	.91	.92	1.55 / .56	1.47 / .59	n.s.	.58 ***
Ease of use	.73	.75	1.41 / .47	1.41 / .48	n.s.	.99 ***
Validity	.75	.80	2.36 / .82	2.36 / .82	n.s.	.99 ***
Fun	.87	.85	1.76 / .68	1.77 / .73	n.s.	.44 ***

***Note:** Items scored from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree; n = 39 to 45, 39 in common; pairwise correlations. *** p<.001. See Appendix 2 for item wording.

Open-ended comments from student instructional evaluation forms relating to CPS

The CPS system. I really liked the CPS system. I liked using the CPS during class to test my knowledge of the material. The CPS technology that we used was very interesting -- it helped me figure out what chapters I needed to go back and re-read. Lecture style and use of CPS for reinforcing learning. CPS and course lecture. CPS. Fun use of teaching technology in class. The CPS was a great complement to the lectures. Using the

eInstruction system is not appropriate in a graduate class and took time away from meaningful discussions. CPS was fun.

Evaluations of the course. Each course taught at any level (undergraduate, master's, doctoral) at the University is formally evaluated at the end of the semester, using a standard instructional rating survey. The survey sheet consists of 10 standard questions with 5-point rating scales, and, on the back side, four open-ended questions where students can write short comments. (The educational literature on student instructional evaluations is vast, and this particular course evaluation form has been analyzed and expanded based on that research - see Rice, Stewart & Hujber, 2000). The anonymous surveys from each class are collected by a student and provided directly to a campus-wide Teaching Excellence Center, which processes all the forms, and some time the following semester provides the instructors a summary sheet with the mean responses for each question, as well as the original anonymous rating sheets with the written comments.

These questions, of course, are quite general, relating to the entire course, and so are not presented here as evaluating any aspect of the course specifically related to use of the CPS. The only numeric items from that form presented here are those most likely to capture some aspect of the instructional technology used: "The instructional methods encouraged student learning" (from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree), "I rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor as..." (from 1=poor to 5=excellent), and an added question, "I learned more of the course material by using the CPS."

The instructional evaluation form also provides four open-ended questions: "What do you like best about this course?", "If you were teaching this course, what would you do differently?", "In what ways, if any, has this course or the instructor encouraged your intellectual growth and progress?" and "Other comments or suggestions." Some participants provided their thoughts on the CPS as part of these comments. Note that both the numeric ratings and the comments are not linked to CPS remote unit ID numbers, so only the overall mean ratings for the course (i.e., not at the individual level) are provided, and thus they cannot be associated with the above individual-level data.

However, as an exploratory extension of the project, we sent an email request to all class members three months after the course ended, asking them if they would send an email to a specific trusted third party (a School administrative assistant) with their CPS ID number, and their responses to the two formal evaluation questions mentioned above, and to a third question asking the extent to which they agreed that they had "learned more of the course material by using the CPS." Upon receiving the replies, the assistant removed all identification information, and provided the researchers with the responses and their respective ID numbers.

Results

Demographics, Computers Usage, Computer Expertise, CEW Fluency, and CMC Competency

Overall, students were predominantly female (72%), in line with the distribution of gender in the Master's program. Their ages fell into the ranges 20-24 (40%), 25-29 (32%), and 30+ (28%). Most of the participants have been using the Internet for 4-6 years (43%), or 7-9 years (34%). They have taken 1-2 (26%), or 3-5 (36%) computer classes with 17% having taken more than nine computer classes. Participants accessed the web very frequently from a variety of locations, including daily web access from home (81%), daily web access from work (78%), and weekly web access from school (30%). Participants accessed the web from public terminals less than once a month (36%) or never (47%), and accessed the web from any other place less than once a month (32%) or never (45%).

Based on the classification scheme by the Georgia Tech (1998) web survey, 38% of the participants could be considered expert, almost half were experienced web users, 13% had intermediate skills, and there were no novices. Participants rated themselves as high in CEW fluency overall (mean=4.69), with general computer fluency highest and web fluency lowest. Participants did not rate themselves nearly as high in CMC competency, with an overall scale mean of 3.83 (excluding contextual factors). All sub-competencies had ratings of around 3.9 except interaction management (3.7), and rapport (3.5). Please refer to Tables One and Two for means, standard deviations, and reliabilities of the main scales and subscales.

Use of CPS for Reviewing

In the course "Mediated Communication in Organizations," 26 questions were recorded across the various sessions. Of these, one question did not have a correct answer (that is, it was intentionally used to stimulate discussion of different possible answers). For 22 out of the remaining 25 questions, the majority of students (at least 50%) picked the correct answer. For one question, the largest group of students choosing a specific answer (44%) picked the correct answer, though this implies that more than half of the students chose incorrect answers. Thus, the majority of students answered nearly all of the questions correctly. More importantly, for the purposes of this study, these students gained direct and rapid confirmation of their gained knowledge. In the case of three questions where a majority answered them incorrectly, more clarification on the topic was obviously needed. As a result of using the CPS in these instances, the instructor received direct feedback during the class that confusion about the topic was still prevalent and could thus address those questions and concerns immediately.

Overall, the number of correct answers per student were fairly high in this course, ranging from 44% to 85%, with a mean of 69.5% (s.d. 11.6%, n=25). Regardless of whether the questions and topic were simple, the instructor explained them well, or the students were especially bright, the important conclusion is that the in-class classroom performance system review allowed students to review or confirm what they had learned, and to clarify what they had misunderstood. As one student wrote on the semester-end instructor evaluation form, "The CPS technology that we used was very interesting -- it helped me figure out what chapters I needed to go back and re-read." Since there were no formal exams in this class, without the use of CPS this student might never have become aware of his/her lack of understanding of certain topics, and would not have been motivated to review the appropriate topics.

In the course "Research Methods," a total of 11 questions were recorded in the CPS database. Five out of eleven questions were answered correctly by the majority (at least 50%) of students. For two questions, the largest group of students (45% in both cases) chose the correct answer, but more than half the students chose incorrect answers. In the case of the remaining four questions, the majority of students (59%-83%) answered incorrectly. Thus, unlike the other course, here most students answered most of the questions incorrectly. Indeed, students answered just under half of the questions correctly (mean of 47.2%, s.d. 15.6%, range of 18% to 73%, n=33). In this course, the CPS technology was an especially useful tool. The technology provided a threat-free environment in which to make mistakes and provided timely feedback to the instructor to review pertinent and complex or confusing concepts again. As one student said on the semester-end instructor evaluation form, "I liked using the CPS during class to test my knowledge of the material."

We will return to the percent of review questions answered correctly (over the two classes, 56.3%, s.d. 18%, n=55) as one possible predictor of CPS evaluation.

CPS Evaluation

As Table Two shows, participants averaged between "strongly agree" and "agree" on the overall CPS evaluation scale, and the subscales of CPS training, ease of use, and

fun. However, concerning the validity subscale, the participants averaged between "agree" and "undecided." Table Two also shows that all but one of the statements about the CPS on the open-ended comments portion of the course evaluation were positive, ranging from the CPS as being one of the best parts of the class, and fun to use, to good for reinforcing learning.

Course Evaluation

While the overall mean course ratings can in no way be explicitly linked to the use of the CPS system, the courses did receive high ratings concerning instructional methods and teaching effectiveness. As Table Three shows, the overall ratings for both courses were between "agree" (4) and "strongly agree" (5) and higher than the mean of all the other Master's course that semester on instructional methods and teaching effectiveness.

Table 3
Summary Course Ratings from End-of-Semester Instructional Rating Survey

Overall Course Mean Evaluations, Reported by Course Evaluation Office				Three Questions Three Months Later - Mean and S.D. of Individual Responses		
Questions	Research Methods	Mediated Communication	Mean of All Master's Level Courses that Semester	Research Methods	Mediated Communication	Mean across the Two Courses
Instructional methods encouraged student learning (a)	4.38	4.52	4.32	3.6 (sd=1.2)	4.4 (sd=.5)	4.1 (sd=1.0)
Teaching effectiveness of the instructor (b)	4.75	4.83	4.46	4.6 (sd=.5)	4.6 (sd=.5)	4.6 (sd=.5)
I learned more course material by using the CPS (a)	---	---	---	3.4 (sd=1.4)	3.8 (sd=.7)	3.5 (sd=1.1)

***Note:** a. 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree; b. 1 = poor to 5 = excellent

In response to the email request three months later for ID numbers and course and CPS evaluations, we received responses from 17 members of the classes. As some students had graduated and moved, some may have changed their email accounts, others were on vacation, and some may have simply not wished to participate, this is of course a small and nonrandom sample of the two courses. However, for exploratory purposes, we will report summary analyses using these data. Table Three provides descriptive statistics for those items. The mean evaluations from these 17, provided three months later, are slightly lower than the mean evaluations for the entire course provided at the next to last week of class, with instructional methods around "agree" and teaching effectiveness midway between "agree" and "strongly agree." The single question about learning more by using the CPS received a mean response between "neutral" and "agree."

Influence of Technology Use, Expertise, Fluency and Competency on CPS

Evaluation

Correlations. To investigate how computer/web use, expertise, fluency and competency influence CPS evaluation, correlation and regression analyses were conducted. Table Four provides the bivariate correlations between the demographics, Internet and web usage, GT web expertise, CEW fluency subscales and overall scale, CMC competency subscales and overall scale, and CPS exposure group and mean percent of review questions correct, with the four CPS evaluation subscales and overall scale.

Table 4
Correlations between Independent Variables and CPS Evaluation Scale and Subscales

Independent Variables	Training	Easy	Validity	Fun	Overall CPS Evaluation
Gender (1=M)	.01	-.03	-.11	.15	.00
Age	.06	.17	-.22	.37**	.10
Years using Internet	-.08	-.02	.14	-.05	-.02
Computer classes	.24*	.25*	.34*	.04	.30*
Web use from home	-.04	-.18	-.25*	-.04	-.18
Web use from work	.06	.29*	.09	.15	.19
Web use from school	-.19	-.20	-.35*	.15	-.20
Web use from public terminal	-.34**	-.38**	-.38**	-.10	-.40**
Web use from other	-.29*	-.30*	-.25	-.11	-.31*
GaTech web expertise	.19	.16	.23	.01	.20
Low, medium, high exposure to CPS	-.36**	-.08	.04	.09	-.07
Percent of review questions correct	-.37**	-.20*	-.08	.07	-.18
CEW: Computer	-.16	-.01	.09	.03	-.00
CEW: Email	-.01	-.01	-.08	-.03	-.05
CEW: Web	-.21	-.09	-.04	-.12	-.15
CEW: Overall	-.13	-.05	-.04	-.06	-.09
CMC: Comfort	-.31*	-.30*	-.14	-.22	-.31*
CMC: Medium	-.24	-.36**	-.15	-.24	-.31*
CMC: General	-.14	-.30*	-.12	-.09	-.21
CMC: Effectiveness	-.30*	-.33*	-.18	.04	-.23
CMC: Rapport	-.12	-.23	-.11	-.26*	-.24
CMC: Efficacy	-.14	-.13	-.07	-.29*	-.21
CMC: Interaction	-.21	-.14	-.31*	.02	-.23
CMC: Contextual	.09	-.03	.10	-.23	-.02
CMC: Overall, without contextual	-.34*	-.38**	-.32*	-.29*	-.45**
Instructional effectiveness	-.46*	-.51*	-.46*	.14	-.41
Teacher effectiveness	-.24	-.26	.14	.10	-.03
Learn more course material by using CPS	-.44*	-.53*	-.64**	.05	-.52*

Note: For all but last three variables, n = 42 - 44; for last three variables, n = 15. Note: The items for the CPS evaluation scale and subscales are scored from 1 = strongly agree

to 5 = strongly disagree, so negative correlations mean more positive evaluation, $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; one-tailed, pairwise tests.

Each of the CPS evaluation subscales was correlated with somewhat different predictors. Positive evaluations of training were predicted by greater exposure to the CPS and more review questions answered correctly. Ease of use was predicted by more use of the web from public terminals, the CMC competency "medium" factor, and the overall CMC competency scale (excluding contextual factors). Validity of responses using the CPS was predicted by having taken fewer computer classes, and greater use of the web. Perceiving the CPS as fun was not significantly correlated with any of the influences (at $p < .01$). The overall CPS evaluation scale was predicted by greater use of the web from public terminals, and the overall CMC competency scale (excluding contextual factors).

Table Four also reports correlations between the three post-course items ($n=15$, so we used $p < .05$ as the significance level) and the CPS evaluation scales. The "instructional methods" course evaluation was significantly correlated with the training, easy, and validity CPS evaluation scales. And the "learned more of course material by using the CPS" validity CPS evaluation scales. And the "teaching effectiveness of the instructor" was not significantly correlated with any of the CPS evaluation scales. These result provide some reassurance of the conceptual validity of the CPS evaluation, as they are related to the instructional methods and CPS-use questions but not to the instructor question).

Regressions. Because of possible intercorrelations among the significant influences, multiple regressions were run for each evaluation subscale and overall scale, using as predictors those influences that had significant correlations as indicated in Table Four. Table Five shows the results. Each CPS evaluation subscale and the overall scale are predicted by a generally different set of influences, including a different CMC competency subscale.

Table 5
Final Stepwise Regressions Predicting CPS Evaluation Subscales and Overall Scale (Excluding Contextual Factors)

Independent Variables	Training	Easy	Validity	Fun	Overall CPS
Age		.28*		.44***	.26*
Web from public terminal	-.27*	.44***	-.34***		-.41***
Web from work					
Computer classes	.15*		.37**		.30**
CPS Exposure		-.40***			
CMC: Medium factors					
CMC: Interaction management					
CMC: Efficacy					-.40**
CMC: Overall scale (excluding contextual factors)	-.33*	.41***			-.53***
Adjusted R-square	.37	.35	.51	.25	.49
F-ratio	6.8***	7.9***	14.4***	7.4***	10.4***
N	39	39	39	42	40

Note: The items in the CPS evaluation scale and subscales are scored from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree, so lower values mean more positive evaluation. Values are standardized beta coefficients. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .005$.

- Evaluation of the CPS training is predicted (37% variance explained) by the better one is acquainted with technology in the first place, the more usage of the CPS system, but less formal courses on computing.
- Evaluation of how easy the CPS is to use is predicted by being older, more frequent use of the web from a public terminal, and greater overall competency in CMC (35%), showing that exposure to a greater variety of computing settings and greater ability to handle communication via CMC facilitates learning how to use this technology.
- Evaluation of the validity of one's responses using the CPS is predicted by using the web more from public places, but taking fewer computer classes (51%).
- Evaluation of the CPS as being fun to use was predicted by being younger, using the web more from public terminals, and greater overall competency in CMC (25%).

The overall CPS evaluation is the best predicted (49% variance explained) by being younger, more frequent use of the web from public terminals, fewer prior computer classes, and overall CMC competency. The more competent one is at using a general computer-mediated communication technology like the web for a range of interactional, applied purposes, the more positive one is likely to be about using this new technology.

Finally, we consider the very exploratory analysis of predictors of the three post-course evaluation variables, by means of final stepwise regressions (n=11 each), shown in Table Six. More positive evaluation of "instructional methods" was predicted by less use of the web from work, and greater competency in effective CMC use (84% of variance explained). A sense of learning more of the course material by using the CPS was predicted by a more positive evaluation of the validity of responses provided through the CPS (68%). And more positive evaluation of "teacher effectiveness" was predicted by less efficacy in CMC use (53%).

Table 6
Final Stepwise Regressions Predicting Post-Course Instructional Evaluations

Independent Variables	Instructional Effectiveness	Teacher Effectiveness	Learned More Course Content from Using CPS
Web from work	-.44**		
CMC: Effectiveness	.67***		
CMC: Efficacy		-.76***	
CPS: Validity			-.84***
Adjusted R-square	.84	.53	.68
F-ratio	29.1***	13.3***	24.6***
N	11	11	11

Note: The items in the CPS evaluation scale and subscales are scored from 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree, so lower values mean more positive evaluation. Values are standardized beta coefficients. * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.005.

Summary

A wireless classroom feedback system was used multiple times in two Master's classes to foster in-class review and discussion, cognitive and physical interaction, and discussion about topics and answers. Evaluation of the classroom performance system (a wireless student response system) in two courses showed that the students generally rated the system highly (between "strongly agree" and "agree") on the dimensions of training, fun

and ease of use, though were less positive about the question of whether the system interfered with the validity of their answers. Overall instructional course ratings were high in both courses.

Different evaluation dimensions were predicted (from 18% to 49%) by different combinations of prior web use, computer classes, exposure to the system, and different dimensions of computer-mediated competency. The system was apparently easy to learn and assess quickly, as there were no changes in over-time evaluation subscales. The predictors of the overall evaluation scale were more use of the web from public terminals, more computer classes, and greater CMC competency.

Gender, age, prior computer usage, experience, and computer-email-web fluency do not seem to influence how students evaluate this wireless course feedback system. However, use of the web from public terminals (indicating greater diversity of exposure to technical and social situations), more prior computer classes, and greater overall efficacy and comfort with computer-mediated communication, do positively influence students' overall evaluation of the system. Positive evaluation of the CPS training in particular is influenced by greater exposure to the system, and overall CMC competency. *Ease of use* is positively influenced by familiarity with media differences, *perceived validity* of the system by more computer classes and better ability to manage computer-mediated communication interactions, and *fun* by younger age and greater sense of efficacy with computer-mediated communication.

Discussion: Strengths, Qualifications and Future Research

Measures

The primary measures used in this study were multi-item, multi-dimensional constructs developed and validated in prior studies, which again showed excellent reliability in this study. Fluency involved three dimensions (computer, email, web), competency involved eight dimensions (comfort, contextual factors, efficiency, interaction management, medium factors, general usage, effectiveness, and rapport), and evaluation of the system included four dimensions (training, ease of use, perceived validity, fun). We recommend this approach of combining published, reliable measures with newer measures that capture more dimensions of the evolving computer use, skills, and attitudes of students, and relevant aspects of course computing technology.

Expertise, Fluency and CMC Competency

It is interesting to note that neither web expertise as measured by the Georgia Tech scale, nor CEW fluency, predict CPS evaluation. In order to understand this result, one must recall the actual items measured by these two scales. The CEW fluency scale is a more skills-oriented instrument, and asks mostly about fairly simple tasks (i.e., using the "save as" function, opening an attachment, etc.). Similarly, the Georgia Tech web use scale asks about very specific tasks completed or not. By contrast, the CMC competency scale looks more at interacting with technology, the application of underlying skills, one's self-efficacy in using a variety of current and new technologies, and one's confidence in knowing which medium to use. Nowadays, having basic computer and Internet technology skills has become ubiquitous. Most people in the U.S. are no longer differentiated on the basis of whether they know how to check their email account or not. However, the application of a broader range of skills to other contexts has many levels, most of which are measured by CMC competency, a more applied measure, and not by CEW fluency, a baseline measure.

Referring to the recent use of self-diagnostic surveys for students to see if they are well-matched to online courses (Hiltz & Shea, 2005; Wang & Newlin, 2002), it does seem that a diagnostic survey using the CMC competency scale could be used to help students understand areas that might positively or negatively influence their evaluation of a wireless class response system. The traditional divides of age, gender,

web expertise and overall fluency with computers, email or the web, do not seem to represent opportunities for the use of such a system in a class to favor or hinder any particular students. However, one's level of CMC competency, something not yet widely understood, studied, or acquired, does seem to be a possible influence on differential system evaluations.

The positive influence on CPS evaluation of more frequent use of the web from public terminals at first seems like a counter-intuitive result. Although the majority of participants in this study rarely access the web from public terminals, if ever, those who do seem to gain special skills. For example, when using public terminals one must deal with a different set-up than at home, potentially a different operating system or web browser, different log-on and log-off procedures, possibly a more stressful or interrupted social context, and more. Thus, the simple process of accessing the web turns into a learning experience - in both technological and social skills -- each time a user attempts this process from a public terminal. These users may become more open-minded toward technology and are better able to draw connections between what they already know, and what the new technology provides, ultimately predicting a more positive CPS evaluation.

Technology Use and Intervening Constructivist Processes

The wireless response system was used in several ways to increase student involvement, personal feedback, class discussion, and content creation, as discussed. Though this cannot be proven through our methodology, it seems plausible that a student who knows that they gave an incorrect answer on the wireless response system review question will be more attentive to the follow-up explanations provided, thus increasing attention and involvement in the class, and potentially increasing learning. The influence of greater competency in effective CMC use on positive evaluation of "instructional methods", and of more positive evaluations of CPS response validity on a sense of learning more course material through CPS use, both support the notion that computer-mediated instructional technology can support positive perceptions of the classroom experience.

However, a rigorous understanding of how computer-mediated instructional technology fosters collaborative, convergence, and constructivist class processes, which in turn might improve classroom satisfaction and learning, would require measurement of the intervening processes of improved cognitive, social and informational interaction. Few instructional technology studies have done so, though use of the Study Process Questionnaire has been able to show deeper learning in groups supported by learning technology (Biggs, 1991; Kwok & Ma, 1999; both cited in Alavi & Dufner, 2005), and would be a useful addition to future studies of classroom performance systems. Specific applications, and specific intervening learning processes, could then be linked to specific evaluation dimensions (as Gold, 2001, suggested). Gold (2001) notes that research on computer-facilitated, collaborative, constructivist approaches should also assess the effects on the instructor (not just the students). This greater understanding could be used to better implement and understand how such new instructional technologies can improve convergent, collaborative, and participative learning in classrooms, without furthering digital divides between students with different competencies.

COLUMBIA ONLINE CITIATION: HUMANITIES STYLE

Rice, Ronald, & Bunz, Ulla. "Evaluating a Wireless Course Feedback System: The Role of Demographics, Expertise, Fluency, Competency, and Usage." *Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education*, 6.3 (2006).
<http://www.utpress.utoronto.ca/journal/ejournals/similie> (insert access date here).

COLUMBIA ONLINE CITIATION: SCIENTIFIC STYLE

http://www.utpjournals.com/simile/issue23/Rice_fullarticle.html

Rice, R.E., & Bunz, U. Evaluating a Wireless Course Feedback System: The Role of Demographics, Expertise, Fluency, Competency, and Usage. *Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education*, 6(3) (2006).
<http://www.utpress.utoronto.ca/journal/ejournals/similie> (insert access date here).

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Ronald E. Rice (Ph.D. in Communication Research, Stanford University; B.A. in English Literature, Columbia University) is Arthur N. Rupe Chair in the Social Effects of Mass Communication in the Department of Communication, and Co-Director of the Center for Film, Television and New Media, at University of California, Santa Barbara. He is also the President of ICA (2006-2007) and a Fulbright Professor in Finland (2006). He has co-authored or co-edited *Media Ownership: Research and Regulation* (2006); *The Internet and Health Care: Theory, Research and Practice* (2006); *Social Consequences of Internet Use: Access, Involvement and Interaction* (2002); *The Internet and Health Communication* (2001); *Accessing and Browsing Information and Communication* (2001); *Public Communication Campaigns* (1st ed: 1981; 2nd ed: 1989; 3rd ed: 2001); *Research Methods and the New Media* (1988); *Managing Organizational Innovation* (1987); and *The New Media: Communication, Research and Technology* (1984).

Ulla Bunz (Ph D. in Communication, University of Kansas; MA and BA in Communication, University of South Alabama) is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication at Florida State University. Her teaching interests include New Technologies, Internet and Society, Communication and Social Change, and Organizational Communication. Her research interests include Uses and Effects of Internet Technologies, Technological Aptitude, Technology Use in the Classroom, and Cybergeography. She has been actively involved in the Association of Internet Researchers, the ICA Communication and Technology Division, the NCA Human Communication and Technology Division, and the Resource Center for Cyberculture Studies.

We acknowledge the generous support of this project by the Office of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education at Rutgers University, and thank the participants. We also appreciate the comments from the anonymous reviewers. An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the 89th annual convention of the National Communication Association in Miami Beach, FL.

AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

Ronald E. Rice
Department of Communication, 5844 Ellison Hall
University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4020
rrice@comm.ucsb.edu, 805-893-4479, Fax: 805-893-7102

Ulla Bunz
Department of Communication, University Center C, Suite 3100
Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2664
ubunz@fsu.edu, 850-644-1809, Fax: 850-644-8642

References

- Abrahamson, A. L. (2002). An overview of teaching and learning research with classroom communication systems (CCSs). Retrieved July 24, 2002 from <http://www.bedu.com/Publications/Samos.html>
- Alavi, M. (1994). Computer-mediated collaborative learning: An empirical evaluation. *MIS Quarterly*, 18(2), 159-174.

Alavi, M. & Dufner, D. (2005). Technology-mediated collaborative learning: A research perspective. In S. R. Hiltz & R. Goldman (Eds.). *Learning together online: Research on asynchronous learning* (pp. 191-214). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Alavi, M. & Leidner, D. (2001). Research commentary: Technology-mediated learning - A call for greater depth and breadth of research. *Information Systems Research*, 12(1), 1-10.

Althaus, S. (1997). Computer-mediated communication in the university classroom: An experiment with online discussions. *Communication Education*, 46(3), 158-174.

Berge, Z. & Collins, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Computer mediated communication and the online classroom: Overview and perspectives*. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Biggs, J. (1991). Assessing learning quality: Reconciling institutional, staff and educational demands. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 21(1), 5-15.

Brown, J. A. (1998). Media literacy perspectives. *Journal of Communication*, 48(1), 44-57.

Bunz, U. (2002). An evaluation of technology use in the basic public speaking classroom. In L. Hugenberg, & B. Hugenberg (Eds.), *Teaching ideas for the basic communication course: Vol. 6* (pp. 3-10). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Bunz, U. (2003a). Growing from computer literacy towards computer-mediated communication competence: Evolution of a field and evaluation of a new measurement instrument. *Information Technology, Education and Society*, 4(2), 53-84.

Bunz, U. (2003b). Website creation as a valuable exercise - Seven steps to communicating significance online. *The Technology Teacher*, 63(5), 7-9.

Bunz, U. (2004). The computer-email-web (CEW) fluency scale - Development and validation. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 17(4), 477-504.

Bunz, U. (2005). Using scantron versus an audience response system for survey research: Does methodology matter when measuring computer-mediated communication competence? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 21(2), 343-359.

Chu, G. & Schramm, W. (1967). *Learning from television: What the research says*. Washington D.C.: National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

Clark, R.E. (Ed.). (2001). *Learning from media: Arguments, analysis, and evidence*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.

Committee on Information Technology (1999). *Being fluent with information technology*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Coppola, N., Hiltz, S.R. & Rotter, N. (2002). Becoming a virtual professor: Pedagogical roles and asynchronous learning networks. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(4), 169-190.

Correia, A. M. R., & Teixeira, J. C. (2003). Information literacy: an integrated concept for a safer Internet. *Online Information Review*, 27(5), 311-320.

Cox, A. J., & Junkin, III, W. F. (2002). Webforms to enhance student learning across the curriculum. Retrieved July 24, 2002 from http://www.ictc.org/T01_Library/T01_229.PDF

Curtis, D. Lawson, M. (2001). Exploring collaborative online learning. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 5(1). Available: June 2006, http://www.aln.org/publications/jaln/v5n1/v5n1_curtis.asp

Dede, C. (1996). The evolution of distance education: Emerging technologies and distributed learning. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 10(2), 4-36.

Dillenbourg, P., & Schneider, D. (1995). Collaborative learning and the internet. [Online document]. Available: http://tecfa.unige.ch/tecfa/research/CMC/colla/iccai95_1.html [2006, June].

Everett, M. D., & Ranker, R. A. (2002, April). *Classroom response system: An evaluation at an easy-access regional university*. Paper presented at the 8th annual University of Kentucky Economics Teaching Workshop, Lexington, KY.

Georgia Tech's GVU's 10th WWW user survey (1998). Retrieved July 16, 2003, from http://www.gvu.gatech.edu/user_surveys/survey-1998-10/

Gold, S. (2001). A constructivist approach to online training for online teachers. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 5(1), 36-57. http://www.aln.org/publications/jaln/v5n1/v5n1_gold.asp

Harasim, L., Hiltz, S. R., Teles, L., & Turoff, M. (1995). *Learning networks: A field guide to teaching and learning online*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Henri, F., & Rigault, C. R. (1996). Collaborative distance learning and computer conferencing. In T. T. Liao (Ed.), *Advanced educational technology: Research issues and future technologies* (pp. 45-76). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Hiltz, S.R. (1994). *The virtual classroom: Learning without limits via computer networks*. Norwood, NJ, Ablex Publishing (Human-Computer Interaction Series). Currently available from Intellect at <http://www.intellect-net.com>.

Hiltz, S.R. & Goldman, R. (2005). *Learning together online: Research on asynchronous learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hiltz, S.R. & Shea, P. (2005). The student in the online classroom. In S. R. Hiltz & R. Goldman (Eds.), *Learning together online: Research on asynchronous learning* (pp. 145-168). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Horowitz, H. M. (2002). Student response systems: Interactivity in a classroom environment. Retrieved July 24, 2002 from http://www.qwizdom.com/software.interactivity_in_classrooms.pdf

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1996). Cooperation and the use of technology. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (pp. 1017-1044). New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Katz, J.E. & Rice, R.E. (2002). *Social consequences of Internet use: Access, involvement and interaction*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kwok, R. & Ma, J. (1999). Use of a group support system for collaborative assessment. *Computers & Education*, 32, 109-125.

Leidner, D. & Jarvenpaa, S. (1993). The information age confronts education: Case studies on electronic classrooms. *Information Systems Research*, 4(1), 24-51.

Markauskaite, L. (2006). Towards an integrated analytical framework of information

http://www.utpjournals.com/simile/issue23/Rice_fullarticle.html

and communications technology literacy: From intended to implemented and achieved dimensions. *Information Research*, 11(3) paper 252 (28p.) Available at <http://InformationR.net/ir/11-3/paper252.html>.

Moore, M. (1993). Three types of interaction. In K. Harry, M. John, & D. Keegan (Eds.), *Distance education: New perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Morreale, S., Spitzberg, B. H., & Barge, K. (2001). *Human communication: Motivation, knowledge, & skills*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Nantz, K. S., & Lundgren, T. D. (1998). Lecturing with technology. *College Teaching*, 46(2), 53-56.

Olson, S. R., & Pollard, T. (2004). The muse pixeliope - Digitalization and media literacy education. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 8(2), 248-255.

Rice, R. E., Hiltz, S. R., & Spencer, D. (2005). Media mixes and learning networks. In S. R. Hiltz & R. Goldman (Eds.), *Learning together online: Research on asynchronous learning* (pp. 215-237). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rice, R.E., Stewart, L. & Hujber, M. (2000). Extending the domain of instructional effectiveness assessment in student evaluations of communication courses. *Communication Education*, 49(3), 253-266.

Rumble, G. (2001). Re-inventing distance education, 1971-2001. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(1-2), 31-43.

Spitzberg, B. (1997). *A model of computer-mediated communication competence*. Unpublished manuscript, San Diego, CA: SDSU School of Communication.

Spitzberg, B. (2006). Preliminary development of a model and measure of computer-mediated communication (CMC) competence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(2). <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue2/spitzberg.html>

Thoman, E., & Jolls, T. (2004). Media literacy: A national priority for a changing world. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(1), 18-29.

Tyner, K. (1998). *Literacy in a digital world: Teaching and Learning in the age of information*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Verdejo, M. F. (1996). Interaction and collaboration in distance learning through computer mediated technologies. In T. T. Liao (Ed.), *Advanced educational technology: Research issues and future technologies* (pp. 77-88). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Walther, J. B., & Bunz, U. (2005). The rules of virtual groups: Trust, liking and performance in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Communication*, 55(4), 825-846.

Wang, A.Y. & Newlin, M. (2002). Predictors of web-student performance: The role of self-efficacy and reasons for taking an on-line class. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 18, 151-163.

Webber, S., & Johnston, B. (2000). The information literacy class at Strathclyde University. Paper presented at the SCONUL Conference 2000, available at <http://dis.shef.ac.uk/literacy/conuljuly.pdf>

Appendix A.

Questionnaire 1: Demographics, Computer Use, Web Expertise, Computer-Email-Web Fluency, Computer-Mediated Communication Competency

Computer-Email-Web Fluency & CMC Competency

1. Are you male or female?

- a. Male
- b. Female

2. How old were you on your last birthday?

- a. Under 19
- b. 20-24
- c. 25-29
- d. 30-35
- e. 36 or older

3. How long have you been using Internet (including using email, web, chat, etc.)?

- a. 6 to 12 months
- b. 1 to 3 years
- c. 4 to 6 years
- d. 7 to 9 years
- e. More than 9 years

4. How many computer classes, courses, or seminars have you attended throughout your lifetime?

- a. 0
- b. 1-2
- c. 3-5
- d. 6-8
- e. 9 or more

How frequently do you access the World Wide Web (WWW) from the following locations?

[Choices on form were a=daily, b=weekly, c=monthly, d=less than once a month, e=never]

- 1. From home?
- 2. From work?
- 3. From school?
- 4. From public terminals?
- 5. From other locations?

Which of the following have you done?

[Choices on form were a=I have done or b=I have never done]

- 6. Ordered a product/service by filling out an online form
- 7. Made a purchase online for more than \$100

8. Created a web page
9. Customized a web page for yourself (e.g. MyYahoo, CNN Custom News)
10. Changed your browser's "startup" or "home" page
11. Changed your "cookie" preferences
12. Participated in an online chat or discussion (not including email)
13. Listened to a radio broadcast online
14. Made a telephone call online
15. Used a nationwide online directory to find an address or telephone number
16. Taken a seminar or class about the Web or Internet
17. Bought a book to learn more about the Web or Internet

[Choices on form, for the following sections on computer, email and web tasks, were a=very difficult, b=somewhat difficult, c=neutral, d=somewhat easy, and e=very easy, with a=1 up to e=5 for data analysis]

The following questions are about computer tasks. Please read each question carefully and fill in the appropriate letter on the scantron sheet.

18. Switching a computer on is
19. Restarting a computer is
20. Opening a new document is
21. Beginning a new document based on a template is
22. Opening a previously saved file from any drive/directory is
23. Saving a file is
24. Saving a document as a template is
25. Saving a file in a specified drive/directory is
26. Using "save as" when appropriate is
27. Saving on a floppy disk is
28. Using the hard drive is
29. Creating folders/directories is
30. Moving files between drives and directories is
31. Switching between currently open applications is

32. Renaming files is
33. Deleting unwanted files is
34. Printing a document is

The following questions are about email tasks. Please read each question carefully and fill in the appropriate letter on the scantron sheet.

35. Opening an email program is
36. Opening new mail messages is
37. Opening an attached file is
38. Saving an attached file is
39. Deleting old or unwanted mail is
40. Sending an email message is
41. Attaching and sending a file with a message is
42. Using the reply and forward features for mail is
43. Blocking unwanted email senders is
44. Creating folders for saving mail is
45. Using message settings such as "important" is
46. Setting preferences such as "save sent emails" is
47. Creating a signature file is
48. Explaining the difference between Address Book & Distribution List is
49. Creating an address in the address book is
50. Using the address book to find an address is
51. Creating my own distribution list is
52. Using a distribution list to send mail is

The following questions are about web tasks. Please read each question carefully and fill in the appropriate letter on the scantron sheet.

53. Using a browser such as Netscape or Explorer to navigate the World Wide Web is
54. Entering a web address to go there directly is
55. Identifying the host server from the web address is
56. Using hypertext links on World Wide Web pages is

57. Using "back" and "forward" to return to pages is
58. Adding bookmarks of useful sites is
59. Editing bookmarks is
60. Using search engines such as Yahoo and Alta Vista is
61. Using advanced search techniques in search engines is
62. Saving text contents of web pages to a disk is
63. Saving images off web pages to a disk is
64. Turning on/off auto load images is
65. Using a dial-in account to log on to the Internet is
66. Creating a website is
67. Using Internet email such as Yahoo, Hotmail, etc. is

For the following questions, please consider CMC to include all forms of e-mail and computer-based networks (e.g., world-wide-web, chat rooms, personal data assistant, electronic bulletin boards, terminal-based video-telephony, etc.) for sending and receiving written messages with other people. For the following items, indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement regarding your use of various CMC media. Please read each question carefully and fill in the appropriate letter on the scantron sheet.

[Choices on form were a=strongly disagree, b=disagree, c=undecided, d=agree, e=strongly agree, with a=1 to e=5 for data analysis.]

[Reverse coded items are indicated by the letter "(R)". Abbreviations indicate subscale: CT-Comfort, MF-Medium Factors, GU-General Usage, ES-Effectiveness, RT-Report, EY-Efficacy, IM-Interaction Management, CF-Contextual Factors.]

68. CT I get nervous using CMC. (R)
69. CT I am not very motivated to use computers to communicate with others. (R)
70. CT Communicating with higher-ups through computers relieves some of my tension.
71. CT I look forward to sitting down at my computer to compose messages.
72. CT I like tinkering with options to make my CMC messages more effective.
73. CT I am very knowledgeable about computer-based communication techniques.
74. CT I simply don't understand CMC hardware or software very well. (R)
75. CF I never seem to have enough time to compose my CMC messages as well as I'd like.

76. CF I like CMC because it gives me time to prepare drafts of my messages. (R)
77. CF Most of my CMC messages are to people who are geographically far away.
78. EY I can almost always figure out quickly how to use a new CMC.
79. EY Having to learn new technologies makes me very anxious. (R)
80. IM I am good at managing the timing of my CMC conversations with others.
81. IM Sometimes I don't know when or how to close down a topic of conversation. (R)
82. CT I am very familiar with e-mail and communication networks.
83. CF Most of my messages I send to persons "above me" (i.e., of higher status) in the organization.
84. CF Most of my messages I send to persons of the same status as me. (R)
85. CF In my work my CMC messages are "all business" and only about the task at hand. (R)
86. CF I treat my CMC messages as opportunities to work on relationships as well as tasks.
87. EY I don't feel very competent in learning and using communication media technology. (R)
88. EY I feel completely capable of using almost all currently available CMCs.
89. EY I am confident that I will learn how to use any new CMCs that are due to come out.
90. EY I am nervous when I find I have to learn how to use a new communication technology. (R)
91. EY I am generally the last person of friends and colleagues to adopt or purchase a new CMC. (R)
92. EY I find changes in technologies very frustrating. (R)
93. IM I manage CMC interactions skillfully.
94. MF I choose which medium to send some messages by (i.e., CMC, mail, phone, or face-to-face), based on how much access the person I need to communicate with has to each channel or medium.
95. MF I choose which medium to send some messages by (i.e., CMC, mail, phone, or face-to-face), based on how quickly I need to get a message out to people.

96. MF I choose which medium to send some messages by (i.e., CMC, mail, phone, or face-to-face), based on how immediate I need the feedback to be.
97. MF I choose which medium to send some messages by (i.e., CMC, mail, phone, or face-to-face), based on how much benefit there would be to having the other(s) present.
98. MF I choose which medium to send some messages by (i.e., CMC, mail, phone, or face-to-face), based on how lively the interaction and feedback need to be.
99. GU I rely heavily upon my CMCs for getting me through each day.
100. GU I use computer-mediated means of communication almost constantly.
101. GU I can easily go a week without any CMC interactions. (R)
102. GU I am a heavy user of computer-mediated communication.
103. ES I generally get what I want out of my CMC interactions.
104. ES I find most of my CMC conversations frustrating. (R)
105. RT My colleagues/friends look to me frequently for help with their CMC questions or needs.
106. RT I spend a lot of time just exploring CMCs just to see what I can do with them.
107. RT I am excited by the prospect of getting and learning new CMCs.
108. RT I usually master a new CMC before most of my friends or colleagues.
109. RT I am rarely far away from a computer with which I can communicate with others.
110. RT I have access to computer communication media both at home and at a place of work.

This concludes our survey. Thank you for participating.

Appendix B.

Questionnaire 2, 3: Evaluation of the CPS - Training, Ease of Use, Perceived Validity, Fun.

Your Experience with Using the CPS Technology
On the Scantron sheet, your I.D. NUMBER has three digits, placed to the right.

- In the 1st row and the 8th column, enter a "1" if you are in the CMC class, and a "2" if you are in the Research class.
- In the same 1st row but columns 9 and 10, enter your two-digit remote control number - that is, 01 up to 32.

- Then fill in/darken the ovals for the corresponding three numbers.

Please tell us about your experience using this new technology. When answering the following questions, please think about your experience with using the remote control technology, not any other CMC technology you might be familiar with.

For each question, please choose the appropriate letter based on the scale: (a=Strongly Agree; b=Agree; c=Neither Agree nor Disagree (Undecided); d=Disagree; e=Strongly Disagree). [where a is entered as 1, up to e as 5, for data analysis.]

Then fill in/darken that letter for that question on your Scantron sheet.

[Note: Reverse coded items are indicated by the letter "(R)". Abbreviations indicate subscale: T-Training, F-Fun, V-Perceived Validity, E-Easy.]

1. T The introductory explanations on how to use the technology were sufficient.
2. T The introductory explanations on how to use the technology were clear.
3. T The introduction didn't provide enough explanation on how to use the technology. (R)
4. T After the introduction, I still wasn't sure how to use this technology. (R)
5. T Listening to the introductory explanations, I understood quickly how this technology works.
6. E Using the technology was easy.
7. E Using the remote controls was easy.
8. E Using CPS is pretty hard. (R)
9. E I don't really understand how this technology works. (R)
10. E I had no problems with the technology.
11. V Having to use the technology influenced the way I answered questions. (R)
12. V I never thought about the technology while answering questions.
13. V I'm not sure my answers were accurate. (R)
14. V Having to use CPS had no effect on how I answered the questions.
15. V I wasn't always able to answer the way I wanted to because of the technology. (R)
16. F Using the remote controls was fun.
17. F I always enjoy using a new technology.
18. F Using CPS as a way of completing a questionnaire is exciting.

19. F The technology was annoying. (R)

20. F I really enjoyed using CPS.

THANK YOU!

Copyright 1992-2006 University of Toronto Press Incorporated except where otherwise noted. For guidelines on use of material on this site see Legal Notice. Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders of material included in this site. If your article appears here without your permission, please let us know and we will remove it. Contact Anne Marie Corrigan.