

Understanding Factors Influencing Teachers' Use of Technologies in Teaching STEM

Georgia L. Bracey and Mary L. Stephen

*Center for STEM Research, Education & Outreach, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville,
Edwardsville, Illinois, U.S.A.*

Keywords: Technology, Teachers, STEM, Secondary Education, Teacher Learning Preferences, Teacher Perceptions of Technology, Teacher Beliefs, Autonomy.

Abstract: Teachers' adoption of technology continues to be challenging; yet, this is a critical process in the effective teaching of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Although more schools are providing technology-rich classrooms, teachers are not always incorporating the new technologies into their teaching practice in a meaningful way. In this three-year case study, we used a grounded theory approach to examine the experiences of two high school teachers working in a depressed urban setting as they began using a newly designed, innovative, high-tech STEM classroom. Data sources included semi-structured interviews and direct observation. We identified three themes related to technology use: personal learning preference, teaching philosophy, and perception of technology. We discuss these themes, highlighting examples from participants' experiences and beliefs, as well as other factors impacting technology use that emerged during the study. These results will be of value to those supporting teachers' integration of technology into their teaching practice.

1 INTRODUCTION

The successful introduction of technology into a teaching setting is influenced by a series of factors (Afshari, et al., 2009; Angers and Machtmes, 2005; Buabeng-Andoh, 2012; Mumtaz, 2000). The interaction of these factors is complex, and plays an important role in determining the extent and ways that technologies are used within a setting. Teachers bring their own unique experiences and backgrounds, skills, and attitudes about technologies and education into the teaching environment (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2009), and these elements have the potential to impact the teacher's understanding of the affordances and constraints for using technologies in teaching. In this paper, we report the findings from a three-year study which documented two teachers' experiences teaching in an innovative, technology-rich Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) classroom in an attempt to identify and understand factors influencing the teachers' decisions on whether and how to use the new technologies in their teaching.

The adoption of technology by STEM teachers is

seen as critical to student success in STEM, as technology use has been linked to increased interest in and engagement in STEM activities, leading to improvements in STEM teaching and learning (Nugent, et al., 2010). Technology-based lessons are viewed as more authentic, giving students the opportunity to engage in real-world STEM activities and to use equipment similar to that which real STEM professionals would use (Hanson and Carlson, 2005). Unfortunately, there is disparity in the availability of and access to technologies needed to teach STEM, as schools in low-income communities do not always have the materials, laboratories, and equipment to teach these subjects effectively (Flores, 2007; Margolis, et al., 2008). In a recent Pew Research Center report (2013), 56 percent of teachers of the lowest income students indicated that a lack of resources among students to access digital technologies is a "major challenge" to incorporating more technology into their teaching.

However, even when sufficient technology is available, teachers' adoption of technology continues to be a serious issue. While having sufficient and up-to-date resources available is important for STEM teaching and learning, resources alone do not guarantee improved student

outcomes. Even when technology is used in instruction, it is often not truly transformative or innovative and merely mimics what has always been done in the traditional classroom. In a study involving over 1,000 students, Wang et al. (2014) found that the majority of students reported using computers in a school setting primarily for word processing and Internet searches, not for problem solving or creative activities. Although several research studies have identified possible reasons for this ineffective use of technology by teachers (e.g., lack of time, insufficient training, lack of confidence, technical issues, etc.) (Bingimlas, 2009; Buabeng-Andoh, 2012; Byrom and Bingham, 2001; Wang, et al., 2014; Zhao and Frank, 2003), there appears to be no significant improvement in the situation (Pew Research Center, 2013).

For successful technology adoption to occur, Ertmer and Ottenbreit-Leftwich (2010) believe teachers need to change their mindsets to accept the idea that “effective teaching requires effective technology use” (p. 256). However, change, whether in mindset or practice, is not easy. The experiences and beliefs that teachers bring to the classroom have a major impact on instructional practices and willingness to change those practices (OECD, 2009; Roehrig, et al., 2007). Thus, when innovations are introduced into an educational setting, teachers require time and support before the innovations can be adopted and implemented to any substantial degree (Hall and Hord, 2011). The study described in this paper is an attempt to understand how and to what extent change occurs in a particular classroom setting given an influx of innovative technologies for teaching and learning STEM. We were guided by two broad questions: What factors influence the ways and the extent that a teacher uses the newly available technologies when teaching in a high-tech STEM classroom? How does the availability and use of the new technologies change teaching practices?

2 METHOD

In seeking to understand the complex interplay of factors involved in teacher and technology use, we used a qualitative case-study design. This design enabled us to acquire and interpret data from multiple perspectives within the natural setting (Patton, 2002; Yin, 2009) and to “describe the unit of study in depth and detail, in context and holistically” (Patton, p. 54). The variety and detail of data allowed us to create a rich story of the

participants and their experiences over the course of the study.

2.1 Setting

McCloud High School (pseudonym), the setting for this study, is an underperforming public secondary school located in a U.S. city in a large metropolitan area. According to 2013 data, 97 percent of the residents of the city are African American with 41 percent of households classified as being below the poverty level. In June 2014, the unemployment rate in the city was 13 percent.

McCloud High School has been in existence for approximately 17 years. During the three years of the study, the school averaged 110 students all of whom were African American and between the ages of 13 and 19 years. The school employs three full-time STEM teachers and offers a range of STEM courses, requiring students to successfully complete three years of mathematics and three years of science in order to graduate. In 2012, the school began to introduce courses from a pre-engineering program, Project Lead the Way (PLTW), into the curriculum.

In 2011, the school received a major gift for construction of a classroom containing a variety of innovative technologies, including 3D printer, video wall, robotics kits, humanoid robot, graphing calculators, iPads, and high-definition video conferencing. This STEM classroom was designed with teacher and student input, along with guidance from the director of a nearby university’s STEM Center, to be a flexible, high-tech learning space that fosters collaboration and creativity. The classroom and its technologies represented an educational innovation with the potential to catalyze major changes in teaching practice. Prior to construction of the STEM classroom, the school had access to two outdated computer labs that often were not fully operational. Most of the school’s traditional classrooms have a projector and teacher laptop, and a few of the classrooms have been equipped with SMART boards.

The study began with the initial planning for the STEM classroom in late spring of 2011 and ended in the summer of 2014. Both of us who served as researchers for this study are researchers affiliated with the university’s STEM Center. We conducted all data gathering and analysis. In our role as researchers, we attended meetings and other events associated with the school and the new classroom (e.g., visits to high-tech schools, STEM classroom open house, monthly STEM staff meetings) in order

to better understand the environment. We also supported logistical aspects of the classroom's implementation, often helping to coordinate events between the high school and the university or other external groups, and so had regular opportunities to interact with the participants.

2.2 Participants

We chose our two participants purposefully in order to obtain the most meaningful, relevant, and detailed information possible. Both Ms. Beech and Mr. Aspen (pseudonyms) were full-time STEM teachers employed at McCloud throughout the entire time of the study and have been closely involved with the STEM classroom from its early design through its final implementation. Additionally, both teachers attended project planning meetings for the new classroom, providing valuable input to the design team on the room's layout, furniture, and technology. They also made several visits to high-tech schools and participated in technology-focused professional development. They began teaching in the room as soon as its construction was complete and continue to teach in the room as of this writing, giving feedback on their experience to the project partners at regular monthly meetings. Their continuous, close involvement with almost all aspects of the STEM classroom made them ideal sources of information regarding its impact on teaching practice at the school.

Ms. Beech is an African-American female in her sixties. At the time the research study was initiated, she had been teaching science and math at McCloud High School for four years. She had previously taught science for two years immediately after graduating from college in the late 1960s, but then entered the business world as an IT professional. She reported having a very satisfying career, saying "I really, really enjoyed IT in my day. There was such a joy in designing and building systems and making them work." She retired from this work after 37 years, during which time she filled many roles from programmer to analyst to manager and also earned a master's degree in business administration (MBA). After retirement from her IT position, she returned to school to earn a master's degree in teaching science. She continues to increase her knowledge and skills as a teacher by participating in a local university's professional development program designed to improve science teaching and student learning. During the time of this study, she taught a variety of courses including biology, chemistry, physics, pre-calculus and anatomy. She also

participated in summer workshops to prepare her to teach an introductory PLTW course. Ms. Beech believes it is her responsibility to share with her students what she has learned: "I took all those courses ... and so it would be a sin not to give them everything I got." Her teaching style involves a lot of interaction with the students and checking individual students' understanding of concepts: "[I want] to know what each individual is doing as opposed to one or two people...I talk to them all the time. I'm living and breathing example of 'this is what you do in life.'" She believes that in addition to helping students get "a better, deeper understanding of the concepts," she has an important responsibility to help students learn to use what they already know, to think creatively, and to acquire "habits that will help them get through" life.

Mr. Aspen is a Caucasian male in his twenties. When the research study began, Mr. Aspen was in his first year of teaching after having completed a bachelor's degree in biology and a master's degree in teaching science. He became familiar with McCloud High School through his time as a student teacher there. His teaching responsibilities included algebra, geometry, general science, and introduction to engineering. In addition, he assisted with the school's robotics team and a university-sponsored game design club. Mr. Aspen is very comfortable with a range of technologies. As he approached his fourth year teaching, he decided to enroll in an online master's program in computer science because of his interest in technology and the flexibility such a program offers. Mr. Aspen described mastering more "problem solving skills" as one of the main goals he has for his students. He added: "[I want them] to be able to do a lot of different things pretty well or come up with different answers rather than be able to do [one thing] like integrals or quotients really well."

2.3 Data Collection & Analysis

Primary data sources included a series of semi-structured interviews and direct observations in both the traditional and STEM classrooms. Interviewing began during the design of the room so as to get an understanding of each teacher's background and their experience teaching in their regular classroom. Over the course of the study, we conducted three hour-long interviews with each participant as well as a final 'participant check' interview. The initial interview protocol included questions on the participants' education and teaching history, use of technology, and classroom environment.

Subsequent interviews were more open, allowing for the flexibility to pursue emerging themes and issues.

Observations began early in the project, again to get a sense of the teachers' experiences in the context of their regular classroom. Later, after completion of the classroom, participants were observed in both the STEM classroom and a regular classroom. When possible, we observed the same class taught in both a traditional and the STEM classrooms. Together, we observed each teacher numerous times, giving us direct experience with the school setting plus the opportunity to notice things that might otherwise seem routine (and therefore go unmentioned) by the participants (Patton, 2002).

As with any qualitative study, data analysis began and overlapped with data collection. We used NVivo software to facilitate the analysis, but also coded much of the data manually. Field notes were taken by hand. Interviews were audio recorded, then transcribed by one of us or by a graduate student assistant. Although we always interviewed and observed our participants together, we coded the transcribed data independently, using a constant comparative process as described by Corbin and Strauss (1990). We began with open coding--reading through transcripts and looking for meaningful units of data. These units of data were then grouped into categories. The development of these categories--or themes--was guided by our research questions as well as by patterns that emerged. As categories arose, they were constantly refined as more data was collected and analyzed. Then, for each category, we developed and defined its properties and dimensions, allowing us to "differentiate a category from other categories and give it precision" (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 117). Properties are particular attributes of a category; dimensions delineate a continuum along which a property can be located. For example, participants discussed aspects of their

personal learning preference (category), which had an attribute of control of learning or *locus of control* (property). However, this property can vary from completely self-directed or *internal* to completely other-directed or *external*. This Grounded-Theory approach to analysis kept us focused on the data, helping us to form well-developed categories while keeping a lookout for newly emerging ideas.

To increase the credibility of our findings, we used several types of triangulation--multiple methods, multiple sources of data, and multiple investigators (Merriam, 2009). Interview and observational data supported and were used to check each other. Additionally, member checking helped to ensure credibility. Each interview was an opportunity to clarify and expand upon the developing themes; and during the final interview, we asked each participant specifically to comment on our interpretation of their previous interview responses and their classroom activities. Our aim was to build in triangulation throughout the study, weaving together data collection, analysis, and verification (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

3 RESULTS

We found that the teachers' use of technology reflected an interweaving of their beliefs about teaching and technology with their accumulated life experiences. In this section, we present three categories (or themes) that emerged from the data analysis and represent aspects of this relationship between teacher and technology use. For each theme, we briefly define it and then discuss it in terms of its framework of properties and dimensions (Table 1), using participants' quotes as further illustration.

Table 1: Categories (factors) and their properties and dimensions.

| Category | Property | Dimension |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Personal Learning Preference | Locus of control | External - Internal |
| | Locus of responsibility | External - Internal |
| | Organization | Freeform - Structured |
| | Atmosphere | Calm - Chaotic |
| Teaching Philosophy | Role of teacher | Lecturer - Facilitator |
| | Role of student | Passive - Active |
| Perception of Technology | Personal value | Practical - Entertaining |
| | Educational value | Narrowing - Expanding |
| | Impact on teaching | Restricting - Enhancing |

3.1 Personal Learning Preference

One theme that emerged was personal learning preference. We defined personal learning preference as the teacher's self-described way that she or he learns best, both in and out of formal settings. Outside formal settings, learning may be pursued because of personal interest or belief that what is learned might be of use personally or professionally. The learner determines the pace and setting as well as what and how learning occurs. In contrast, formal settings involve planned learning in which someone other than the learner structures the learning goals, environment, content and process. Each teacher gave various examples of how they learned in both types of settings, with both teachers speaking of learning independently. For example, Mr. Aspen described how he would learn to use new software: "I would just look online until I found something that would be a nice tutorial." Ms. Beech was similarly independent: "I spread out at my kitchen table, I take a book, and I go at it." The teachers also emphasized the personal nature of learning and the need to "own" one's learning. Ms. Beech explained, "In my mind, it seems to me that learning is a personal thing. People can guide you as best they can but individually you have to make it your own." Mr. Aspen also felt that individuals needed to personalize their own learning: "I think it's really important that they learn what works for them." Both teachers saw the control of and responsibility for learning residing internally, within the learner, allowing individuals to make choices about when and how they learned.

However, despite agreeing on the importance of learner responsibility and independence, there were some basic differences in their personal methods for learning. Mr. Aspen described a technology-oriented and multi-method process:

My hierarchy is written tutorial, picture-based tutorial, video tutorial. So I would probably start working my way down until I found what I wanted. I've never been able to sit through a lecture and take notes and then understand what's going on by those notes. I have to do multiple things.

In contrast, Ms. Beech described her preference for traditional, written materials and a more focused approach: "I used to love reading IBM manuals, God in heaven, I longed for it, I did, because you could read it and you could understand." She also shared her dislike of online tutorials and "help" options with "snippets of this and snippets of that," describing them as "appalling." For both teachers,

the ability to choose how they organized their learning (internal locus of control) was important, but the actual organization varied significantly, with one being more structured and the other being more freeform.

There were also differences in the physical learning environment preferred by each teacher. Ms. Beech described needing quiet, more controlled surroundings: "Sometimes things will pop off the page, and so you need to stop and ponder it. I don't learn in chaos." In contrast, Mr. Aspen described a more chaotic learning environment: "I do all my work sitting on the couch at the coffee table with a dog running between my legs and [the] TV on." So, again, the teachers acknowledged the importance of having internal control over their learning environment, choosing the atmosphere that suited them best. One teacher preferred a very calm and structured atmosphere, while the other was comfortable studying in a more disordered setting.

Finally, we noted that the teachers' learning preferences also showed up in their opinions of professional training. Neither teacher is a fan of traditional professional development, particularly for learning about technologies. Mr. Aspen preferred to 'tinker' rather than participate in formal training on how to use technology tools. Ms. Beech described her frustration with the rapid pace of professional development on technologies:

You've got some of the worst training, in my opinion, because people who run the seminar will say 'do this, do this, do this' and you want to say 'for real?' And then you're supposed to be expert in that.

The traditional professional development format, with its tendency to have a more external locus of control, didn't meet their desire to be in control of their own learning (i.e., to choose when and how to learn). They had a need for autonomy and to learn in an environment with which they were comfortable.

3.2 Teaching Philosophy

A second theme concerned each teacher's personal teaching philosophy. We defined this as the teacher's personal beliefs about how teaching and learning occur combined with examples of how the teacher puts these beliefs into practice when teaching. Both teachers spoke at length about what should happen in the classroom and what they did to optimize teaching and learning. Both valued direct interaction between teacher and students, usually in the form of meaningful discussion or dialogue surrounding questions or problems. Ms. Beech

acknowledged that she did a lot of talking when teaching, but not as lecture: "My teaching style is probably to talk, but talk with the students. I like interacting with them, I just do. You've got to stop, pause, and discuss." Mr. Aspen saw interaction as an opportunity for questions: "I want some dialogue with students along the way, allowing students to ask more questions."

Often, the purpose of this dialogue was to assess a student's level of understanding and to elicit a student's thinking processes, making them visible to both teacher and student. Ms. Beech's approach to teaching very much emphasized this:

You've got to talk about what got written so that the teacher can be assured that the students are getting where they need to be. I need to know what they know. We could be going on and on, and I'm thinking that things have been communicated and are well understood. Then you start talking to 'em and you realize that that whole boat was missed! So those are opportunities that you get to find out where they are. For me, it takes interaction because the room is full and you got people at different levels of interest and different levels of preparedness.

Although more teacher-centered in appearance, her role in the class discussion was very purposeful, and she did not see herself as a lecturer.

When observing teaching sessions, whether in the STEM classroom or the traditional classroom, we saw Ms. Beech continually using questioning to engage with students (teacher asking students, students asking teacher) with lots of give and take occurring between the teacher and the students. Through her interactive style, she made sure all students were included and accountable for what was being taught. Similarly, Mr. Aspen stated: "Asking more questions to figure out where we need to go is a lot of how I am." Both teachers felt that students should be actively engaged in the classroom activities and in their learning.

Additionally, each teacher saw their role as one of facilitator or guide, providing critical structure and direction to the students' learning experiences. Ms. Beech referred to one of her classes as "more of a seminar type thing," with her guiding class discussion to elicit student thinking and assess student understanding. Mr. Aspen specifically referred to himself as a facilitator and coach:

I want to be engaged with them, have them be the primary speakers and me be a facilitator of education rather than an expert of education. What's been helping me through a lot of things and helping a lot of

the students through is providing set and clear, established expectations for what they need to do. Today I wrote what you need to do to get every bit of points right on that board (points to board in front of classroom) at the beginning of class, showing them, okay, this is what we are going to be doing, more of a learning coach than a knowledge giver.

For both teachers, meaningful classroom interaction was the key to successful teaching and learning.

Interestingly, Mr. Aspen's philosophy evolved somewhat during the period of the study, changing from unsure and idealistic to more confident and realistic. During our final interview, he described this shift in his teaching:

I am teaching differently than I used to because it used to be a very binary system. I was really way too far on the progressive side, or I was way too far on the traditional side. I tried to do something, and if it didn't work out like I wanted it to, I would fall back to this 'lecture and do problems from a worksheet' sort of thing.

As an early-career teacher, Mr. Aspen was still finding the best way to meld the ideals of his teaching philosophy with the realities of the classroom.

During the time of the study, we saw changes in the way Mr. Aspen taught, which he attributed to moving from being a novice teacher to a more experienced teacher. Early in his first year of teaching, he stressed: "I am very much not a traditional style teacher. I have found it a lot easier to put the work on students rather than me." However, following his third year of teaching, he admitted that his philosophy had changed:

I am no longer under the assumption that I can change education for kids overnight... I've actually gotten more traditional. I wouldn't say that I am a traditional teacher, though. I think I lecture more and introduce concepts more at the beginning of class than I used to because I found that kids are more familiar with that [approach] and receptive to it and so I try to pick out specific concepts that, if I know they're going to run into this problem within the first five to ten minutes of them working with something, then I try to address it up front.

As Mr. Aspen gained teaching experience, he began to think differently about what works best in the classroom and made small modifications to his teaching practice in both classrooms.

3.3 Perception of Technology

A third theme concerned each teacher's perception of technology. We defined this as the way a teacher views and uses technology, both personally and professionally. Both teachers viewed technology as a tool, something that could be potentially useful in and out of the classroom. Each teacher spoke of the many practical advantages to using technology. Mr. Aspen believed that knowing how to use technology is essential in today's world. He considered himself tech-savvy, regularly using the Internet and technology gadgets in his daily life, and is a self-proclaimed 'geek.' Ms. Beech also valued technology, but emphasized its more practical uses:

I really do appreciate cell phones because there are a lot of needs in an emergency. I used to have to write things by hand, and when I started [working] it was punch cards. Then it evolved... so technology, in that sense, is a good thing, and it really has helped the countries of the world. I think you get so much productivity with technology.

For Ms. Beech, technology's value resided more in its impact on safety and efficiency and less in its potential for entertainment and education.

In addition to personal entertainment, Mr. Aspen described how technology helped him to be more productive, adaptable, and flexible in his classroom:

I was going to have an end of year survey for my students and get feedback from them, and I was actually able to just say, 'Okay, everyone go get an iPad.' I was able to make a Google form in the time that it took them to go get that and come back, and I just did it that way. It's nice to have that adaptability. A lot about it [technology] is the flexibility that you have. If I need some kids to just swing over and start working on something online, or on a computer, or a quick self-check quiz, or a Kahn Academy lesson or something like that, it's really nice to have the flexibility to do that.

Technology expanded his options in the classroom and enhanced his teaching.

While Mr. Aspen embraced the use of technology in teaching, Ms. Beech questioned its role in teaching and stressed that she will not use it "just for the sake of using it." She worried that technology has been too widely and too quickly accepted:

I get the sense that there's a lot of looking outside of current resources to access a lot of

stuff that apparently is effective. I think technology is a good thing. I have not bought into technology being a replacement for [the] teacher; I just haven't bought into that it replaces interaction with students. I really don't want to imply that that's a general perspective on technology, but with the constant hype about using technology, I think that you're left with the impression that if you're not using technology, then there's definitely something wrong with you. I think that if the teachers work at it, and if the technology can facilitate more learning in some way, then it'll be a good thing.

While Ms. Beech questioned the use of technology in teaching, she was aware that, with effort, it could be used effectively. The main drawback in learning to use technology effectively in the classroom, according to Ms. Beech, was the time it required to find good resources that could be integrated in a way that promoted student learning. She recognized technology's limitations:

What happens, I think, is that when you rely too much on technology, kids will learn a pattern and they will not understand the pattern; they cannot transfer it. So what I need to know is how much technology do we get that actually focuses on the ability to transfer?

She perceived technology as potentially narrowing students' learning experiences, but sensed that teachers could make the difference and ensure that technology facilitated learning instead.

4 DISCUSSION

The results of this study highlight the impact that teachers' experiences, beliefs, and perceptions have on their use of technology. Both teachers in this study were presented with a new and very unusual teaching environment: a high-tech STEM classroom designed for flexibility. In addition to this new room, the teachers were provided with a technology support specialist, customized professional development, and the support of the school's administration, as a lack of these items has been identified as a major factor influencing teacher's adoption of technology (Bingimlas, 2009; Buabeng-Andoh, 2012; Hew and Brush, 2007). Both teachers made use of this environment, bringing their students into the STEM classroom on a regular basis and using its new technologies. Over the course of three years, as the teachers became familiar with the

innovations, we noticed small changes in how they used technology in their classroom teaching. For example, Ms. Beech had students teach the class about using graphing calculators, incorporating some peer instruction into her normally teacher-centered classroom. Mr. Aspen, initially using as much technology as often as possible, incorporated more direct instruction into his class by the end of the study, stating that technology needed to serve him and not the other way around. However, in spite of these changes, we did not observe any significant changes in the way technology was used by either teacher or in the way that they taught. Each remained true to their own core beliefs and viewpoints—beliefs and viewpoints that drove their use of technology and that appeared to be largely shaped by their life experience and personal learning experiences. This contrasts with findings reported by Becker and Ravitz (1999) that found a strong relationship between technology use and pedagogical change among secondary science teachers. On the other hand, research by Ertmer et al. (2012) supports this alignment between personal beliefs and technology integration.

Several other researchers have studied the effect that teachers' beliefs have on their teaching behaviors and their adoption of innovations (Ertmer, 2005; Hew & Brush, 2007; Ricardson-Kemp & Yan, 2003; Wozney, Venkatesh & Abrami, 2006). For example, in a study of factors influencing adoption of inquiry learning curriculum in science, Roehrig, Kruse, and Kern (2007) reported that teachers' beliefs combined with school support played an important role in how a new science curriculum was implemented. Furthermore, teachers' practices and beliefs are formed based on aspects of the teacher's background, including professional background, content and pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of technology, beliefs about teaching, classroom activities, classroom and school level environments, teacher's technology self-efficacy, and professional activities (Holden and Rada, 2011; Mishra and Koehler, 2006; OECD, 2009). Our findings are consistent with results of these studies and contribute to the international literature on factors influencing teachers' use of technologies (Afshari et al., 2009; Baek, et al., 2008; Buabeng-Andoh, 2012; OECD, 2009).

The three themes that emerged from the data create an interrelated set of factors influencing the teachers' use of technologies (Figure 1). The first theme, the teachers' personal learning preferences, guided their teaching both with and without the use of technology, influencing both teaching philosophy

and perception of technology. As self-described independent learners, the teachers also encouraged their students to be the same, to ask and pursue their own questions and take responsibility for their own learning. Often, as in the case of Mr. Aspen, this independence showed up in the differentiation that was built into the lessons, allowing students to work at their own pace and on their own projects using the technology of their choosing when possible. It also came out in the strong belief by both of the teachers that students have to "make learning their own." No matter what happens in the classroom, the responsibility and control of learning resides within each student. In many ways, both teachers teach with technology in the way they preferred to learn.

The second theme, teaching philosophy, is strongly tied to what teachers believe to be best in education. We observed elements of each teacher's teaching philosophy directly impacting their use of technology in both the traditional and STEM classrooms. For example, each teacher believed in the importance of verbally interacting with students—not lecturing them, but talking *with* them. Neither teacher saw him or herself as a traditional lecturer; talking was used very purposefully to elicit student thinking and to gauge student understanding. Mr. Aspen regularly took advantage of the numerous projection options in the new classroom to project individual student work on computers and engage students in discussion about that work. Even Ms. Beech, who considered herself more of a knowledge giver than facilitator, expected her students to take an active role in their learning. When she began using PowerPoint slides in classes, she used them as a basis for class discussion. Both teachers encouraged students to ask questions, listen carefully, and thoughtfully discuss the material. They valued student-student interaction as well as student-teacher interaction, and both teachers expected their students to become critical thinkers and independent learners. Even though the teaching environment changed and technologies were introduced into it, the philosophy of teaching still guided teaching practice.

The new STEM classroom was equipped with a variety of new technologies, and so it is not surprising that the teachers' perception of technology emerged as a prominent theme in our analysis, directly influencing the classroom use of technologies and, at the same time, being influenced by both personal learning preference and teaching philosophy. Previous researchers have identified the influence of teachers' beliefs about technology on their decisions on when and how to use technology




Figure 1: Relationships among factors influencing teachers' use of technologies.

in teaching (Ertmer, 2005; Teo, 2011). Although both teachers saw value in technology (e.g., increased productivity, efficiency, flexibility), Mr. Aspen's all-out embracing of technology--even the playful aspects--contrasted strongly with Ms. Beech's more skeptical view. This wide difference in viewpoint is in line with their very different background experiences. Ms. Beech's years of working "behind the scenes" with large computer systems gave her a very particular lens through which to view education's current emphasis on bringing new technologies into the classroom. She believed that "technology dictates behaviour." She explained, "If you use technology, you're going to use the technology the way that a designer's built it." At one point, she referred to today's technologies as "toys." On the other hand, Mr. Aspen comes to technology with more of a consumer viewpoint, perhaps better able to appreciate the entertainment aspects of technology.

Although the teachers were expected to utilize the technologies in the new classroom, the school administration gave them the freedom to decide how they would use the technologies and how quickly they would adopt each technology. The teachers were given the chance to assimilate the innovations into their own teaching practices according to their

own teaching philosophy, learning preferences, and perceptions of technology. Professional development occurred in progressive stages, with the teachers deciding on the format, when it would occur, and what technologies it would address. It has been suggested that this type of autonomy not only plays a critical role in motivation and creativity, but is actually a basic human need (Pink, 2009). Jones and Dexter (2014) found that formal professional development activities organized at an administrative level often ignores the experiences and knowledge of teachers and stifles their creativity in using technology in teaching.

Regarding the perception of technology, we noted a generational difference in the participants. Mr. Aspen showed much more confidence towards and willingness to embrace technology than Ms. Beech. While research conducted by Wang et al. (2014) did not find this difference, this observation is supported by a recent Pew survey (2013) that saw differences in teachers responses to technology based on age group. According to the survey, teachers under the age of 35 were more likely than teachers age 55 and older to say they were "very confident" about using new digital technologies (64 percent vs. 44 percent). However, although this same survey reported that the oldest teachers (age 55

and older) were more than twice as likely as their colleagues under age 35 to say their students know more than they do about using the newest digital tools (59 percent vs. 23 percent), our participants both believed that their students were much more tech-savvy than they were.

5 IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study have implications for those seeking to maximize teachers' adoption of technologies into the learning environment. First, teachers' beliefs—formed and solidified over years of life experience—direct much of what happens in the classroom. These beliefs are deeply tied to teaching philosophy and perception of technology, making them a core factor in classroom technology adoption. Professional development activities that recognize and acknowledge the role such beliefs play by including strategies that help teachers expand their existing teaching philosophy to include technology use and that help teachers extend their perception of technology are more likely to be successful than activities that do not. However, it is important to realize that modifying beliefs and perceptions take time, and thus, so do change and the adoption of innovations.

In addition to beliefs, teacher autonomy may play an important role in the successful adoption of innovations. Both teachers in this study valued being in control of their own learning and having the opportunity to determine what they would learn, when they would learn it, and at what rate. It seems that their personal learning preferences along with a strong internal sense of “what is best” for teaching and learning influenced their classroom practices. Therefore, strategies that acknowledge and work with teachers' different learning preferences, combined with allowing teachers to decide their best learning path, may promote the best outcomes during any type of change process. Successful adoption of technology requires attention to teacher differences and plenty of options for teacher choice.

6 LIMITATIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH

Although one should always be cautious in generalizing findings, our results are consistent with several other studies concerning teachers' adoption of technology and reaction to change (Ertmer, 2005;

Ertmer and Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010; Hew and Brush, 2007; OECD, 2009; Reid, 2014; Richardson-Kemp and Yan, 2003; Teo, 2011). Furthermore, the case study design provides enough detail to allow other researchers to decide upon its transferability. While our study focused on only two teachers, our participants were very different in almost every respect: demographics, personal and professional experience, and in most personal beliefs about technology and pedagogy. This maximum participant variability provided us with rich data and allowed us to capture a wide range of ideas and themes while reducing the chance of missing an important concept.

Since we studied a complex, active environment for over three years, it's not surprising that a variety of outside events impacted what we observed in these classrooms. Over the course of the study, many changes took place in the school and in the district. For example, a new director was hired early in the study and initiated the PLTW program as well as other initiatives. New after-school programs were implemented, many of them STEM-related. Mr. Aspen gained two years of valuable teaching experience, significant for a beginning teacher and most likely accounting for the evolution of his teaching practices over the course of the study. A longitudinal project is subject to these issues, but since the process of change can be lengthy, it was critical for us to spend enough time with our participants.

Finally, further research could address the role autonomy plays in the adoption of technology and the modification of teaching practices. Although some authors have discussed autonomy in relation to teacher job satisfaction and professionalism (Common, 1983; Pearson and Moomaw, 2005), there have been relatively few studies that examine its role in the change process specifically when the change involves technology. While Ernest (1994) discussed teacher beliefs and their role in autonomy and the enacting of a new mathematics curriculum, additional research focusing on the impact of teacher autonomy in the adoption of innovations and on the modification of teaching practices is still needed.

REFERENCES

- Afshari, M., Bakar, K. A., Luan, W. S., Samah, B. A., and Fooi, F. S., 2009. Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communication technology. *International Journal of Instruction*, 2(1), pp. 77-104.
- Angers, J., and Machtmes, K., 2005. An ethnographic-

- case study of beliefs, context factors, and practices of teachers integrating technology. The Qualitative Report, 10(4), pp. 771-794.
- Baek, Y., Jung, J., and Kim, B., 2008. What makes teachers use technology in the classroom? Exploring the factors affecting facilitation of technology with a Korean sample. *Computers & Education*, 50, pp. 224-234.
- Becker, H. J., and Ravitz, J., 1999. The influence of computers and internet use on teachers' pedagogical practices and perceptions. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 31(4), pp. 356-384.
- Bingimlas, K. A., 2009. Barriers to the successful integration of ICT in teaching and learning environments: A review of the literature. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*. 5(3), pp. 235-245.
- Buabeng-Andoh, C., 2012. Factors influencing teachers' adoption and integration of information and communication technology into teaching: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*. 8(1), pp. 136-155.
- Byrom, E., and Bingham, M., 2001. Factors influencing the effective use of technology for teaching and learning: Lessons learned from the SEIR_TEC Intensive Site Schools, 2nd Ed. (2001). SouthEast Initiatives Regional Technology in Education Consortium (SEIR_TEC).
- Common, D. L., 1983. Power: The missing concept in the dominant model of school change. *Theory into Practice*, 22(3), pp. 203-210.
- Corbin, J. M., and Strauss, A., 1990. Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), pp. 3-21.
- Ernest, P., 1989. The impact of beliefs on the teaching of mathematics. In P. Ernest. ed. 1989. *Mathematics teaching: The state of the art*. London: Falmer Press. pp. 249-254.
- Ertmer, P.A., 2005. Teacher pedagogical beliefs: The final frontier in our quest for technology integration? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(4), pp. 25-39.
- Ertmer, P. A., and Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., 2010. Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research in Technology Education*, 42(3), pp. 255-284.
- Ertmer, P.A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., and Sendurur, P., 2012. Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. *Computers and Education*, 59(2), pp. 423-425.
- Flores, A., 2007. Examining disparities in mathematics education: Achievement gap or opportunity gap? *The High School Journal*, 91(1), pp. 29-42.
- Hall, G.E., and Hord, S. M., 2011. *Implementing change: Patterns, principles and potholes*. (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Hanson, K., and Carlson, B., 2005. Effective access: Teachers use of digital resources in STEM teaching. Available: <http://www2.edc.org/GDI/publications_SR/EffectiveAccessReport.pdf>.
- Hew, K. F., and Brush, T., 2007. Integrating technology into K-12 teaching and learning: Current knowledge gaps and recommendations for future research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 55, pp. 223-252.
- Holden, H., and Rada, R., 2011. Understanding the influence of perceived usability and technology self-efficacy on teachers' technology acceptance. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 43(4), pp. 343-367.
- Jones, H. M., and Dexter, S., 2014. How teachers learn: the roles of formal, informal, and independent learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 62, pp. 367-384.
- Margolis, J., Estrella, R., Goode, J., Holme, J.J., and Nao, K., 2008. *Stuck in the shallow end: Education, race and computing*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Merriam, S. B., 2009. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M., 1994. *Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Mishra, P., and Koehler, P. A., 2006. Technological, pedagogical, content knowledge: A new framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), pp. 1017-1054.
- Mumtaz, S., 2000. Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communications technology: A review of the Literature. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, 9(3), 319-342.
- Nugent, G., Barker, B., Grandgenett, N., and Adamchuck, V., 2010. Impact of robotics and geospatial technology interventions on youth STEM learning and attitudes. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(4), pp. 391-408.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2009. Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from teaching and learning international survey. Available: <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/creatingeffectiveteachinandlearningenvironmentsfirstresultsfromtalish.htm>.
- Patton, M. Q., 2002. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Pearson, L. C., and Moomaw, W., 2005. The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), pp. 38-54.
- Pew Research Center, 2013. How teachers are using technology at home and in their classroom. Washington, DC: Author. Available: <<http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2013/Teachers-and-technology>>.

- Pink, D., 2009. *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Reid, P., 2014. Categories for barriers to adoption of instructional technologies. *Education and Information Technologies*, 19, pp. 838-407.
- Richardson-Kemp, and Yan, W., 2003. Urban school teachers' self-efficacy, beliefs and practices, innovation practices and related factors in integrating technology. *Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference Proceedings, Vol. 2003, No. 1*, pp. 1073-1076.
- Roehrig, G. H., Kruse, R. A., and Kane, A., 2007. Teacher and school characteristics and their influence on curriculum implementation. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44, p. 883-907.
- Stephen, M. L., 1997. *A study of the effects of differences among students' and teachers' perceptions of computers and experiences in a computer-supported classroom*. PhD dissertation. Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO.
- Strauss, A., and Corbin, J. M., 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Teo, T. (2011). Factors influencing teachers' intention to use technology: Model development and test. *Computers & Education*, 57(2011), pp. 2432-2440.
- Wang, S. K., Hsu, H.Y., Campbell, T., Coster, D. C., and Longhurst, M., 2014. An investigation of middle school science teachers and students use of technology inside and outside of classrooms: Considering whether digital natives are more technology savvy than their teachers. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 62(6), pp. 637-662.
- Wozney, L., Venkatesh, V., and Abrami, P. C., 2006. Implementing computer technologies: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 14(1), pp. 173-207.
- Yin, R. K., 2009. *Case study research: Design and methods. (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Zhao, Y., and Frank, K.A., 2003. Factors affecting technology uses in schools. An ecological perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(4), pp. 807-840.