Title: **Mind the gap: using technology to promote teacher immediacy and build a learning community**

Presenters: **Clare Milsom, Jim Turner and Carol Maynard**
Liverpool John Moores University

Abstract:

Session Learning Outcomes

By the end of this session, delegates will be able to:

1. Identify strategies for enhancing teacher immediacy using clicker technology.
2. Evaluate case studies showing use of technology in development of learning communities.

Session Outline
Key issues to be addressed are:

This workshop looks at the relationship between community learning and teacher immediacy and demonstrates how technology can be used or misused to close or widen the teacher-student gap. We will provide guidance on how less immediate teachers can close the gap by using technology. We will also alert staff to the potential gap widening consequences of CPS. Voting systems may cause more immediate teachers to become distanced from their students. Case studies will be discussed and an opportunity to use the clickers will be built into this workshop.
Community learning does not readily lend itself to the lecture environment (Campbell 2008). What can the lecturer do to create a learning setting where students are committed to and engaged with the subject, the lecturer and each other? At their disposal are: the physical environment; the material; their ability to engage the students; and the teaching methods. Rapport and approach are within the lecturer's most immediate control. Research into the lecturer-student relationship (teacher immediacy) shows that the more immediate the teacher, the more likely students are to take direction, engage with the study approach and work with each other (Burroughs 2007, Pogue & AhYun 2006, Velez & Cano 2008). Technology is often used to engender a more active response to large group learning (Gauci et al. 2009, Nagy-Shadman & Desrochers 2008) and is one of the pedagogic approaches within lecturers' control. In recent years the use of classroom performance systems (CPS) has become prevalent (e.g. Addison et al. 2009). At LJMU we have analysed the impact of classroom-based technology on teacher immediacy. Early results show that the more immediate the teacher the more effective the use of technology is in developing a learning community.

Session Activities and Approximate Timings

Timing	Activity and purpose	Delegate participation
0 – 5mins	Clicker quiz to diagnose delegate familiarity with classroom performance systems.	All delegates vote using handset.
5 – 15mins	Overview of teacher immediacy and large lecture learning technologies.	Interactive handout.
15 – 25mins	Case study discussion.	Delegates divided into small groups and asked to evaluate case studies according to teacher immediacy criteria.
25 – 35mins	Feedback to main group.	One delegate from each group to report back identifying a technology-related strategy to promote community learning.
35 – 40mins	Summary and circulation of handout with clicker 'top tips'.	Delegates to identify techniques appropriate to their learning environments.
40 – 45mins	Evaluation of community approach and workshop using clickers.	All delegates to provide feedback on workshop using handsets.

References

Addison, S., Wright, A. Milner, R. (2009) Using Clickers to Improve Student Engagement and Performance in an Introductory Biochemistry. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education*, 37(2), 84-91.

Burroughs, N.F. (2007) A Reinvestigation of the Relationship of Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy and Student Compliance-Resistance with Learning. *Communication Education*, 56(4), 453-475.

Campbell, A., Kunnemeyer, R., Prinsep, M.R. (2008) Staff Perceptions of Higher Education Science and Engineering Learning Communities. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 26(3), 279-294.

Gauci, S.A., Dantas, A.M., Williams, D.A., Kemm, R.E. (2009) Promoting Student-Centered Active Learning in Lectures with a Personal Response System. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 33(1), 60-71.

Nagy-Shadman, E. and Desrochers, C (2008) Student Response Technology: Empirically Grounded or Just a Gimmick? *International Journal of Science Education*, 30(15), 2023-2066.

Pogue, L.L. and AhYun, K. (2006) The Effect of Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy and Credibility on Student Motivation and Affective Learning. *Communication Education*, 55(3), 331-344.

Velez, J.J. and Cano, J. (2008) The Relationship between Teacher Immediacy and Student Motivation. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 49(3), 76-8.