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Abstract
Teaching online is an increasingly common aspect of university lecturers’ teaching roles. While research has developed understanding in relation to the student experience and learning online, less attention has been paid to the role of the lecturer. This study observed the practice of university lecturers teaching on a range of undergraduate degree programmes in the United Kingdom. Lecturers’ purpose, pedagogy and philosophy were seen to emerge in the dialogic patterns of the online space. Practice was shaped by lecturers epistemological positioning and their cultural values and beliefs. The practice which was observed across different modules reflected the different positions lecturers took when they approached online teaching. The research highlights the importance of the role of the lecturer, and the influence of their purpose, pedagogy and philosophy, on the online setting.
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**Purpose, Pedagogy and Philosophy: ‘Being’ an Online Lecturer**

**Introduction – What is the problem?**

As universities develop more online and blended programmes, working online is becoming an increasingly common occurrence for lecturers in higher education. Research has highlighted the key role that lecturers play in supporting student proficiency and participation in the online setting (Park, 2015). Effective facilitation of online modules supports student engagement (Arbaugh, 2014) and scaffolds student interactions (Cho and Cho, 2014). The current research explored the role of lecturers within a range of online undergraduate degree programmes.

Research focusing on online learning, in educational settings, has largely focused on the student, rather than the lecturer (Arbaugh, 2014). Studies have explored students’ loss of social and emotional cues in the online space (Guillaume et al., 2016, Slagter van Tyron and Bishop, 2006), the challenges of creating social presence for learners (Adie, 2011, Kehrwald, 2008, Laffey, Lin and Lin, 2006), communities of inquiry (Akyol and Garrison, 2011, Garrison, Anderson and Archer, 2000, Garrison, 2012, Joksimovic et al. 2014, Pozzi et al. 2016) and the influence of motivation and self-efficacy (Kim et al., 2015, Stott, 2016). These factors also influence the lecturer experience; online delivery posing new challenges, particularly when facilitating collaborative activities (Palloff and Pratt, 2004). Lecturers are positioned differently to students as they are responsible for the learning of students within the module space; as well as engaging themselves they are responsible for the engagement of others. In the online space many of the cues which lecturers utilised in face-to-face settings are lost; students are not physically visible and are often working in different geographical and temporal spaces. This poses challenges for the online lecturer, as they are required to re-position themselves within the online setting. Rather than being in a classroom students studying online are often in different physical and temporal spaces to the lecturers responsible for ‘teaching’ the modules.

Lecturers working in university settings utilise a range of pedagogic approaches (Akerlind, 2004); the approach taken influencing the learning of students in their classes (Entwistle and Karagiannopoulou, 2013). Pedagogic and discipline beliefs, epistemology and technological ability may also influence lecturers’ approaches to facilitating online modules (Lameras, 2012, Owens, 2012). Studies of e-learning in
university settings have found similar pedagogic variation to the face-to-face environment; transmission of information and dialogic or collaborative pedagogies being observed in both settings (Gonzalez, 2010). This would suggest that not all lecturers’ approach online teaching with the same pedagogic underpinning, or the same technological know-how.

In institutions quick to take up online delivery there are now a generation of experienced lecturers, who have developed teaching approaches appropriate to the online setting. These lecturers work in a range of disciplines and are likely to hold a variety of pedagogic beliefs. The current study explored the teaching approaches of lecturers, when facilitating online collaborative activities. Lecturers taught on a range of modules within four undergraduate degree programmes at the same university. Focusing on the ways in which lecturers facilitated collaborative activities as part of the teaching process, the study observed practice as it was enacted in the online setting.

**Research Methodology and Methods**

Taking an ethnographic approach, lecturers’ online participation was observed as they taught online undergraduate modules. The observations focused particularly on the collaborative aspects of practice: the ways in which lecturers worked with students, or facilitated students to work with each other. The observation was iterative utilising data from the online space, interviews and a focus group (Fig. i). The study observed the ways in which lecturers participated online, observing what they did through data drawn from online modules and gaining their perceptions of the experience through interviews and a focus group. The iterative approach created a rich observation of the lecturers’ online practice. In keeping with the ethnographic stance data gathered from the university learning management system was observed qualitatively (Cohen et. al, 2013) and a hybrid inductive-deductive approach (Fereday & Muir Cochrane, 2006) was taken when analysing interview and focus group data.
The lecturers the study observed worked at a distributed university in the United Kingdom, teaching on a range of online undergraduate degrees. Data, from the university learning management system (LMS), was gathered which presented the participation patterns of lecturers, as they engaged within the online setting. Data was extracted from the LMS, through running ‘course reports’ and exported in the form of excel spreadsheets. To access the data lecturers were approached and asked to take part in the study. Eighteen lecturers enrolled the researcher onto their module space, inviting the researcher to observe the practice and enabling her to run course reports to collect data. Data from the module space of each lecturer was shared with them at the interview stage. Fifteen lecturers were interviewed. Any data relating to students was anonymised and lecturers were only shown data they had access to themselves. The researcher did not share data from other modules with lecturers during the interviews.

Socio-grams of discussion boards were drawn using SNAPP software, which presented visual representations of the discussion board dialogue (Dawson, 2010). Socio-grams were generated from one hundred and thirty-five discussion boards, situated in eleven of the eighteen modules observed (Technical issues with the software prevented the creation of Socio-grams from the remaining seven modules). Dialogue mapping identified posts in relation to whether student or lecturers posted,
and visualised strings of dialogue. These were coded to analyse differences in the
types of posts lecturers used.

The data was analysed taking an ethnographic stance – it was used to observe
patterns of online participation (Wolpers et. al., 2007). GPS data has been used in a
similar way when observing movements around physical spaces (Christensen et. a.,
2014) and social networks have been observed by visualising online discussions
(Dawson, 2010, Gottardo and Noronha, 2012). Approaching the data qualitatively;
the aim was not to quantify or predict action, participation within the online space
was observed and qualitative differences were identified. The data allowed, to an
extent, immersion in the online world and observation of its rituals (Hammersley et.
al., 2007). While it was not possible to travel to the online setting the data enabled
observation of the participation within that setting, in line with an ethnographic stance
(Maneen, 1988). Engaging with the challenge of interpreting and translating these
observations adequately, observations drawn from the data were collated and
presented to lecturers during the subsequent interviews (Fig. ii).

Taking the observations to the interviews and focus group enabled the observations
of participation to be explored with the lecturers. Interview questions were developed
in response to the data analysis and informed by a pilot interview, carried out with a
lecturer who also took part in the focus group. Interviews lasted between thirty-five
minutes and one hour. Thirteen interviews were face-to-face and two used the
university video conferencing (VC) system. The interviews were conceived as a
process of co-constructing meaning between the interviewer and the interviewee
(Gubrium, 2012). Interviewees were asked seven questions and then shown, and
asked to respond to, the data relating to the modules on which they taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How would you describe teaching and learning? What is involved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What discipline would you describe the modules you teach (relating to this research) as belonging to? What is the nature of knowledge in that discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I’m looking at collaboration in online environments. How would you describe the nature of collaboration in an online module?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How would you describe your approach to teaching modules (here insert the relevant modules the research had observed)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subsequent focus group used video conferencing to bring together seven lecturers, in geographically disparate locations. Three lecturers unable to attend the focus group commented on a summary of proceedings. The focus group began by the researcher sharing a summary of the interview analysis, five questions were then posed:

1. In regards to your own experience does that make sense?
2. Are there any aspects which you didn’t agree with?
3. Do you approach discussion boards with a clear rationale? Would you describe your main aim as being to check or validate understanding, support students to post or develop dialogue?
4. How would you describe your role as an online tutor in regards to your presence on a module? Should you be central to delivering structuring content, part of weekly discussions or simply available if students have questions? How does an online tutor enable student learning?
5. Do you think these findings have any implications for practice? Do they highlight any key issues in relation to online practice?

The focus group enabled a dialogic negotiation of meaning (Lambert and Loiselle, 2008), as lecturers discussed their experiences as a group. Sharing the summary of the interview analysis enabled the focus group to act as a second member-checking layer. Following the identification of patterns of participation within the online data, the interviews and focus group were analysed narratively, using an iterative approach which identified themes within the data.

Before proceeding with the research, ethical clearance was granted by the university ethics committee. Data collected from the online space was kept secure. It was not
shared in its raw form; all data were made anonymous, before being presented in publications or to lecturers. During the interviews lecturers were only shown data from modules on which they taught; data they had access to through their own module space. Participants’ perspectives were respected and the researchers own positioning within the field was clearly acknowledged. Any evidence used in analysis was made anonymous before being included in any written, or verbal, presentations.

Results

The observation drawn presented a rich and varied picture of online practice. Within this, qualitatively different approaches to online teaching, and to facilitating discussion boards, were observed. Presented below are three vignettes, which highlight the qualitatively different ways in which lecturers approached online practice. The vignettes are presented in narrative form to highlight the different experiences of the lecturers involved, demonstrating the situated nature of online practice. They do not suggest that any one approach is better than another rather they show how epistemological and philosophical differences influence the practice of online lecturers.

The three lecturers were all experienced online practitioners. They were situated physically in different locations. They each taught predominantly on one of three different degree programmes (this research looked at modules from four degree programmes). Data was collected from two modules, one at SCQF level seven and one at level nine for two of the lecturers. For the third lecturer data was collected on three modules; one at SCQF level seven and two at SCQF level nine. In the vignettes below the tutors have been given pseudonyms and anything which could directly identify them has been removed from the data presented.

Vignette One – Jenny

Jenny viewed education as a holistic practice. She spoke about the social and emotional aspects of the learning process and was concerned with the holistic development, and well-being of students. When asked about learning and teaching she said:
‘To me Education, learning and teaching, is much more about these softer outcomes … it’s to do with helping people realise their worth, their capacity in terms of who they are… my role as an educator has to be, I think, about helping students to recognise their potential… the capacity they have to be the best that they can’

The degree on which Jenny taught related directly to a professional community. Students were employed and completing qualifications directly related to their ‘day jobs”. The degree attracted a wide range of students, predominantly female, with a mix between mature and “traditional students”. The routes into the degree were varied; many of the students accessed the programme through college-based vocational courses, and many had had a large gap of time since engaging with academic study.

The discussion boards on Jenny’s modules presented socio-grams with multiple connections between participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-gram of Jenny’s discussion board</th>
<th>Dialogue mapping showing lecturer comments in red and green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fig. iv Visualisations of a discussion board: Jenny
Jenny took a nurturing approach and responded to students individually, encouraging them and supporting their participation on the discussion boards. Observations of participatory positioning reflected this; Jenny responded to the majority of student posts (fig. iv). Jenny recorded the highest number of posts, out of all the lecturers observed, in the comparisons of discussion board activity. When discussing her facilitation of the discussion boards, and in response to the diagram showing her dialogic participation, Jenny commented;

‘This is me (identifying the boldly outlined red boxes in Fig. iv) I would purposefully go out to interact to this level’

Reflecting on this Jenny added;

‘Presence, social presence is really important … they’re (students) looking for that level of reassurance (response from tutor)’

Although Jenny was an experienced online lecturer she still found the online context challenging;

‘In the face-to-face classroom it’s easier (facilitating discussion) because of the immediacy … you’re not getting that level of facilitation that you can immediately in face-to-face … maybe as a tutor I’m trying to compensate for that and that’s why you’re seeing me as present as much as I am’

The online space mediated Jenny’s practice through its lack of non-verbal and para-verbal feedback. The lack of feedback led to interactions feeling constrained. Jenny was always available for her students and worked hard to project her presence into the online space. As well as frequent discussion board communications Jenny responded quickly to e-mails and was ‘available 24/7’ (Focus Group), supporting her students as they progressed through the modules. The use of collaborative activities in Jenny’s teaching was motivated by the holistic needs of students;

‘I think collaboration is the key in terms of helping students to feel engaged with the learning process, … I think as a tutor my role is to try to get them to recognise that there’s this wider community that they can engage with and if they reach out to engage with the wider community that makes them feel
more part of the bigger picture, part of something that’s going on rather than I’m sitting at home on my own’

Collaborative activities, for Jenny, provided an opportunity to engage students in a learning community. The social and emotional aspects of the learning process were important.

**Vignette Two – David**

David worked on a degree in a scientific discipline and was passionate about his subject. The degree on which he taught had the same wide ranging student demographic as Jenny’s. In contrast to Jenny’s programme, David’s was more subject-orientated; it related to future professions, but was not firmly connected to one particular professional community. David described the progression of teaching as it developed over the three years of the degree:

‘In first year it’s just science and it’s just factual … we don’t try to explore why that is, the reasons behind it, debate about it …there’s a heavy dose of science in all of the (modules), however by third year I’m trying to teach them that they need to broaden their horizons beyond just the science … there’s implications in everything we do … in politics … computing, we’re using computer models … socio-economic aspects… it’s multi-disciplinary’

David’s passion for his subject shone through in the interview discussion;

‘Everyone on this earth should know for example … it’s a fundamental fact’

The language was emotive, the knowledge which the degree taught was important.

Sociograms drawn from David’s discussion boards, and the related dialogue maps showed David to be centrally located in the dialogue, reflecting the traditional classroom dialogic pattern of question, answer, comment (Nuthall, 2007).
David positioned himself in the centre of the dialogue setting questions and responding to the answers, posted by students.

David shared Jenny’s perception of online collaboration being a challenge;

‘(Collaboration) it’s quite iffy … personally I prefer VC (video-conferencing) much more because they see me and they put a name to my face’

Jenny had compared online interactions with her previous face-to-face teaching; David compared them to his teaching using video-conferencing. In both examples the human-ness of the other medium, the immediacy of the face-to-face, and seeing people’s faces on VC, emphasised what was lacking in the text-based communications of the online context. David’s response to this, though, was quite different to Jenny’s:

‘I make it obligatory for them to contribute to the discussion board each week because 40% of their grade depends on a reflection of contributions to the discussion board, however, I pick four weeks for them to talk about, reflect on
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…but I don’t tell them until the end of term which four weeks … they must contribute to all of the weeks even though I’m only going to pick four of them at the end for them to reflect on, this works really well.

David was responsive to the feelings of his students; he spoke of how they were often scared to post on discussion boards. He enjoyed the rapport he built with classes through VC sessions and he felt the online context constrained this;

‘In the online environment it’s a lot more difficult … there’s not as strong a rapport’

Although both David and Jenny identified similar constraints to the use of collaborative activities when teaching online, their responses were quite different.

6.2.4 Vignette Three – Laura

Laura described teaching and learning as a relationship;

‘Well it’s a relationship, I think that’s absolutely critical, it’s the nature of that relationship that will make it, not entirely but certainly have a strong lean on how effective it is … the students respond to the relationship and to the personality of the person who’s doing the teaching … Now that’s not, that’s not across the board, there are some very well-motivated students that never want to talk to you but in the main I would suggest it’s about relationships’

Laura’s modules were based in a different degree to Jenny or David’s, although first year modules from Jenny’s degree were optional in Laura’s and vice-versa. As with all three of the tutors presented in these vignettes, Laura was experienced in relation to teaching online. When asked about the nature of online collaboration, Laura highlighted its pedagogic potential:

‘The nature of collaboration, I think I’d start by saying it’s not instinctive and therefore it has to be contrived. The importance of collaboration, if we start from the point that collaboration is a part of this relationship of learning and teaching then to collaborate is about developing knowledge, learning and constructing knowledge in a group’
Laura presented a pedagogic approach which reflected a social view of learning (Bruner, 1996, Wenger 1999), in which collaborative activities developed and constructed knowledge. In describing collaboration, within the online environment as contrived, she highlighted the mediating role of the online space. In discussion she suggested that face-to-face collaboration was more natural;

‘When you sit in a classroom next to somebody and there’s a kind of instinctive chatting’

Facilitating discussion boards Laura was informed by a clear philosophy; as well as actively engaging with her own online teaching Laura had taken part in research, related to student’s use of discussion boards;

‘If the lecturer stays out in the early stages the conversation reaches consensus and stops, the job of the lecturer in an online discussion is to take it outwards, to bring in a new idea, to ask a question and in some cases to share opinions, disclosure is really important in there as well … it’s also being responsive to what’s going around, what the students are interested in’

This was reflected in the data drawn from discussion boards, on Laura’s modules. She positioned herself within the dialogue, and directed the students to reply to a single thread, rather than starting new ones.
Sociograms from all of Laura’s modules displayed single lines of dialogue. Laura took a directive approach and positioned herself within the discussion, acting to stimulate and generate student’s continued dialogue.

Laura’s posts were the longest of the three tutors presented here. Being positioned within the dialogue Laura drew together the discussion, added new thoughts or introduced a new concept and invited responses. Laura reflected that not all students wanted to join in on the discussion boards, some were quite happy to work alone. However, she felt that the lecturers role should be active, she discussed the use of chat rooms (synchronous text-based online discussions) and the success of these, when students engaged. Chat rooms were regular occurrence on the modules which Laura led. She felt that the role of the tutor, as in a face-to-face class, was to engage students with the module content, to ‘teach’;

‘The tools are the same, it's the personality, it's the materials, it's the engagement but you're doing it in a different setting’ (Interview 12).
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Discussion

The approach a lecturer took was observed to play a significant role, in the resulting online discussion. Lecturers’ purpose, pedagogy and philosophy were reflected in the dialogic patterns which emerged when engaging with online tools. Comparing practice across different modules and degree programmes highlighted the social and cultural factors which influenced lecturers. Cultural beliefs, such as the importance of nurturing learners, influenced the ways in which lecturers positioned themselves when interacting online (Vignette One). Epistemological understanding and social structures influenced lecturers’ philosophies and approaches to teaching (Vignette Two). Positioning was also influenced by lecturer’s pedagogic approach (Vignette Three). The vignettes present a simplified picture in their presentation of the variance of lecturers’ approaches to online facilitation. Previous research has highlighted the influence of lecturers on the student experience in both face-to-face (Entwistle and Karagiannopoulou, 2013), and online settings (Lameras, 2012, Owens, 2012).

Lecturers are situated in cultural and social spaces, influenced by cultural values and expectations, and epistemological understanding. Consideration of these factors has the potential to develop understanding of the role of the lecturer, and the influence they have on learning in online settings. These influences are not deterministic; they were observed to be inter-related and reflected the complex and messy reality of the learning process (Lave, 2008). The three vignettes highlighted qualitatively different approaches, variations of these approaches were observed across the eighteen modules compared in the wider study.

The purpose of online interactions was seen to vary between lecturers. They saw themselves as facilitators, gatekeepers and guides. They described nurturing students, imparting knowledge and signposting. These varying positions reflected the purpose of their actions. Lecturers aimed to build learning communities, confirm understanding and enable students to negotiate meaning. Three foci which reflected these different purposes were identified as knowledge, affect and dialogue (fig. vii).
These three foci are balanced by lecturers as they enact practice in the online setting, they are mutually constituting (Rogoff, 1995); one can be brought into focus but the rest are still there, and influenced by any action taken. Although lecturers might foreground a particular foci (as in the three vignettes presented above) they are still aware of the other two. The three foci are reflective of different pedagogic approaches (Gonzalez, 2010), but act in a different ways, as lecturers engaged with all three, simply to varying degrees.

Lecturers adjusted their positioning over time, and depending on the student group. One of the foci might reflect their purpose, philosophy or pedagogy at a particular point in time, or as an over-riding approach but the other foci were considered and a part of lecturers ongoing practice. For example David (Vignette Two) focused on knowledge, potentially due to epistemological beliefs. He was, however, very considerate of affect, describing the ‘fear’ with which first year students approached discussion boards and was keen to enable dialogue during interactions with students. For online lecturers consideration of their positioning within the frame of reference of the three foci (fig. vii) has the potential to develop their awareness of the purpose, philosophy and pedagogy they enact. This, in turn has the potential to develop the student experience in epistemologically relevant and culturally appropriate ways.
Lecturers working in online settings face many of the same challenges as online students. While students need to acquire the self-efficacy and organisation to engage with online learning (Stott, 2016), lecturers are required to engage themselves, while facilitating the engagement of others. Their facilitation of the modules on which they teach shapes the student experience, as they position themselves in relation to their pedagogic approach. Lecturers' philosophy, pedagogy and purpose influence their engagement with online tools. Online practice, like face-to-face practice is situated by the cultural spaces in which lecturers act; the cultural values and beliefs of professional communities and the informing epistemologies are enacted through the interactions between participants as they engage in, and through, online spaces. The online setting mediates practice in ways which are fundamentally different to face-to-face settings, challenging physical and temporal boundaries. To develop practice and ensure that the learning which takes place is high quality and comparable to the face-to-face setting, it is important to consider the role of the online lecturer and engage with online practice. As technology develops online practice is of ever greater importance: technology mediates social interactions to enable learning, it is an artefact which mediates teaching processes.
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