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**Abstract**

This paper takes an action research approach to problems associated with small group work carried out in break-out rooms during synchronous online tutorials, in a distance-learning HE context. It makes the case for small-scale, practitioner-led studies to determine and share best practice, taking the view that online best practice is discipline- and context-specific and therefore not easily determined by top-down research. It stresses the importance of collaborative learning as an essential part of the student experience, and outlines some of the difficulties facing the distance-learning tutor in facilitating collaborative learning online.

¹ Corresponding author email address: c.b.knowles@open.ac.uk

Introduction

Although online systems for teaching and learning in HE have been available for a long time, and the subject of discussion and controversy for almost as long, their take-up and success often depend upon human factors. Collaborative learning, in its widest sense of active engagement with others, is not easy to achieve in an online context, because it demands a high level of participation from students, expertise and direction from tutors, and a willingness on the part of all participants to engage in an ongoing cycle of reflection and self-improvement. It has been observed that ‘the freedom that online working gives with one hand is taken away with the other. The processes, so familiar in face-to-face groups, no longer apply in the same way, and additional problems occur. Participants need to learn how to collaborate all over again’ (Jaques and Salmon 2008 p.204), and certainly this is true of collaborative learning in online synchronous tutorials. Interaction and active learning cannot be assumed; the means by which collaborative learning can be achieved need to be considered on a practical level by tutors directly involved in online learning, on a discipline-specific basis. This report covers a stage in my own attempts to learn ‘how to collaborate all over again’, from the perspective of a reflective practitioner.

Context

As a Classics Associate Lecturer with The Open University (OU), I work in a distance-learning HE context which is becoming increasingly more dependent upon online tuition provision, with many modules using a blended learning model of face-to-face tutorials, online synchronous tutorials through OU Live (powered by Blackboard Collaborate), asynchronous forums, module websites, podcasts and other forms of delivery. Associate Lecturers (‘ALs’ or ‘tutors’) are responsible for the delivery of core module material; in order to make use of the available systems, we receive optional practical training in the basic facilities of the platform, but little training in the appropriateness of different methods of tuition for different types of learning or subject areas. This has been the focus of my action research over the last several years, as I undertake small-scale studies of my own practice in relation to new and emerging forms of tuition, and their appropriateness to Arts subject areas.

The modules in Classical Studies (broadly defined as the study of the ancient world, and comprising the study of ancient languages, literature, history, philosophy, culture, economy etc.) which I tutor at the Open University take a mixture of ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ approaches to learning (Fry et al. 1999 p.30): ‘surface’ in the rote learning of dates and methods in the study of ancient history, and in the learning of ancient languages; and ‘deep’ in the interpretation of physical and literary evidence based on cultural context. This combination of approaches, dictated by the subject matter itself, is shared by Classics courses throughout the HE sector; what is notable about Classics at the OU, however, is the composition of the OU student body.

The ‘non-traditional’ circumstances (‘non-traditional’ tends to be an umbrella term, covering variables like age, country of origin and previous educational experience; here I use it in a broad sense to cover students not on full-time taught degree courses) of OU students lend themselves to a third approach, sometimes called the ‘achieving approach’ or the ‘strategic approach’ (Fry et al. 1999 p.30). This approach is characterised by a focus on achieving high marks rather than on developing a deeper understanding, and students who take this approach may use strategies of both ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ learning. Characteristic of ‘achieving’ students are strong organisational skills: ‘their notes are usually neat and well organized, they
plan and use study schedules, and they meet assignment and study deadlines’ (Chalmers and Fuller 1996 p.7). Many non-traditional students are engaged in a mid-career updating of skills or retraining, and these students are ‘amongst [the] most critical of “customers”, and particularly intolerant of mediocre higher education practices’ (Bridge 2006 p.64); well-organised themselves, these learners expect highly organised tuition which gets results. Furthermore, OU course materials are presented in a format which attracts such learners: with assignment questions for the entire module distributed at the beginning, students can themselves prioritise study of the topics needed for the assignments and manage their own learning efficiently. Personal commitments are also an important consideration: many OU students are in employment and/or have families, and because of the additional demands on their time they approach an OU course as an organisational challenge as much as a learning experience.

Not all OU students take this approach: there are always students who are motivated by an interest in the subject itself, particularly in a non-vocational subject like Classics, more than by the desire for achievement, even in an HE environment which has veered towards an overriding concern with ‘the outcome and the comparative value’ of a degree (Beaty 2006 p.102). However, recent funding changes like the ELQ rule (Equivalent or Lower Qualifications, restricting funding and loans for students who already have a degree, which has been relaxed for Science but still affects Arts) and the steep rise in tuition fees are making the OU less accessible to recreational students, and give all students a financial push to succeed. Bridge in his 2006 summary of changes relating to non-traditional learners, observed, ‘Their disciplinary focus, and indeed their basic motivation, has changed significantly – towards the vocational and career-orientated’ (p.58), and this change has certainly not reversed since 2006.

It is against this background that I have been undertaking an ongoing action research project focusing on online tutorial provision, an important (although optional) element of my practice, and specifically on my own methods of devising and delivering synchronous online tutorials on a Level 3 (FHEQ Level 6) Classics Course. This report focuses on one stage of the project (2014), the results of which are feeding into the next cycle of the investigation. The scale of this project is very small, focusing on a single tutor (myself) experimenting with different strategies each year, based on feedback and data from the previous year: methodologically the results are neither robust nor generalisable, but provide food for thought for practitioners dealing with student and institutional requirements for online teaching.

My investigation relies heavily on end-of-module questionnaires, the design of which is modified each year based on analysis of the previous year’s results. In addition, special online tutorial sessions are regularly organised, in order to test out new approaches and new teaching strategies. These are presented to students openly as an optional extra: those students who choose to take part take on a collaborative role in the research, critically assessing their own learning experience and communicating their findings. This allows participants to position themselves not as passive respondents but as active and ‘at-risk stakeholders’ (Brydon-Miller et al. 2003 p.25) involved in an ongoing process of reflection.

**Theory**

In common with much action research carried out by researchers who are teachers first and foremost, this investigation has been light on theory throughout, with ontological and paradigmatic orientations tending to be bolted on after the fact; ‘Personal theory is created
not as an end in itself, but in order to advance practice’ (Bassey 2007 p.148). In general, however, a broadly interpretivist view has been taken, despite the use of quantifiable questionnaires, in the sense that student views rather than generalisable data have been sought. The research is situated within a constructivist paradigm; constructionism, while not without its problems in relation to adult distance learning (Huang 2002 pp. 31-2), can provide a useful basis for evaluating the relationship between individually-tailored and collaborative learning which is valuable to practitioners working in this context. It is not, of course, the only theory which advocates active and social learning in a collaborative environment. Laurillard (2006 p.73) lists eight influential theorists from different paradigms who share the same commitment to ‘the recognition that learning concerns what the learner is doing, rather than what the teacher is doing’, and emphasises the need to focus on quality of learning and the student experience ahead of technology, pointing out that ‘the drivers of change are numerous, and learning quality ranks poorly in relation to most of them’ (2006 p.71). The claim that learners’ active engagement in the learning process can improve the quality of their learning is common to so many current theories and paradigms that it can almost be taken for granted; significantly, however, collaboration and active learning are not prioritised in the practical training which we, as tutors, receive in using online teaching systems.

**Small-group work in distance learning courses**

OU Arts tutors have always resisted student demands that we focus our tutorials on simply transmitting information relevant to the next assessed piece of work. Much of our job involves providing tailored feedback and personal support for individual learners, but face-to-face tutorials give us a rare opportunity to facilitate ‘deep’ learning through direct interaction with both tutor and peers, and through active engagement in discussion and debate which provide a wider context for the core course materials. This has for a long time been accepted as a necessary component of quality ‘arts and humanities teaching, where discussion and debate are essential to the testing out of ideas and the finding of meaning’ (Cowman and Grace 1999 p.295), and is now acknowledged to be an important part of online teaching of arts and humanities, subject areas which ‘demand a pedagogical approach that fosters participatory and dialogic learning, critical thinking, and the possibility of knowledge production as opposed to mastery’ (Moore and Simon 2015 p.3).

Group work is therefore common in face-to-face Arts tutorials: tutors avoid lecturing, and instead encourage students to take an active role in their own learning. These two modes of teaching are sometimes described as the ‘transmission approach’ to teaching, in which knowledge is transmitted from teacher to student, and the ‘two-way cooperative approach’, in which students are led, through interactive and group work, to ‘construct their own knowledge, make their own sense of reality, and adopt a conceptual framework in line with that shared by the experts in the field’ (Chalmers and Fuller 1996 p.10). The latter, leading to a more qualitative and ‘deep’ approach and a higher quality of learning experience, is desirable but not always achievable, given the constraints of limited contact time; nevertheless, OU tutors are encouraged to use group tuition to enable transactional learning wherever possible, on the understanding that ‘the goal of effective instruction is not only to present information but also to encourage the learner to engage in appropriate cognitive processing during learning’ (Clark and Mayer 2011 p.35).

Online synchronous tutorials, however, provide a new environment in which the technology and the limitations (in terms of practicalities, knowledge and willingness) of its users (tutors
and students) often dictate the approach taken to teaching and learning. The range of interactions is limited by the facilities made available by the platform: in an OU online tutorial, while students can contribute verbally to the tutorial by means of a microphone, they can only speak to the whole group, not to individuals, which removes the element of one-to-one interaction so important to face-to-face tutorials and often makes shy students unwilling to speak. Equality of opportunity is also a problem here, since not all students have both a microphone and the technical expertise to use one. The group dynamic is therefore different to that of a face-to-face tutorial, with some students effectively voiceless and others dominating, and every tutor needs to develop his or her own practical response to this problem. One possible approach, which I tend to follow in my own tutorials, is to encourage all students to use the chat box facility (except at stated times) rather than the microphone, which is used by the tutor to provide a running commentary and address points raised by students; this avoids common technical problems, preserves equality and is reassuring to nervous students, as well as being more inclusive for hearing-impaired individuals. However, it also reduces all students to the level of the least advanced, which is not ideal, and students with dyslexia and dyspraxia can find the speed of written interactions uncomfortable. In developing tutorial materials and strategies, I have found that it is necessary to be conscious of how the differences between a virtual classroom and a physical classroom situation can affect the experience of individual learners with specific requirements, and I am still exploring the challenges of this in my practice.

One challenge of online synchronous tutorials is that they lend themselves to the ‘transmission’ approach to teaching, with the tutor delivering information in a lecture format, based on pre-prepared slides; this is perhaps the simplest way to structure and deliver an online session. Many students seem happy with this, since it suits the ‘achieving’ approach to learning. In the long run, however, the nature of this particular module (an essay-based Arts course at Level 3) makes the simple transmission of knowledge inappropriate as a sole mode of teaching. The module assignments require the student to go beyond the course materials by evaluating evidence and modern scholarship; these are ‘deep’ rather than ‘surface’ skills. While other forms of teaching (most notably the feedback on assignments) are used on OU courses to develop ‘deep’ analytical skills, tutorials too have an important role to play in this process, and simple ‘transmission’ teaching does not fulfil that role.

My ongoing action research projects focus on the effectiveness of online synchronous group work through ‘OU Live’, and attempt to determine whether this could facilitate ‘deep’ learning and active engagement. The objective of my 2014 project was simply to investigate whether the addition of a group-work element to my online tutorials could improve the quality of the students’ learning experience, from both my perspective and the students’, in the hope of using my analysis to develop a more effective and appropriate learning environment.

**Action Research Project**

Over the last few years I have been investigating my own online tutorials. In 2011-12 I carried out a small-scale positivist action research project, in which I examined recordings of my online tutorials, quantifying interactions in response to particular activities. I combined this with data from customised end-of-course student surveys, a ‘method which offers every student the chance to respond while at the same time generating data which are quantifiable’ (Hounsell 1999 p.166) to gain a picture of the effectiveness of my own teaching strategies.
The evidence I collected suggested that my practice of dividing the class into small groups for break-out room discussions in the middle of a tutorial was actually confusing for the students and disrupted the whole-group dynamic for the rest of the session.

While my 2012 project highlighted problems with the use of break-out rooms, the quantitative data I collected did not cover either the causes of the problems or possible responses to them, leaving some key questions unanswered. Following the ‘self-reflective spiral of cycles of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting’ (Kemmis 2007 p.168) characteristic of action research, I took this as a starting point for my 2014 project, undertaking a qualitative investigation into how to make group work in online tutorials more effective. In order to judge effectiveness, each tutorial needed to be evaluated from two perspectives, mine and the students’, allowing me to incorporate two of Hounsell’s (1999 p.164) three types of feedback: feedback from students and self-generated feedback (the third, ‘feedback from teaching colleagues and professional peers’, can be difficult to obtain in a distance-learning context, but would offer a valuable additional perspective in any future investigations). To that end, I composed a 10-question questionnaire, with a mixture of closed and open-ended questions, distributed through SurveyMonkey, for both the students and myself to answer after each tutorial.

I planned three separate tutorials; these were bonus sessions, in addition to my contracted teaching hours, so participating students would gain extra contact time and further help in preparing for their final assessment. This ensured that everyone involved would gain something from participation. I recorded the tutorials, with the permission of the participants, and asked the students to complete the questionnaire immediately after each session.

My design of the sessions was based on Griffiths’ ‘Teaching and Learning in Small Groups’ (1999), and on her list of types of group work (p.102-3). For this practitioner inquiry I decided to look at the problem-based tutorial group, the structured enquiries and the tutorless group, since those methods were most appropriate to the material I intended to cover.

Session 1

The first tutorial included a component of unstructured group work which fell into Griffiths’ category of problem-based tutorial group: students were assigned to one of three break-out rooms and instructed to work through a problem for fifteen minutes before reporting back to the whole group. I provided no further instructions, either technical or pedagogical, to see what problems would occur without tutor intervention. I also stayed out of the break-out rooms to give the students the opportunity to resolve difficulties together; I did, however, remind them about the ‘raise hand’ facility, which would attract my attention if necessary.

Participants’ responses to this group activity, expressed through open-ended questions on the questionnaire, were generally positive, but certain issues were flagged up in response to two questions in particular.

- Students were asked to comment on the balance between tutor-led work and student discussion in this session. Responses varied considerably: some students seemed to think that the small-group discussion was too short (‘more time for group discussion’, ‘I felt that the group led session was too short and I did not really know what to do in it which was a shame because overall it was a good idea’), while others noted that discussions in the breakout rooms were beginning to flounder (‘I think the breakout group sessions were about of the right length. Most people in my group had run out of
ideas near the end and the chat was becoming silent and non-productive’, ‘I was happy with the balance. It was useful to bounce some ideas round amongst a small group but wouldn’t want it for too long as I think it would dry up’, ‘I think there was the right amount of time for the group discussion. We were starting to run out of ideas towards the end but we weren’t left hanging around’). Other students commented on the tutor-student balance from a wider perspective (‘I think that in view of the importance of Level 3 modules, the bias should always be in favour of the tutor’), and from a practical perspective (‘Balance seemed okay. A bit difficult to keep up with and assess earlier comments in the group discussion as the message box is small!’).

• Students were asked whether they could think of anything to improve future sessions. Comments ranged from positive expressions of satisfaction (‘Overall the session was of great value. As a student who has not been able to attend many tutorials I find online tutorials a very useful asset’, ‘I found it helpful that the topic area was quite specific - i.e. this time, “abstracts”, as it emphasised the points and maintained a focus for the discussion’, ‘Very useful session’) to practical suggestions about time-management (‘One Hour sessions may be better-but probably no more than 90 minutes - if ever that would be considered!’, ‘Perhaps make the group session longer?’). The main focus of the comments was technology and inexperience (‘A refresher on the use of the technology involved at the start of the session especially writing on the white board’, ‘For myself - practise, as it is the first live session I've attended’, ‘I struggled (as did others in my breakout group) to get to grips with the technology. None of us managed to write on the white board and resorted to using the chat box. This worked fine but it was a little difficult to read and contribute at the same time’).

The responses to these questions indicated firstly that the ideal length of a small-group work session was directly related to the level of engagement of the participants: one group, which struggled to get started, found the fifteen-minute break-out room session too short, while another group which was more active from the start found that discussion without direction or prompting naturally ran out after about fifteen minutes. In other words, the most engaged and confident students were the ones who wanted a shorter session.

Secondly, it was apparent (from the responses and from later discussion) that most of the students struggled with the technology; one group decided to type their comments on the whiteboard, but were unable to remember how to do so (this had been covered in an earlier session), and wasted time trying to figure it out. Another group grew frustrated with the chat box; they became side-tracked by trying to change the size of the box, a trick which again had been demonstrated in an earlier session. While one of the students was new to online tutorials, the others had attended several previous sessions, and most were experienced and confident users of technology; when put in a group, however, they were distracted from the activity by trying to help one another solve technical problems.

Session 2

For the second tutorial, instead of an open-ended discussion I planned a text-based break-out room task, asking each group to highlight and correct a faulty paragraph; Griffiths defines this as ‘Structured enquiries – tutor provides lightly structured experiments and guidance’ (1999 p.102). Before I sent the students into their break-out rooms I provided clear
instructions on how to use the whiteboard, which was a required part of the task, and I allowed a few minutes for students to practice using the tools that they would need for the task. I observed activity in the break-out rooms carefully, and visited rooms to prompt discussion whenever the activity level dropped.

Comments in response to the open-ended questions in the questionnaire were much shorter and more positive than they were following Session 1.

- Students asked about the balance between student discussion and tutor-led work were overwhelmingly positive this time (‘I was happy with the balance’, ‘Found this about right’, ‘Balance seemed about right’), with only one student suggesting more time for group work (‘Probably a bit more time with student discussion so as to allow longer discussion of subject matter’) and nobody suggesting that the group sessions were too long or that the discussion was winding down. This break-out room activity was the same length as that in Session 1.
- In response to ‘anything that might improve future sessions?’, answers focused more on successful features of Session 2 than on ideas for future improvements (‘Appreciated the reminder on how to use the white board’, ‘Good point is that the tutor can drop in to each discussion group and provide guidance and pointers’, ‘Helpful in that the session focussed on a relevant, specific topic’). There were a couple of forward-looking suggestions, but they were focused on technical/managerial issues (‘I wonder if talking to each other by microphone is possible? Its quicker than typing!’, ‘if possible, a larger area to view contributions from rest of group’) rather than on the activities and the role of small-group work within the tutorial.

The increased engagement of the students suggested that this group exercise was more effective than the last in promoting active engagement and collaborative learning; all students used the whiteboard tools to point out problems with the text, and the chat box was used frequently to discuss corrections and issues arising from the text. The plenary discussion was also more lively, with even the quiet and inexperienced students contributing something. Student feedback in the post-tutorial questionnaire was positive too; respondents seemed confident in their use of technology and clear about the task, even those who considered themselves lacking in experience or technical confidence.

Session 3

My intention in the third tutorial was to build on Session 2 by encouraging members of the group to take on different roles - discussion leader, note-taker etc - to clarify not only the technology and the task, but also the responsibilities of each individual, following the method which Griffiths defines as ‘Tutorless group – group appoints leader and may report back; may focus on discussion or completion of some other type of set task’ (1999 p.103). However, this did not go to plan. The tutorial was to be our final online meeting, and several students requested a question-and-answer session with me instead of independent small-group work, on the basis that ‘it would be more useful’ (student email).

While I would have liked a third set of results, the needs of the students had to come first, so I gave a more directly informative tutorial instead. It was interesting that the students seemed to perceive group activities and collaborative learning as less immediately useful to them, and less suited to last-minute information sharing, suggesting that the positive feedback I had
received in response to Session 2 was related more to the quality of the experience than to a perception of effective learning. This is an issue which I intend to explore in the next cycle of action research.

Implications for practice

The observations I have made of my own practice, both in this small-scale investigation and in my earlier investigations, have indicated that the problems and benefits of small-group work in online synchronous Arts tutorials require further exploration. It should not be taken for granted that online tutorials can be approached in the same way as face-to-face tutorials; despite the obvious similarities, there are crucial differences in dynamics (interpersonal dynamics, and the dynamics between the user and the interface) which demand critical investigation, not just from researchers but from active practitioners, and attention to individual needs. In 2013 the QAA recommended that ‘Institutions should be cautious about using technology as a replacement for face-to-face interactions, or as a substitute for developing an active and collaborative learning environment and community’ (Kandiko and Mawer 2013), and the question of whether online tutorials are a poor substitute for an ‘active and collaborative learning environment’ or, managed correctly, a valuable and vibrant part of the community remains a controversial one.

There are many caveats in using the data I have collected. The results of my student questionnaires need to be treated with caution, ‘as putative “quality indicators”, signalling the need for further investigation rather than immediate action’ (Green et al. 1994 p.107). The very nature of the inquiry could bias the results, since ‘discussion of satisfaction tends to bias the user’s reported perception towards the negative’ (Green et al. 1994 p.106): by asking students to comment on break-out room problems, I encourage them to focus on the negative aspects. The other side of the coin is the recognition that student views of their own experience should not be accepted uncritically, and need to be tempered by a tutor perspective: ‘students’ views on what constitutes good teaching may be based on their favoured means of learning, which might be to be provided with a “good set of notes” for the purposes of reproducing information’ (Stefani 2006 p.117).

Despite these caveats, I have put my findings to good use already in planning this year’s online tutorials. Investigating the function and value of group work, ‘a critical mechanism for exploring the development of a range of key skills’ (Griffiths 1999 p.97), and the nature of collaborative learning, has encouraged me to persevere with break-out rooms, which I once dismissed as being too much trouble; although online small-group work is an organisational challenge for the tutor, it enables an approach to learning and teaching which cannot easily be achieved by the other tools available to the distance-learning tutor. My situation is complicated by the fact that I work for a region which covers The North and Continental Europe, which means that in a typical tutorial group I have a mixture of local students and students from many different European countries, most of whom I will never meet in person; this makes online group work particularly vital for some of my students, who have no other means of interacting directly with their peers.

Another area in which my observations will affect my practice is preparation. Griffiths says of small group work, ‘Not only do tutors have to learn how to teach using small group methods but also students have to learn how to work in small groups... it is the tutor’s job to assist students to learn, to equip them with self-confidence and facilitate group cohesion’ (1999 p.96). This is even more of a challenge in online tutorials, in which the forms of
interaction are neither natural nor automatic: it cannot be assumed that students will be able to interact with an online group without training, practice and clear goals. My attempt at a problem-based tutorial group demonstrated that basic training in OU Live early in the course was insufficient to give students the confidence to contribute to the group; in order to achieve the goals of the session, clear instructions and training in how to perform the task need to be provided as part of the session itself. This has changed the way I plan sessions: when attempting an interactive activity, I now allow time for explanation and demonstration of the relevant facilities (and, crucially, for students to practice using the facilities themselves), so that the technology does not act as a barrier to learning and group cohesion.

**Further Implications**

A final point to note is the relevance of my inquiry to issues of institutional concern and classical pedagogy.

A consultation process to develop a new group tuition policy is currently underway at Senate level within the OU, with implementation of the final policy expected in late 2015, and one of the early principles established by the draft Senate paper is to support a programme of scholarship and research into group tuition. The importance of group work, both face-to-face and online, is now being acknowledged at an institutional level, and steps are being taken to promote awareness of group work as a desirable teaching strategy. Student consultation as part of this process has emphasised the perception that for online tuition to be valuable to students ‘it needs to be an effective medium’ (University Students Consultative Forum 2014), characterised by ‘the right balance between tutor and student contributions’ and ‘teaching approaches that accommodated different learning styles’. Research into what constitutes the right balance and approach can profitably be carried out by the ALs who provide the link between institution and learner. Although sometimes described as ‘the lost (or invisible) tribe’ (Tony Brand in Beaton and Gilbert 2012 p.xv) because we are unable to influence major developments or policy, part-time tutors are well-placed to carry out investigations which put the needs of learners first, to put recommendations into practice immediately, and to share findings with colleagues.

My interest in the role of technology in Classics courses also fits into current pedagogical debate within the subject area. Many disciplines ‘have, and support, their own “tribal” culture’ (Jaques and Salmon 2008 p.195), and the ‘tribal’ culture of Classics is particularly conservative and traditional: the model of ‘the Sage on the Stage’ is still a popular one, showing no sign of being replaced by ‘the Guide on the Side’ (Lockwood and Gooley 2001 p.xi). Concerns have recently been raised about the training of university-level Classics teachers: as Goyette summarises, ‘The field of classics has traditionally prepared many of its college- and university-level teachers by more or less directly plunging them into the classroom, having them “learn on the fly”’ (2012 p.104-5). This traditional avoidance of formal training is becoming particularly problematic in relation to new and emerging technologies; Reinhard (2012 p.121) comments, ‘Technology and teaching is nothing new, even for classics, but there has yet to be any standardized approach to teaching the teachers what technology to use and how to use it. It is still very much every-teacher for-himself-or-herself when it comes to selecting what technology to deploy’. In sharing my approach, my findings and above all my belief that HE lecturers involved in online teaching need to take...
part in an ongoing process of trial-and-error testing and reflection, I hope to contribute to the encouragement of technological experimentation and standardisation in Classics teaching.
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