

Ileana Torres, Jessica Evans, & Mitch Schneider

FACULTY RESISTANCE TO --- TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

May 2019

“

There can be infinite uses of the computer and of new age technology, but if teachers themselves are not able to bring it into the classroom and make it work, then it fails.

Nancy Kassebaum

”

WEL

COME

FACULTY RESISTANCE

Institutions of higher education are heavily investing in technology, yet there are barriers in leveraging innovation. One point of barrier are the faculty. Institutional culture, self-efficacy, and lack of support, are key barriers for faculty to effectively leverage technology in an innovative manner.

Institutional Culture

Institutional culture can promote, support, or stifle technology innovation in proactive and/ or passive manner.

Faculty Self-Efficacy

Faculty beliefs about their ability to successfully use technology can impact proper technology integration.

Lack of Support

Lack of support to transform curricula into a digital environment can be extremely time consuming and cause frustration and anxiety

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

According to Zhu (2015), an institution's culture can be a main barrier to effectively implementing technology. An organization's culture is complex and dynamic. It involves leadership, values, structures, policies, and practices which can influence the selection, implementation, and support of technologies. If an institution's culture does not value or incorporate innovation and technology in a strategic and holistic manner, success can be stifled from the beginning.

Leadership

Leadership has the most influence on culture through their leadership style, values, staffing, priorities, and expectations. They must value and embrace innovation and technology in all manners from vision, budget, to staffing. They must be consistent and collaborative.

Structure

Organizational structure, staffing, decision-making, and accountability can directly influence the culture and effectiveness of adopting and promoting technology innovation. A vision and culture must be supported by proponents, budgets, and tools.

Support

Even with leadership and organizational structure, without the proper support staff (IDT, technology integration specialist, help desk...) and tools, implementation will be stifled which can quickly effect the culture in return. .

Culture is both complex and dynamic. It needs constant support to ensure it is healthy and innovative.

FACULTY SELF-EFFICACY

Self-efficacy in a general sense refers to one's belief or having the ability to succeed (Bandura, 1993), in this case, in the areas of academia, as it relates to the use of technology. Steps should be taken towards increasing computer self-efficacy or the confidence in using newly adopted technologies. Current knowledge and experience often determines success in using technology or the positive outlook on the ability to learn and adopt new technology initiatives.

Technology Experience

Low self-efficacy by faculty may be attributed to lack of comfort, exposure, and training, which is a significant barrier to change and adoption. It may be ideal to examine current knowledge and obtain some type of measurement of self-efficacy as opposed to assuming everyone has had experience and past knowledge of how to use certain technologies.

Professional Development

Training in order to teach faculty on how to use specific technologies and how they can increase efficiency is needed in order to increase not only self-efficacy, but to properly integrate technology. Increased professional development opportunities will also provide faculty with the opportunity to experience the usefulness of the technology which is often times a major concern.

The more familiar and comfortable faculty are with technology, the more inclined they are to use it.

LACK OF SUPPORT

Johnson, Wisniewski, Kuhlemeyer, Isaacs, and Krzykowski (2012) reported that many faculties find curricula development incorporating new technologies extremely time consuming, challenging, and anxiety-ridden. They do not have access to curricula designers who can help them modify or transform their curricula into a digital environment.

Commitment

Faculty often do not receive additional compensation or recognition for technology based curricula and quickly revert back to more traditional curricula. A primary concern of technology adoption of newer technologies is the lack of understanding of the type of support that is needed. There must be a commitment to building trust with instructional designers in order to be able to communicate exactly where support is needed.

Challenge

Other issues that could affect the integration of technology could have to do with the pedagogical approach that faculty used or perhaps even the time it takes to actually use the technology. Without a clear understanding of what the problem is, appropriate and focused support is difficult to provide.

Ongoing Support

Ongoing conversations are necessary once implementation has taken place to ensure continued support, not only in the beginning of the integration process. If those who adopt new technology experience setbacks and do not receive adequate faculty support, then the negative reports will lead to the majority becoming more skeptical about the usefulness of the new technologies.

Ongoing support can increase faculty engagement and help them feel empowered to successfully improve student learning using technologically supported pedagogy.

REVIEW

Faculty Resistance to Technology Integration

Institutional Culture

Leadership, Structure, and Support

Faculty Self-Efficacy

Technology Experience and
Professional Development

Lack of Support

Commitment, Challenge, and Ongoing
Support

REFERENCE

- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.
- Ertmer, P.A. (1999). Addressing first- and second-order barriers to change: Strategies for technology integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 47(4), 47-61.
- Johnson, T., Wisniewski, M.A, Kuhlemeyer, G., Isaacs, G., & Krzykowski, J. (2012.). Technology adoption in higher education: Overcoming anxiety through faculty bootcamp. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(2).
- Martins, E. C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organizational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6, 64–74.
- Outlaw, V., Rice, M. L., & Wright, V. H. (2018). Exploration of faculty's perceptions on technology change: implications for faculty preparedness to teach online courses. In I. Management Association (Ed.), *Technology Adoption and Social Issues: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Reid, P. (2017, February 27) Supporting faculty adoption of technology: what can we do? *Educause Review*. Retrieved from <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2017/2/supporting-faculty-adoption-of-technology-what-can-we-do>
- Uys, P.M., Nleya, P., & Molelu, G.B. (2004). Technological innovation and management strategies for higher education in africa: harmonizing reality and idealism. *Educational Media International*, 41(1), 67-80, DOI: 10.1080/0952398032000105120
- Zhu, C. (2015). Organizational culture and technology-enhanced innovation in higher education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 24(1), 65-79, DOI: 10.1080/1475939X.2013.822414

Q
A

QUESTIONS

ANSWERS

THANK

YOU

Ileana Torres, Jessica Evans, & Mitch Schneider