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Focus on teachers in the changing teaching environment

On the global level:
• Global trend towards digitalization: bridging the classroom to the society (Lonka)
• a change in the working environment: decreasing resources combined with new technology and technology-rich environment
• changing professional requirements for tools and communication

On the local level:
• The teacher has a problem to be solved: What to do? How to do it? Who could help me?
• Digitalization is often seen as a big externally enforced, massive leap with no clear shape or form.

The three doors to digitalization
### Visualization of the model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Pedagogics</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Expanding roles and interaction</td>
<td>NEED; critical use of digital tools, curiosity, innovation</td>
<td>Social networks and interaction, echoes of technical choices to the group, roles, socio-cultural conventions</td>
<td>HYBRID: Pedag. + Tech Pedagogically motivated use of digital technology</td>
<td>Function =&gt; Impact on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEEL DOOR</td>
<td>[Te] =&gt; [St]...</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>Who are the students? Teacher activity? Student activity?</td>
<td>Information and communication technology in teaching, general aims and potential digital technology available</td>
<td>Possibilities, know-how, level of skills, usability, efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;CONFLICT&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAK DOOR</td>
<td>[Te] H (Gr: [St] [St] [St]) H [St] [St] [St]...</td>
<td>CHANGE, COURAGE, POTENTIAL POSSIBILITIES,...</td>
<td>Added value to the students; balance between know-how and experimentation; choice to the students</td>
<td>Use of tacit knowledge; teaching process + reflection &amp; assessment of pedag. success</td>
<td>Digital Literacy iPads, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;CHANGE&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLASS DOOR</td>
<td>[Te] [Te] [Te]... H [St] [St] [St]... H ...</td>
<td>LEARN, SHARE, TRAIN AND COACH THE OTHERS</td>
<td>Community of practice; organization pedagogies; shared expertise</td>
<td>Dialogic interaction in virtual environment [Te] H [St]; shared aims, planning, implementation</td>
<td>Flexibility in the choice of digital tools; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;DEVELOPMENT&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interaction:

1. **Steel door**

2. **Oak door**

3. **Glass door**
Developmental dimension:
Conflict & need => considering options
=> experiment
=> critical reflection
=> sharing the experience and the results

“A digitally literate person in the Faculty of Science can access, critically analyse and utilise the appropriate tools and be adaptable and innovative in relation to new software and environments.” (Learner DL attributes SCI)

Niinivaara & Vaattovaara: social aspect: the digital choice (right or wrong) the teacher makes, marks the experience; both support and training are needed for the better choices; some of these choices should be left for the students to make (based on their needs and past experience)!
Social dimension:

The roles of the teacher and the student
(Biggs, 2011)
1. Who are the students?
2. What does the teacher do?
3. What are the students doing?

How does the pedagogical technology chosen change/support interaction among the teacher and the students?

Sharing tacit knowledge (through interaction)

=> Communicative needs become more emphatic
(Sivunen, 2007)
Pedagogical dimension:

Pedagogically motivated use emphasizes the relevance of the content in/for the (learning) activity provided by the media.

**INTERFACE**: Action, activities and interaction between the **tool** and the **students**.

(Vahtivuori & Masalin 2001.)

Rytkönen 2014: Pedagogics vs. Technology => **hybrid**

Good pedagogical tools (1) support **language learning** and (2) provide possibilities for **interaction** among the teacher(s) and the student(s)
Technological dimension:

An evaluation framework with three levels:

- a micro-level: activities by the users of technology / individuals
- a meso-level: learning experience as a whole / a tool for learning a language
- a macro-level: more permanent impact to learning / does the tool meet the needs of the teacher and the students; does it support learning?

(Vavoula & Sharples 2008)

The use of technology should always be pedagogically motivated! The choices should support learning: not just for the sake of experimenting or for the sake of technology itself.

Consider the mark the learning experience leaves to the minds of the students and the teacher... Did it actually provide any added value? Was it more of a negative learning experience? Did it provide real support in the task?
### Visualization of the model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Pedagogic</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>Expanding roles and interaction</td>
<td>NEED; critical use of digital tools, curiosity, innovation</td>
<td>Social networks and interaction, echoes of technical choices to the group, roles, socio-cultural conventions</td>
<td>HYBRID: Pedag. + Tech Pedagogically motivated use of digital technologyFunction, tool ⇒ impact on learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEEL DOOR &lt;CONFLICT&gt;</td>
<td>[Te] ⇒ [St]...</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>Who are the students? Teacher activity? Student activity?</td>
<td>Information and communication technology in teaching, general aims and potential digital technology available</td>
<td>Possibilities, know-how, level of skills, usability, efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAK DOOR &lt;CHANGE&gt;</td>
<td>[Te] ⇔ (Gr: [St] [St] [St]) ⇔ [St] [St] [St]...</td>
<td>CHANGE, COURAGE, POTENTIAL POSSIBILITIES,…</td>
<td>Added value to the students; balance between know-how and experimentation; choice to the students</td>
<td>Use of tacit knowledge; teaching process + reflection &amp; assessment of pedag. success</td>
<td>Digital Literacy iPads,…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLASS DOOR &lt;DEVELOPMENT&gt;</td>
<td>[Te] [Te] [Te] ... ⇔ [St] [St] [St]... ⇒ ...</td>
<td>LEARN, SHARE, TRAIN AND COACH THE OTHERS</td>
<td>Community of practice; organization pedagogies; shared expertise</td>
<td>dialogic interaction in virtual environment [Te] ⇔ [St]; shared aims, planning, implementation</td>
<td>Flexibility in the choice of digital tools; innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Steel Door

"A conflict triggers action"

What to do? Begin by small steps; do not aim for a big leap!

When digitalizing teaching, the teacher may worry about unexpected changes in pedagogics, interaction and control (Niinivaara, 2018)

What are the limitations of digitalized teaching? Why? Has a colleague solved a similar problem? Would it be possible to teach by using authentic materials available or sharing assignments on the Internet?
The Oak Door

<Change>

What to do?
Try to give some of the power to the students: leave them some of the implementation choices

The TEACHER:
* Often selects the pedagogical and technological approaches (Rytkönen, 2014)
* Often selects the tools by him/herself. The wrong choice is then "the teacher's fault" (Niinivaara & Vaattovaara, 2018)

The STUDENT:
* Should be treated as adults (at university level)
* In language learning, the students are responsible for their studying and their interaction (Wallinheimo, 2016)
* COLLABORATION: Studying approaches and tools should be chosen together with the students (mm. Jalkanen, 2015; Niinivaara, Vaattovaara, 2017)

Is it essential for the teacher to know where the students interact and monitor all of this? What is the context and environment where the students use language(s)? Anything the teacher could learn from the students?
The Glass Door

<Development>

What to do? Aim at developing your working community; be tolerant with work-in-progress

Community of Practice (Wenger, 1998)

Comprehensive leadership of educational institutions (Pietiläinen, 2010)

Learning community (Engeström et al)

How and where to share the results of the experiments? How to help the colleagues? Have you discussed the aims of digital pedagogics in meetings or corridor discussions? Is experimentation / trial-and-error accepted in the working community?
Conclusions:

There is **no single big leap of digitalization**! Rather, the change is gradual, continuous, dynamic and flexible; consists of several interacting dimensions!

**Criticality! What really works and supports learning?**

Digitalization is not just about implementing technical solutions. It has an impact on interaction and the way people operate:

1. by themselves and in
2. student groups
3. work community, and
4. society as a whole

... and eventually is reflected back to teaching and learning
Any questions, comments...?
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