

# Barriers to and Strategies for Faculty Integration of IT

**Thomas M. Brinthaupt**

*Middle Tennessee State University, USA*

**Maria A. Clayton**

*Middle Tennessee State University, USA*

**Barbara J. Draude**

*Middle Tennessee State University, USA*

## INTRODUCTION

At most institutions of higher education, faculty members wear many “hats.” Among other responsibilities, they are expected to teach, conduct research, and participate in institutional and public service. Within the teaching realm, faculty members have always had multiple responsibilities. For example, in addition to being content experts, they may need to become course design, assessment, communication, community or interaction experts. Instructors can be described as architects, consultants, resources, reviewers, and role models (Oblinger & Hawkins, 2006). It is primarily (though not exclusively) in the teaching realm where instructional technology (IT) is relevant. The more that faculty utilize IT, the more the non-content aspects of teaching become salient.

Depending on level of faculty expertise, asking them to increase the time and effort they put into their teaching might reduce the time and effort they can devote to research, service, and other institutional requirements and responsibilities. Why should they, especially if there is very little acknowledgment or tenure/promotion credit given for incorporating IT into their teaching? This is, in part, why many faculty members may have to be dragged “kicking and screaming” into using these technologies.

## BACKGROUND

To address the predicament faced by faculty, it would be helpful to provide some guidelines on how to balance multiple roles (and the time and effort required). However, there do not appear to be any models that

deal with this challenge. One way to help understand the process of IT adoption is to consider the different roles or positions of individual faculty members. For example, non-users of IT face a much steeper learning curve than do instructors who have partially or fully integrated IT into their teaching. Learning to use IT might, therefore, be thought of as a socialization process.

In their model of socialization to groups, psychologists Moreland and Levine (2000) highlight the importance of the processes of evaluation, commitment, and role transition. In particular, in order to acquire a new identity as a group member, an individual must pass from being a prospective member to a new member to a full member. This passage is a function of how both the group and individual evaluate each other, their respective levels of commitment to each other, and the eventual transition in roles as the individual passes into and through the group.

For purposes of this chapter, we assume that higher education faculty go through a similar socialization process with IT integration. In particular, they must first evaluate the IT options available to them and determine if using those options is feasible. If their commitment to integrating IT into their teaching is high enough, they may begin learning about those options, depending on the support and resources of their institution. This learning process might shift the instructor’s role from a prospective user to a new user and eventually to a full user of IT. The barriers to IT integration vary depending on the user roles that faculty play in this socialization process, how they evaluate IT, their own and their institution’s levels of commitment to its use, and their IT learning curve. Table 1 presents a developmental model of faculty integration

*Table 1. Developmental model of faculty integration of IT*

<b>Role</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Commitment</b>	<b>Learning Curve</b>
Non-user	Negative or neutral	Low	Very Steep
Prospective user	Negative, neutral, or positive	Low to medium	Very Steep
New user	Negative, neutral, or positive	Medium to high	Steep
Experienced user	Positive	High	Moderately steep

*Table 2. Major barriers to IT integration in higher education*

<b>Technology-Related</b>	Wide range of IT Options
	Role Conflict
	Pace of IT Improvements & Innovations
<b>Academic-Related</b>	Time & Effort
	Academic Quality of Courses
	Incentives & Compensation
	Tenure & Promotion
	Job Security

of IT loosely based on Moreland and Levine's (2000) group socialization model.

Both non-users and prospective users of IT may not adopt it for several reasons. They may negatively evaluate the use of IT, lack the time and effort necessary to commit to its use, or fear the steep learning curve that awaits their efforts to integrate IT into their teaching. New IT users are more likely to evaluate its use favorably and to have more commitment to using it, yet will still have a steep learning curve. Of course, if new users' initial experiences are negative, they will be less likely to increase their commitment to and use of IT. Experienced users will typically show positive evaluations, high levels of commitment, and less steep learning curves. However, with each of these roles, there are potential barriers that limit the initial or continued integration of IT into faculty members' teaching.

## PERCEIVED BARRIERS

Even assuming adequate levels of training, support, and access, there are many barriers to faculty members' adoption and integration of instructional technologies. Table 2 lists some of the major technology-related and academic-related barriers to IT use in higher education.

Prospective IT users may have the misconception that they should learn about and use IT because it makes teaching and learning more convenient. This may be true to some extent, but it is no more true than the claim that instructors use a textbook for convenience. In this sense, there is nothing special about new instructional technologies. Whether one is talking about a pencil, a textbook, a whiteboard, or a 21<sup>st</sup> Century classroom, these are all tools along a continuum. Even if faculty members do not see it this way, their Net Generation students increasingly look at many of these new technologies as "pencils" (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005), and those students use the technologies for multiple purposes (Donlevy, 2005). However, for faculty, this is one of the most obvious barriers when facing emerging technologies—the ever increasing, wide range of options. Even when they evaluate the use of IT favorably and are committed to integrating it into their teaching, they quickly become alarmed at how many different pencils they need to sharpen! The fear of failing to master these applications is also quite real (Beggs, 2000). Even for instructors who are experienced IT users, learning to use additional existing or new technologies can be a formidable challenge.

The content realm is probably valued most highly by the majority of faculty members. However, when new technologies are added to the changing charac-

6 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/barriers-strategies-faculty-integration/11748](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/barriers-strategies-faculty-integration/11748)

## Related Content

---

### Collaborative E-Learning Using Semantic Course Blog

Lai-Chen Luand Ching-Long Yeh (2008). *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies* (pp. 85-95).

[www.irma-international.org/article/collaborative-learning-using-semantic-course/1731](http://www.irma-international.org/article/collaborative-learning-using-semantic-course/1731)

### Winning an E-Learning Proposal or Grant

Karl M. Kapp (2005). *Encyclopedia of Distance Learning* (pp. 2044-2050).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/winning-learning-proposal-grant/12390](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/winning-learning-proposal-grant/12390)

### Analysis of Efficiency and Effectiveness in the Implementation of the Flipped Classroom in the Context of Higher Education: Experimental Results

Sergio Francisco Sargo Ferreira Lopes, Luís Borges Gouveiaand Pedro Reis (2021). *Handbook of Research on Determining the Reliability of Online Assessment and Distance Learning* (pp. 244-261).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/analysis-of-efficiency-and-effectiveness-in-the-implementation-of-the-flipped-classroom-in-the-context-of-higher-education/266551](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/analysis-of-efficiency-and-effectiveness-in-the-implementation-of-the-flipped-classroom-in-the-context-of-higher-education/266551)

### E Learning in Engineering Education: Design of a Collaborative Advanced Remote Access Laboratory

Jagadeesh Chandra A.P.and R.D. Sudhaker Samuel (2010). *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies* (pp. 14-27).

[www.irma-international.org/article/learning-engineering-education/42092](http://www.irma-international.org/article/learning-engineering-education/42092)

### Persistence in Distance Education: A Study Case Using Bayesian Network to Understand Retention

Marianne Kogut Eliasquevici, Marcos César da Rocha Seruffoand Sônia Nazaré Fernandes Resque (2017). *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies* (pp. 61-78).

[www.irma-international.org/article/persistence-in-distance-education-a-study-case-using-bayesian-network-to-understand-retention/187247](http://www.irma-international.org/article/persistence-in-distance-education-a-study-case-using-bayesian-network-to-understand-retention/187247)