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Abstract

Teaching during the remote episodes of the Covid pandemic demonstrated that the majority of classroom teachers replicated classroom practices rather than adapting to a new system for learning. During the rapid shift online, professional development of teachers focused on upskilling rather than changing and challenging teaching practices. As a result, students were unmotivated and disengaged. The problem now exists that teachers are stuck with a lack of understanding of how to teach online with the likelihood of further external uncontrollable occurrences. Additionally, there is no roadmap forward on how to harness the benefits of learning online through the emerging flexible modalities of blended or hybrid teaching in schools. The current risk is that schools return to classroom based pedagogies and miss the opportunities that learning online brings. In this paper I draw from research and experience in the field of educational technologies, online and digital pedagogies, and teacher professional learning. I bring together these understandings to address this crucial stage in schooling offering a way forward. To do this, there is a need to pause in time, to reflect on what is known and what is important to consider to be able to move forward effectively. As such I firstly examine the rush to get online and the frenzied up-skilling of teachers so that we have a better understanding of what skills were developed. I then synthesises the literature to identify what pedagogical skills are needed to effectively teach online in a classroom context. Drawing extensively from theories and empirical studies over the last 30 years I then present a roadmap forward that offers professional development of a different kind identifying the need to change teachers' practices from replicating the classroom or tooling them to teaching effectively online.
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1. Introduction: The problem in schools now

The shift to online learning in schooling happened and will continue to happen, with the move to hybrid, blended and or recurrences for the need for off-school campus remote teaching approaches (Starkey et al., 2021). Whether this integration of online learning is a response to social, economic, education and or environmental factors, governments worldwide have demonstrated that the continuation of education is a necessity through online approaches (Ferri et al., 2020; Winters, 2021). However, evidence suggests that teachers’ first move to online learning, which in the majority occurred during the Covid19 pandemic, indicated that they were unprepared for such a pedagogical shift (Reimers, 2022). Due to the lack of professional development and the swift need to get online teachers first response was to using online tools in ways that mirrored classroom practices (Ewing & Cooper, 2021). Additionally, this was considered effective (Howard et al., 2021). It has been clearly evidenced that classroom based practices do not transfer effectively to the online learning space as the environment is different requiring different pedagogical approaches (Barbour et al., 2020). The concern, therefore, emerges with both a lack of knowledge and understanding that classroom teachers have to teach effectively online.

As a result there has been a major international call for developing and supporting teacher competence in effective online pedagogical practices (Bond & Bergdahl, 2023; Delcker & Ifenthaler, 2021; Reimers, 2022) with specific identification of professional learning needs such as teachers’ pedagogical competencies to facilitate learning online, create clear instructions, provide feedback and keep students engaged (Howard et al., 2021; Yates et al., 2020). These pedagogical competencies have been identified as critical to the online learning dynamic which is based on a networked system of user engagement (Prestridge et al., 2021). This online networked learning system orientates to users, that is students, engaging in many to many communication practices rather than one to one. One to many communication is more reflective of traditional classroom based system of engagement, being teacher to students. What was observed during the remote teaching periods was a domestication of an online networked learning system.

Teachers were domesticating the technology, that is, trying to make the online system fit the same ways of learning that happen in the classroom (Bigum, 2012). Domesticating technology draws back to Green and Bigum’s (1993) call for new pedagogies, new philosophies for these new kinds of media rich students (aka Aliens) in the classroom rather than doing the same kinds of practices with the new technologies. Online tools and systems can be considered here. The popular quiz based tools such as Kahoot is easily domesticated as it requires the same traditional kinds of classroom practices for content revision and practice (see Pfirman et al., 2021). In essence, teachers choose these online tools as they easily fit the practices of the classroom. Whereas online learning systems like forum discussions work on a network system of engagement which is different. To use a forum effectively it is better not to domesticate it, that means building the student interactions rather than dominating interactions by the teacher.

This domestication of technology to fit the teaching structures and practices of the classroom directs and controls students engagement within a limited system dominated by the teacher. Students are not engaging freely with each other rather they are responding to the teachers’ communication demands. Teachers’ domestication of the online learning environment were evidenced during remote teaching in that they chose particular digital tools to engage students with or used tools in ways that limited students communication systems to the one to many practices. In this way teachers asked students to respond to them in the main or did not organise student to student engagements. Some examples of domestication of the online learning space include the implementation of practices such as creating teacher made video content and sending these out to students and or providing written material for students to complete with little interaction around this content or peer to peer engagement with this content. Other examples include schools that timetabled learning at home zoom sessions that replicated school 40 min subject-learning periods and also replicated classroom instruction such as a teacher teaching off a whiteboard or presenting a PowerPoint. Ewing and Cooper (2021) concurred and found that during the remote teaching period teachers were able to support students’ connection to content but were unable to achieve other aspects of effective online learning such as social and cognitive engagement.

This initial domestication of online learning using classroom based teaching practices can be theorised from long-standing categories of technology use: such as teachers’ supplementing practices with technologies rather than transforming their pedagogical practices to be effective within a new digital environment or with a new digital tool (Ertem et al., 2012; Prestridge & de Aldama, 2016). We are currently at an important juncture in education to turn back to only classroom based teaching and learning or build on remote teaching and learning experiences and transform our approaches in blended or more flexible modes of schooling. The latter is needed, especially in case of future pandemics and the need to shift rapidly online.
To transform pedagogical practices so that new approaches are adopted by teachers when using online tools and environments, two elements are required. Firstly, an understanding of the learning tool or online digital ‘networked’ system. Secondly, a shift in teachers’ mindset about how they are teaching, often considered as a change in pedagogical beliefs which identifies the pedagogical reasoning for using technologies in particular ways (Ertmer, 2005; Prestridge, 2012). Both are needed and will be explored in this review. In the next section, effective online teaching and learning pedagogies will be examined within an Australian context. Following this will be a roadmap forward which considers how to change teachers’ practices so that they experience a shift in their pedagogical beliefs that appropriate a change in how they understand and teach online. Unless we can do this, we will have continual domestication of online technologies.

2. Establishing online pedagogical practices within a classroom context

In this section flexible learning is considered when students and teachers are using digital tools where the interaction is online not wholly virtual or distance education. In Australia, this could mean that students and teachers are at a distance; or the teacher is teaching children in the classroom and other students online at the same time; or that the digital tool is being used as part of classroom based instructions but the interaction between the students is online and can be done as part of classroom activities or outside of classroom time. This has been defined as a blended approach (Ryan et al., 2016) but there are many definitions and grey lines between online learning, distance learning and hybrid approaches (Singh & Thurman, 2019). This work examines the component of learning that occurs through online digital tools or in an online environment in relation to the classroom engagements. This section will explore what can happen online in terms of engagement to explore the opportunities of student interactions beyond interactions with content alone or teacher-centred presentations.

We know that teaching online is different to in-person teaching and teachers are considered as learning engineers rather than instructors when online. As a learning engineer the teacher’s role is to facilitate or ‘engineer’ engagement, engagement being the key to unlocking the potential of online learning (Bluec et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2020; Yen et al., 2018). Noted through the pandemic, studies by Ewing and Cooper (2021), Howard et al. (2021) and Yates et al. (2020) indicated that there was a lack of student social and cognitive engagement. As a teacher then, to engineer social-cognitive engagement online through a Microsoft Teams discussion forum or a synchronous Zoom chat, student engagement can be considered in three ways online: 1. Student to student to teacher; 2. Student to content; and 3. Student to interface (see conceptual frameworks proposed by Moore, 1989 and Hillman et al., 1994). In drawing these three together, a key proponent of online learning is engineered by the teacher by harnessing themselves as a critical co-learner supporting students’ interactions with other students around the content, bounded within a digital interface which affords certain kinds of interactions.

How does a teacher engineer online student engagement around the content within the interface? Many studies and reviews highlighted that in order to develop student to student interactions, there needs to be teacher to student interactions to help facilitate this (Bervell et al., 2020; Prestridge et al., 2023), especially in the early stages of an online learning task or component of learning or when using a new digital tool (Bervell et al., 2020). Prestridge et al. (2023) identified that teachers first connect students individually to the online place before they are able to develop student co-engagement. However, only low levels of teacher to student interactions are necessary to maintain progress on group activities and discussions (Borokhovski et al., 2012). In other words, once an online learning system is created the teacher’s role is more active at the beginning phase moving to a co-participant or co-learner through the on-going discussion or activity. This is also evident in Dalke and Norton’s (2023) practitioner research on the use of online socratic seminars. This work identified the critical role of structure and scaffolding to support student engagement with each other and the content, more intensively at the beginning of the online course. Additionally, in order to generate discussion between students, encouragement and prompting is often an essential feature of the teachers’ role. Through the role of the modeller the teacher is teaching how to learn online and how to appropriately engage (Dubuclet et al., 2015).

For teachers to engineer student engagement with others around content both the design of the online activity plus the engagement type needs to be considered (Bervell et al., 2020; Dubuclet et al., 2015; Herman et al., 2018). When teachers engineer online collaborative inquiry student engagement can be considered in terms of three engagement types: cognitive engagement- students’ discipline strategies, application of ideas and persistence in problem-solving; social engagement- students interests and attitudes; and behavioural engagement-learning habits and study skills (refer to the seminal works of Fredricks et al., 2004; Jones, 2008; Skinner & Belmont, 1993), Borup and Archambault (2023) suggest that teachers consider these as engaging students’ hands (behavioural); hearts (affective); and heads (cognitive) and that there are scales of passive to interactive to creative engagement which can help identify and or design online activity. Adding to this, both Bond and Bergdahl (2023) and Prestridge et al. (2023) identify the need for social engagement as part of online activity to facilitate a supportive online environment. It has been suggested that components of online learning can be designed as project-based or inquiry-based so that temporal and discursive practices are at the forefront of online activities (Borokhovski et al., 2012; Kalogeropoulos et al., 2021; Sullivan et al., 2020). To support student engagement through online collaborative inquiry Kalogeropoulos et al. (2021) suggest reducing the quantity of tasks online with the teacher taking greater direction to facilitate student interactions and feedback while Sullivan et al. (2020) encourage the teachers to utilise student responses as teaching opportunities and for student to student feedback.

Evident here from the k-12 online literature reviewed, teachers are able to utilise online tools or environments for student
engagement with each other around the content however a pedagogical shift is required from instructor to co-learner, modeller and co-contributor. This has been well considered in our understandings and experiences of remote, distance and online teaching research literature. These roles reflect the work of Erica McWilliam’s (2008) long-standing call to ‘unlearn’ the pedagogical habits that are no longer valuable for new communication mediums. McWilliam posed a new category of the teacher’s role beyond the Sage-on-the-stage and Guide-on-the-side to harness the pedagogical affordances of new technologies. In this she proposed that teachers adopt the role of a ‘Meddler-in-the-middle’ where mutual involvement in teaching and learning is argued as the dominant requirement for a post millennial social world. The ‘Meddler in the middle’ represents a pedagogical shift to new ways of working with technologies and students. It is to this that we now turn, in exploring just how to shift teachers’ pedagogies to ‘Meddle in the middle’.

3. Professional development of a different kind

Most teachers are prepared for and have only experienced classroom-based pedagogies which have strong cultural cues for learning behaviours, rules and student engagement practices (Shernoff, 2013). As such, teachers were unprepared for the rapid shift to remote teaching and how to, if at all, adopt new practices for an online environment distinctly unfamiliar and different to the classroom. Added to this, is the complex situation that simply transferring traditional instructional practices from the classroom to the online environment are doomed to fail (Peltier et al., 2007). This domestication of the online environment was evidenced by student disengagement and lack of motivation during the remote schooling period (Ewing & Cooper, 2021). Also during the pandemic we saw a rapid movement to upskill teachers and help them understand online instruction through courses, school based training and through their own social media networks and communities (Prestridge & Cox 2020; Trust et al., 2020; Ulla & Perales, 2021). These professional development opportunities were more responsive to technical, pedagogical and social-emotional support rather than the need for pedagogical change, exploration and reformation.

It has long been established that professional development in educational technologies focuses on supporting teachers’ effective pedagogical use of technologies rather than upskilling the teacher on the functions of a digital tool (Lieberman & Miller, 2014). Little, in her early work in the 1990s on the role of professional development in educational reform, proposed that the validity of professional development should be evident in its capacity to equip teachers to act as shapers, promoters and well-informed critiques of reform. Before the pandemic, Philippsen et al. (2019) reiterated as part of professional development of online and blended learning pedagogies that teacher change is a pivotal component, especially for the teacher’s roles and their pedagogical beliefs. Moreover, professional development is considered to involve changes in a teacher’s capacity for practice associated with shifts in professional knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and or mindsets, especially if it is associated with the teacher’s needs and interests and therefore situated within their teaching practice (Albion et al., 2015). These types of attributes are second order barriers to the integration of technologies (Ertmer, 2005) and have been found to be much more difficult to shift but have greater potential for enabling effective appropriation of digital technologies (Prestridge, 2017). Clearly, changing teachers’ pedagogical beliefs as part of professional learning and development so teachers begin to ‘Meddle in the middle’ and engineer learning online is critical to this current pursuit. How to change pedagogical beliefs and what elements of professional development are needed is now considered.

Beliefs that form through personal experience are called underived beliefs and beliefs are established during earlier experiences and become stronger over time as they are used to process subsequent experiences (Pajares, 1992). Teachers’ pedagogical beliefs are supported by strong Prestridgeity and broad consensus (Albion & Ertmer, 2002) and are not easily changed. Comas-Quinn (2011) suggest that one’s educational beliefs are strongly related to certain role attributions teachers hold towards themselves and their students. According to Nespor (1987) when beliefs change, it is more likely a conversion or a Gestalt shift, rather than as a result of a marshaling of evidence. In this sense a disruption to the belief and belief system occurs and the individual ends up dissatisfied with their existing beliefs (Posner et al., 1982). This suggests that pedagogical beliefs must be challenged in some way for a belief to change. With regard to professional development, the seminal work of Guskey (2002) proposes that when teachers’ try something new in their classroom and there is a change in student behaviour, learning outcome, interaction and or instruction that then affects a change in a teacher’s belief. This ‘change’ seen by the teacher creates the disruption, the Gestalt shift, causing the new practice to be trialled again, re-implemented and with on-going experiences, the new pedagogical practice is maintained. In essence, the trialling of a practice precedes change in beliefs, which is congruent with one’s experiences in the formation of beliefs. Maintaining that practice then becomes critical to ongoing reformation of beliefs that inform and reform practice. However, it is important to first establish teachers’ pre-existing beliefs so that these can be open to examination and discussion as part of professional implementation, learning and development (Levin & Wadmany, 2005).

The pandemic period and the shift to remote teaching forced teachers into an experimental period where new teaching practices were being trialled. This exploration would have led to many disruptions, many new understandings about how students learn online and many trials of different pedagogical strategies. However, as indicated previously, professional development during this time was more oriented towards pedagogical and technical support rather than challenging how teachers were designing learning and what beliefs were informing these practices.
4. Looking forward to disrupting how to teach online

In the context of supporting teachers to effectively use online digital tools and environments it is important to consider that change in both pedagogical beliefs and practices are necessary. Providing only training on digital tools without change in pedagogical beliefs there will be no change in teaching practice, domestication of the online system will be maintained. This brings to light implications for teacher professional development, such as, the requirement of developing a conscious ‘knowledge-of-practice’ (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2001) where teachers come to know and understand their beliefs that inform their practices, actively exploring the ‘truth’ and ‘reality’ of these beliefs during implementation of their practices. This ensures that classrooms or the ‘online-classroom’ becomes the site for professional inquiry around which reflection and critical discussion with colleagues occurs (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Additionally, there is a need for an extended period of professional engagement for reformation of beliefs to be strengthened (see Levin, 2015; Miranda & Daminco, 2015).

The remote teaching period provided time to trial and explore online teaching and learning practices. Harnessing these disruptions as critical professional learning events is needed to continue the reformation process, especially as teachers are now blending online and exploring new possibilities for teaching in and beyond the classroom. It is important to remember that professional learning has to be disruptive while also being supportive. Collegiality in professional learning is fundamental in building trust and camaraderie but without the opportunity to engage with colleagues in critique there is no need for collegiality or the professional learning community. In other words, a learning community is built on camaraderie but without the opportunity for learning to occur through critique, there is no point in membership (Prestridge, 2007; Prestridge, 2009). Fundamentally, teachers learn through professional communities as they are given the opportunity to reflect and discuss, online in their networks or in the school, based within their classroom context (Trust & Prestridge, 2021). It is in these communities where ideas need to be disrupted.

As I have found with over twenty years of research in this field of pedagogical transformation for the effective use of educational technologies, the key principles for professional development which we have shifted away from now needs to return: that is, to be disruptive with critiques and constructive in our collaborative discourse; examine what drives pedagogies, what sits behind the online teaching practices within the context of praxis. These key ideas can be contextualised to suit new and different learning events. Pedagogical beliefs are hard to shift but can be shifted. It is only then that change can happen, and we need change.
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First, let me say that I think that the authors have done a great job in walking the line between the remote learning that we have seen over the past three years and established online and distance learning programs. With respect to this point, one of the things that would strengthen this manuscript would be the inclusion of either https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning (more higher education focused) or https://k12sotn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/understanding-pandemic-pedagogy.pdf (a more K-12 focused from roughly the same authors).

Having said that, this manuscript also suffers from a common issue that we have seen within the field since the advent of the pandemic... The world moves the K-12 system to a remote format, and legions of scholars "discover" K-12 distance and online learning. As I review this manuscript and, in particular, the reference list I see no sign of any awareness of the scholarship related to K-12 online learning over the past three decades or the over half century of literature related to K-12 distance learning. The references that are used are all focused on other COVID-related literature, distance learning with adult populations, and K-12 technology integration. A review of the 384 distinct authors from the 356 journal articles reference in https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2018.1553566 would be useful (and the authors have included their data set as a supplemental file according to the article).

Scholars who should be referenced include:

- online teaching: Archambault, Borup, Cavanaugh, Davis, Ferdig, Kennedy, Murphy, Oliver, Rice - to name a few
- professional development related to online teaching: Archambault, Dawley, Kennedy, Rice - to name a few

Table 2 (i.e., the top authors in the field based on the journal article analysis) in the article provide the more prolific scholars in the field that have been ignored in this piece.
Similarly, articles 2, 4, 10, 11, 12, 17, and 18 in Table 5 (i.e., the top 20 cited articles) are all relevant to the content being discussed in this manuscript; as are the entries for 1995, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2011, and 2012 in Table 6 (i.e., top cited articles each year).

If the goal of research is to build upon what is known, it is important for scholars to ground their scholarship in the fields in which they are writing. The complete absence of any of the top 20-25 authors in the field, the absence of almost any or any of the authors from either of the two editions of the Handbook of Research on K-12 Online and Blended Learning, and absence of any citations from the Journal of Online Learning Research (i.e., the only journal in the field that publishes exclusive K-12 distance, online, and blended learning articles), all suggest to an informed reader that as well meaning as the author(s) are and as important as they work that they have conducted might be, it likely won't be found and won't have an impact on the field of K-12 distance, online, and blended learning because it fails to build upon anything the field has learned over the past decades.
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Comments on this article
Firstly, thank you for taking the time to provide feedback. I really appreciate it and having reviewed your comments I have gained some further insights. I did read both the Dec 2020 report on *Understanding Pandemic Pedagogy* report as well as the analysis of literature on K-12 online learning which you authored. I also read chapters from the recent Handbook of ODDE. I will incorporate these as indicated below to reinforce ideas presented in this short exploratory essay. I'd like to respond with a few points.

1. I have personalised the abstract to position this short essay so that my background is known (Ed Tech, online and digital pedagogies and PL) and the Australian context.

2. This essay, as you identify, comes from a classroom based ‘educational technologies’ perspective as the focus was on moving or shifting classroom based pedagogies by incorporating online options during class or as part of new flexible pathways. This was not focused on virtual schools or distance school. I have made this clearer in section 2 by adding “not wholly virtual or distance education”.

3. The main point was to emphasise a deliberate ‘disrupting of ideas’ or ‘transforming’ pedagogical beliefs approach which may help teachers to teach more effectively when using online spaces (in relationship to classroom).

4. Classroom or school based flexible approaches that use aspects of online delivery are different to fully online delivery which has been identified clearly from the authors you referred me to. I think it's an interesting 'in between' space or as Stephen Heppell calls it- the 'nearly now' space. The relationship or pull to classroom pedagogies is stronger.

5. Your references to K-12 online learning, I have incorporated into this into Section 2 and retitled for clarity: *Establishing online pedagogical practices within a classroom context*. I agree that the k-12 online literature, is minimal, scattered but growing. It is here that looking to the ODDE literature can further support this idea of student engagement as a game-changer. I have drawn on Bond & Bergdahl's 2023 and Borup & Archambault's (2023) frameworks for designing and facilitating student engagement. But it is important also to refer to empirical studies which there is still a dearth (as indicated in Arnesen 2019- your scholarship review) but both practitioner research of Dalke's 2023 (published in JOLR) and also a recent empirical study I led on how teachers' engineered student engagement through a social presence theoretical lens (Prestridge, etal 2023).

6. Agree in the removal of some of the Higher Ed online literature -see list below.

7. Thank you for referring me to the Journal of Online Learning Research (JOLR). It is open access but it is not available unless you go directly to LearnTechLib site.

8. With regard to professional development the message was focused on epistemologies to disrupt and challenge rather than training approaches for knowledge and skills to teach in...
virtual or distance schools. Looking to both your article (Virtually unprepared) and Hodges, Barbour & Ferdig 2022; plus Rice & Dawley 2009 status of PD for K-12 Online, there is evidence of course work, seminars and workshops for building inservice teachers' capabilities. However, this essay, as an idea or a start, focused on shifting core pedagogical beliefs as an approach to include classroom teacher's PD for effectively using online spaces (in relation to the classroom).

9. This essay identifies domestication and the complex process to change pedagogical beliefs and practices.
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