

WebQuests Revisited: A Variation on an Online Inquiry Model

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching Degree
School for International Training
Brattleboro, Vermont

By
Derek Keever

October 2008

Copyright Derek Keever 2008

Copyright Permission Form

The author hereby grants to the School for International Training permission to reproduce either electronically or in print format this document in whole or in part for library archival purposes only.

The author hereby grants the School for International Training the permission to electronically reproduce and transmit this document to the students, alumni, staff, and faculty of the World Learning community.

Author's Name _____

Author's Signature_____

Copyright Derek Keever, 2008. All rights reserved.

This project by Derek Keever is accepted in its present form.

Date _____

Project Advisor _____

Project Reader _____

Acknowledgments:

First, I would like to thank my reader Scott Mazak for his careful reading of and insightful comments on this paper. The idea for the Community WebQuest was adapted from a documentary proposal that he created. I would also like to thank Budd Wilkins for reading the paper and conversing with me throughout the writing of it. And finally, I would like to extend thanks to Patrick Moran, PhD for his guidance. His work has been a major influence on this project.

Abstract

WebQuests are a popular framework for guided, web-based inquiry. The primary goals of WebQuests are to help students develop higher-level thinking skills and knowledge application. This paper describes WebQuests and the rationale for using them. It presents modifications to the WebQuest model drawing primarily from Schema Theory and Experiential Learning. A revised model demonstrates how WebQuests can be used for cultural inquiry.

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Descriptors:

WebQuests

Cultural Inquiry

Frameworks

Guided Inquiry

Inquiry Models

Web-based Research

Table of Contents

Introduction.	1
Chapter 1 What are WebQuests?	4
Definition	5
Components	.6-12
Chapter 2 Critical attributes of WebQuests	16
Scaffolding and using web resources	17
Authenticity and Motivation	19
Open-ended questions and Individual expertise	20
Transformative Learning and Thematics	21
Meta-cognition	22
Chapter 3 Modifications	25
Schema Theory	26
Preparation Component	29
Experiential Learning Cycle	30
Reflection Component	31
Chapter 4 A WebQuest Example	38
Chapter 5 Final Thoughts	52
References	54
Useful Web Links	55

Introduction

Technological innovations, particularly advances in the World Wide Web, are changing the educational landscape, redefining the way we get information, altering the way we teach and learn. For instance, Web 2.0 has facilitated the design of information sharing and collaboration among users through developments such as social-networking sites, hosted services, wikis, blogs, and folksonomies. An increasing number of online classes are utilizing these developments, but are still catching up to the rapid changes.

Given these technological changes and educational realities, combined with the increasing availability of internet technology in the classrooms, how do we best organize learning experiences in a web-based environment? Tech-savvy teachers and educators have been experimenting with ways to exploit the internet, have been developing frameworks for organized inquiry on the web since the mid-1990s. For example, a very recent development, SurReal Quests, utilizes Second Life for virtual language-learning opportunities, CyberInquiry and WebQuests are frameworks for task-based online inquiry.

The focus of this paper is on WebQuests, defined in 1995 by Bernie Dodge as "an inquiry-oriented activity in which some or all of the information that learners interact with comes from resources on the internet, optionally

supplemented with videoconferencing" (Dodge, 1997). There are many teacher-designed WebQuests accessible online covering a wide range of topics, as well as online templates and resources that provide guidance for their creation.

This paper will be of interest to educators at all grade levels, including language teachers. College instructors and university professors, as well as teacher trainers may also find the information presented here useful. The primary purpose is to define the term WebQuest and illustrate how modifications can be made to suit individual teaching needs. For my own purposes, I have adapted the WebQuest model for facilitating cultural inquiry. I teach ESL to intermediate-advanced students in a community college setting. It is primarily a content-based course with a focus on culture learning and community-based research. I have included a WebQuest in the final chapter to illustrate the suggested modifications.

The Organization of the Paper

The first chapter defines the term WebQuest and briefly traces its evolution. It also describes a common template currently being used for designing WebQuests. The description names the constituent parts (Title, Introduction, Task, Process, Evaluation, and Conclusion) and details what should be included in each of these components.

The next chapter gives the critical attributes of a WebQuest and provides

the underlying principles for using a WebQuest. This is done by looking closely at the definition given by Tom March, one of the originators of WebQuests. The cognitive rationale, the constructivist nature, as well as collaborative aspects of WebQuests are examined, demonstrating the sound learning principles and traditional research methods underlying the inquiry model.

Chapter three proposes two modifications to the WebQuest framework: a Preparation component, and a Reflection component. The rationale for including the Preparation component comes from Schema theory and is organized in part by the K-W-L learning model. The purposes of the Preparation component are to activate schema and to develop autonomy by giving students more control and input into the direction of the task. The Reflection component is implemented with the Experiential Learning Cycle serving as the basis for its inclusion. This component offers students an opportunity to reflect on their learning, and gives teachers an explicit forum for feedback on the process.

As mentioned above, chapter four illustrates the modifications I have proposed with an example WebQuest. The example exemplifies how a WebQuest can be used for cultural inquiry. It is essentially a fictional scenario in which students take part in a federally-funded research project that aims to improve the quality of community life. The task uses Patrick Moran's Cultural Dimensions to organize research on Co-housing and the information is used to stimulate discussion on life in their communities.

Chapter 1

What are WebQuests?

A WebQuest is a framework for guided inquiry that uses web resources as the primary source of information. The WebQuest has been widely adopted in K-16 classrooms in more than 40 states in the USA, and in 10 countries and regions worldwide, including Australia, Brazil, Canada, Hong Kong, Germany, New Zealand (Zheng, Perez, Williamson, & Flygare, 2008). A search on any popular search engine for WebQuests will net you thousands of links to WebQuests on a wide range of topics and subjects. Teacher-authored WebQuests at all educational levels can be found on websites devoted to WebQuesting.

The popularity of WebQuests, the experimentation with WebQuests by educators around the world, as well as advances in technology have spurred the evolution of WebQuesting. Bernie Dodge coined the term WebQuest in 1995, while teaching a course on Technology for Teachers. In the first attempt to codify and frame WebQuests as a strategy for integrating the World Wide Web into the classroom, Bernie Dodge defined the WebQuest as "an inquiry-oriented activity in which some or all of the information that learners interact with comes from resources on the internet" (Dodge, 1997). In addition, WebQuests

...used headings to signal the critical attributes...Beyond the obvious

introduction and conclusion, the key features were the 'task', a 'set of information sources', a 'description of the process' involved in achieving the task, as well as some 'guidance on organizing the information' (Dodge, 1995). (March, 2007)

In 1995, Dodge and a graduate student in his program, Tom March, were curious about how to utilize this new framework, how to exploit the emerging internet technology to create meaningful online learning opportunities. Since 1995, March has regularly produced new WebQuests, conducted workshops, and experimented with ways to extend the understanding of what facilitates effective web-based learning (March, 2007). He offered an updated definition of WebQuests in 2007:

A WebQuest is a scaffolded learning structure that uses links to essential resources on the World Wide Web and an authentic task to motivate students' investigation of an open-ended question, development of individual expertise, and participation in a group process that transforms newly acquired information into a more sophisticated understanding. The best WebQuests inspire students to see richer thematic relationships, to contribute to the real world of learning, and to reflect on their own meta-cognitive processes. (March, 2007)

Taking a close look at the definition, we see that some of the key terms are scaffolding, authentic task, group process, and meta-cognitive processes.

Scaffolding is a term based in the work of Vygotsky. March uses it to describe the aid and assistance of expert to the novice, the help and guidance of teacher to student: questions to frame the research, links to necessary content for completion of a task.

By authentic task, March is referring to tasks that are relevant to students'

lives; tasks that have real implications and relevance to real-world events. For instance an authentic task might require students to research candidates in an upcoming election, investigate their perspectives, the communities to which they belong, as well as other relevant background information. The goal of these investigations could be to increase students' understanding of the candidates, what they stand for, who they should support and why.

Group process essentially means that the tasks are usually done-perhaps most effectively, even- in a collaborative manner. Students are given a research task and asked to share and evaluate information, with the goal of presenting findings to the larger class or in writing.

Meta-cognitive processes are in a sense reflective exercises that ask students to think about their own thinking in relation to the project, or to reflect on the process and the experience of the research task. The goal is to enhance learner autonomy by encouraging students to be mindful of how they think, and awareness of the processes they undergo to complete a task.

Components

So now that I have given the definition of a WebQuest and a brief introduction to some of the important terminology of the definition (I believe these brief explanations will suffice at this point, as I will discuss them at greater length later in the paper) I would like to turn to the constituent parts of a WebQuest. What follows is a brief description of what is commonly accepted as the

necessary elements of a WebQuest and the purpose of these components.

Currently what is considered a well-designed WebQuest usually consists of a Title, Introduction, Task, Process, Evaluation and Conclusion? There are several websites that offer free templates for the creation of WebQuests- essentially all you need to do is enter information into each component of the template.

Title

This section is where you include the Title, Description, Grade Level, Curriculum, and Co-authors. On some templates, like the one on zunal.com, you can upload images to enhance the aesthetics and add a visual element. This is also the place where you can add keywords so that your published WebQuest will be accessible from database searches.

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to introduce the topic, to prepare and hook the reader. By providing an engaging first statement you set the stage and tone for the entire WebQuest. A short paragraph is usually written to describe the activity or lesson to the students. If there is a role involved (e.g. "You are a member of a committee that must decide whether a Wal Mart should be built in your town.") then this is where it would be explicated. Generally the introduction provides an overview of what the project is about and includes the focus

question, the organizing principle around which the whole WebQuest is centered (Unal, 2008).

Task

The task describes what the students will do, specifically it details the end product that students will present, write up, or perform. This culminating product will be the driving force behind all the scaffolded activities and sub-tasks, and thus should be described clearly and cogently. The task could be for students to:

- Write a story
- Present research findings in a Power Point
- Develop a viewpoint on a topic
- Write an essay
- Compile a book of recipes
- Solve a mystery
- Articulate an aspect of their identity
- Or any task that requires students to find or discover information, then

analyze, synthesize and evaluate it. If there are any tools (such as video, cameras, recorders) to be used then they should be mentioned in the Task section (Unal, 2008).

Process

The process section describes and outlines how students will complete the

task. It lists, in explicit detail, the resources needed and the scaffolding steps required to complete the project. It is in the process component that learners will find and access (usually via hyper links and hypertexts) the online resources that have been identified by the teacher as integral or helpful to accomplishing the task. It is here also that the scaffolding of the task will be included: focus questions for the analysis of the information, guidance on the group's organization of the task, deadlines for specific parts of the process, as well as information or skills needed for the lesson (how to prepare and carry out an interview, how to use mindmaps, information on discourse structures, etc.).

Clearly describing the process the students will engage in to accomplish the task will help lower the affective filter of students; in addition, it will help other teachers see how the lesson flows, making the lesson easier to follow and adapt.

On the following page is an example of the process section in a WebQuest by Urszula Dobrosz from questgarden.com, entitled: "The Perfect Sweet". The task is to present a sales and marketing promotion plan for a product.

Preparing for sales & marketing plan:

First go to Cadbury Ltd. website [HTTP://www.cadbury.co.uk](http://www.cadbury.co.uk) . Find the product you are going to promote. Put down any notes you feel could be useful. Remember to get a bit of information about the company itself, which you might need later on.

Suggestions: a picture of your product could be useful, you can import it to your computer by right-clicking and choosing "Save Image As...". The same with Company logo.

Don't make your plan too detailed.

Guiding questions - things to think about...

- 1. Who is a target group for my product?*
- 2. What is the main benefit of my product?*
- 3. When my product may be consumed?*
- 4. What is the price acceptable for my consumers?*
- 5. How do I want to distribute this product?*
- 6. What are my company resources?*

The preparation for presentation is the most important and difficult part of your task. Organize yourself as you want, but remember to:

A. Introduce yourself, your company and your reason for coming

B. Target your customer's needs

C. Answer these needs in your presentation of your product

D. Give all the commercial data you can think of: not just the price! e.g. product shelf life, marketing support for the product, terms of payment. You may make things up if they remain reasonable!

E. Offer a degustation of the product, packaging presentation.

F. End your presentation in a very polite and formal way, so as to leave a good final impression!

Evaluation

This section provides the mode of assessment for the project. The assessment should align with the final project as described in the task section. Tom March has this to say about the evaluation of WebQuests: "Traditional evaluation techniques are not the best means for evaluating the results of WebQuests, since all students may not learn the same content. Individual evaluation rubrics should be developed that follow curriculum objectives and are easy for students to understand" (March, 1998).

Authentic assessment such as rubrics helps the growth of students rather than enumerating mistakes. By providing a detailed guide and framework of what will be assessed students are able to track their progress or performance in specific areas related to the task. For instance, in a language learning class, one criteria of the rubric could be to evaluate the ability to use proper transition markers in a presentation, another could be to make connections between the content and their own experience.

In figure 1 on the following page, I have included an assessment rubric template taken from Bernie Dodge's website.

Figure 1: Rubric Template from Bernie Dodge's website:

(<http://projects.edtech.sandi.net/staffdev/tpss99/rubrics/rubri-template.html>)

Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary	Score
	1	2	3	4	
<i>Stated Objective or Performance</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting a beginning level of performance.</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting development and movement toward mastery of performance.</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting mastery of performance.</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting the highest level of performance.</i>	
<i>Stated Objective or Performance</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting a beginning level of performance.</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting development and movement toward mastery of performance.</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting mastery of performance.</i>	<i>Description of identifiable performance characteristics reflecting the highest level of performance.</i>	

Conclusion

The conclusion brings closure to the WebQuest. It is your final statement and it should encourage reflection and promote extension and application of new knowledge to other areas. From the WebQuests that I have viewed these goals of reflection and extension are not always achieved, a subject I will return to this in a later chapter.

The components that I have described above (Title, Introduction, Task, Process, Evaluation, and Conclusion) are included in the most common templates being used on the web. R. Zheng in her article on WebQuests succinctly describes how these parts are typically formed into a lesson (a WebQuest) and used in the classroom.

Student-centered and inquiry based, the WebQuest is generally structured around a scenario of interest [Authentic task] to students who work in small groups by following the steps in the WebQuest model to examine the problems, propose hypotheses, search for the information with the web links provided by the instructor, analyze and synthesize the information using guided questions, and present solutions to the problems. Students are often assigned with certain roles in the group by working on the topics in the area in which they assume a role, students collectively [group process] contribute to the understanding of the issues with considerable breadth and depth. The instructor scaffolds learners through the entire learning process using a structured approach. The ongoing, formative assessment, which often takes the form of rubrics, is used to evaluate students' learning, the purpose of which is to help students learning rather than cataloging their mistakes. (Tomlinson, 1999) (Zheng et al., 2008, p. 296)

Zheng's description expounds upon some of the key terminology discussed earlier, specifically how these ideas interact in a WebQuest. An

authentic task that appeals to students' interest is chosen by the instructor, who then guides and assists through scaffolding, and finally assesses using a rubric that aids instruction by evaluating content and skills well as other dimensions of the learning process (group interaction, for instance).

Concluding Remarks

The key distinction that separates WebQuests from other types of inquiry models is that all the resources are web-based; all the research is done online. With the proliferation of internet use and the accompanying technological advances (online journal, eBooks, blogs, informative web pages, to name a few), it is now possible to do research projects using online material exclusively.

The online research can be done in or out of the classroom, depending on internet access, time or other contextual variables. The sharing of information and the re-working and preparation of the data for presentation are primarily done in the classroom, although students could be asked to meet and work on their project outside of class as well.

In closing, with newly emerging web literacies that are quite different from reading and interpreting books and other printed materials, it behooves educators to begin investigating ways of using and maximizing the potential of the internet as a pedagogical tool. As an illustration, my former professor and advisor who teaches Religious Studies at a public university in North Carolina related to me the need and concerns of his department to find ways to utilize the internet as a way to initiate and supplement their usual lessons, tasks and

research. As traditional modes of learning are giving way to, or combining with, electronic research, which require web-based literacies and different modes of learning, many educators are looking for ways to capitalize on the benefits of the internet as a learning tool.

Given these realities, and now that I have briefly discussed the evolution of WebQuests, offered a definition, described the purpose of the component parts, and briefly looked at how a WebQuest might play out in the classroom, I would now like to take a closer look at why WebQuests might offer an effective alternative to supplement traditional research. In the next chapter, I would like to discuss some of the underlying principles for the use of WebQuests in the classroom to better understand if, and how, WebQuests can contribute to the need for a greater emphasis on web-based teaching and research.

Chapter 2

Critical Attributes

Chapter one describes a WebQuest and details the constituent components and the purpose of each. This chapter will describe the critical attributes of WebQuests by returning to the definition given by March. The aim is to parse the aspects of the definition in order to explain the rationale for using WebQuests, and to determine the enhancements, if any, that the model offers to traditional research and organized inquiry.

In his seminal work titled 'Some thoughts on WebQuests' (1997), Bernie Dodge discusses the underlying principles for using WebQuests. Dodge utilizes the conceptual framework of Marzano, particularly from his 1988 article 'Dimensions of Thinking', to provide the cognitive basis for WebQuests. In chapter one, Marzano elaborates on some of the goals of education as put forth by various disciplines such as philosophy, education and psychology. One viewpoint that succinctly expresses the rationale for WebQuests is articulated below:

The goal [of education] is to develop mature thinkers who are able to acquire and use knowledge...model learners work actively to integrate new information with what they already know, to select important information, to make inferences beyond the information given, and to think strategically about their own learning. (Marzano, 1988, p. 14)

An effective WebQuest develops and enhances cognitive skills. Students search for information on the Web following a prescribed format that focuses on problem solving. A well-designed WebQuest requires students to go beyond simple fact finding. It asks them to analyze a variety of resources and use their creativity and critical-thinking skills to solve a problem. WebQuests promote higher-level cognitive processes by providing a framework for students to analyze, synthesize, evaluate and present information.

Tom March, who has worked closely with Dodge since 1996 on WebQuests, has given a definition of WebQuests and has expanded the cognitive basis for WebQuests to include the social aspects of Constructivist learning principles, implementation of authentic tasks for motivation, and development of individual expertise. In his article "What WebQuests Are (Really) (2007)", March discusses the critical attributes of a WebQuest by elaborating on each aspect of his definition. Here is March's definition given in chapter 1:

A WebQuest is a scaffolded learning structure that uses links to essential resources on the World Wide Web and an authentic task to motivate students' investigation of an open-ended question, development of individual expertise, and participation in a group process that transforms newly acquired information into a more sophisticated understanding. The best WebQuests inspire students to see richer thematic relationships, to contribute to the real world of learning, and to reflect on their own meta-cognitive processes. (March, 2007)

Scaffolding

The first critical element mentioned in the definition is taken from the Constructivist Theory of Learning: scaffolding.

Underpinning the WebQuest model is an aspect of cognitive psychology that says that if we want people who may be new to an endeavor to perform at more expert levels, we should examine what experts do and then prompt novices through a similar experience. (March, 2008)

Learners are provided with a well-defined task and are assisted in accomplishing the objective of the project by scaffolds. Examples of scaffolding are "activities that help students develop the right mindset, engage students with the problem, divide activities into manageable tasks, and direct students' attention to essential aspects of the learning goals" (Ngeow, 2001, p.3). Specific activities and supports that teachers provide for WebQuests are guiding questions, links to resources, hyper links and hypertexts that provide links to skills (for instance, presentation skills or technical language) necessary for completing the task.

Uses Essential Resources on the World Wide Web

A well-designed WebQuest facilitates meaningful use of essential web resources for educational ends (March, 2008). March defines essential resources as "interactive, media-rich, contemporaneous, contextualized, or of varied perspectives" (March, 2008). Examples of the types of websites that March advocates using are: (<http://www.kowaldesign.com/budget/>), found in the resources of the WebQuest "Look Who's Footing the Bill!" and Editorial Cartoons on School Shootings (<http://cagle.slate.msn.com/news/schoolshooting/>) in the WebQuest "Crool Zone?" (March, 2008). Both of these websites are interactive,

they provide historical contextual information, offer differing viewpoints, allow for comments on the content of the pages, and they also give users an opportunity to give feedback on the actual websites.

Authenticity and Motivation

Another criterion given for using WebQuests is that they provide motivation to students. When students are motivated their effort increases, they are more alert and ready to make connections. When motivated, students can more effectively focus on relevant details and ignore extraneous material. WebQuests contribute to motivation by asking a focal, open-ended question that requires an honest answer. When students are required to hypothesize, analyze, synthesize, evaluate and present real-world solutions to problems that go beyond the classroom, they are faced with an authentic task. An authentic task that is relevant to students' experience, that they engage with and receive feedback from their peers on, creates a community of learners striving to accomplish a common goal (March, 1998, p.3).

Another facet of WebQuests that motivates learners is the authenticity of the resources. Rather than reading the sometimes graded, doctored and abridged textbooks, learners can use updated and authentic research materials from the web: news stories, magazines, blogs, searchable databases (March, 1998, p. 3). Connecting authentic materials to students' interests and lives gives an extra incentive to students when working to accomplish a task.

Posing an open-ended question

March also notes that "attempts to motivate students are furthered by the use of probing, open-ended questions" (March, 1998). An open-ended question challenges students to do more than just learn facts but requires them to engage in a process of gathering information and knowledge application: seeking information, analyzing it, synthesizing, evaluating and presenting their findings.

Posing open questions also serve to activate prior background knowledge. that leads to a deeper understanding. March succinctly states this in "What are WebQuests (Really)?"

Further justification for questioning comes from schema theory and Constructivism. Because we want to support students as they transform information into new understanding, using a question can access prior knowledge, thus activating pre-existing cognitive networks of meaning. In addition, questions can create the cognitive dissonance that leads to investigation and assimilation of a more robust understanding. (March, 2008)

Development of individual expertise

Typically students participating in a WebQuest will assume a particular role within their group. For instance, consider a WebQuest on energy sources (oil, nuclear, etc.): the task is to decide, as a group, whether or not to recommend the continued use of the energy source. Each member of a group might be assigned a question to explore. (for example: How is the energy source refined? How is it transported to the user? Are there any natural disasters associated with the energy source?) Each student would then report and share their findings with the group and they would work toward the objective of the task. Thus, each person

would acquire and present a certain expertise on each element of the task.

Group process and Transformative Learning

Another criterion mentioned is the cooperative nature of the processing of information. In order to be a true "group process" (March's term) the task must require the learners to research a new topic, think critically, analyze and synthesize the information as a group. That is, they must make something new out of what they have learned through a dynamic exchange of researching and sharing information, comparing and discussing ideas, and working together to synthesize the culminating product.

March refers to this type of learning, this engagement with the materials as *transformative learning*. March gives an example of the type of task that brings about transformative learning:

Students are ...challenged with a Group Task such as: 'Based on its natural resources, social policies, main businesses, climate, and history, which state of those you've studied is most likely to be successful in the later 21st Century? Decide what criteria you will use to define and evaluate what it means for a state to be "successful". (March, 2008)

Rich Thematic Relationships

Another criterion for "real" WebQuests is providing links and websites that "entwine thematic and interdisciplinary relationships" (March, 2008). For instance, as educators we can supply contextual information as well as links and resources that "relate Picasso's 'Guernica' to inner-city graffiti, The Lord of the Flies to street children in Angola, or the War in Iraq to school violence" (March,

2008).

Providing this type of scaffolding helps students make logical connections among disciplines, and increases the chance for transferring knowledge from one context to another (March, 2008).

Meta-cognitive Learning Strategy

When students have a greater awareness of their own learning and thinking processes, research shows that they develop into more independent learners. The final goal is to eventually pull away the scaffolding so that in the end learners are more autonomous and self-initiated. In other words, by focusing students' attention on their cognitive processes, asking them to reflect upon how they learn, what helps or hinders their learning, they can better or more effectively understand how to relate their own knowledge and experience to new information and learning situations.

Summary

To sum up, the underlying principles of WebQuests are rooted firmly in Constructivist learning theory. The idea of problem-solving an authentic task that has a personal link to real world issues is grounded in the thinking of John Dewey, who felt that learning should involve both a social and a pragmatic focus. An authentic task and proper scaffolding provide motivation for students. Posing open-ended questions that require students to collaboratively transform new information enhances the development of critical thinking skills.

The fundamental constructs of WebQuests provide a fairly solid foundation for web-based inquiry. Studies on the effectiveness of WebQuests have reflected the core principles and attributes discussed above, as is shown below in Halat's (2007) report on the effects of this web-based inquiry model:

Strengths of This Strategy

- Is an alternative teaching technique that enhances students' motivation in class
- Serves as an alternative assessment tool of students' learning
- Gives students an idea of the student's degree of acquisition of knowledge and implementation of knowledge
- Provides teachers an opportunity to see and assess student's ability in using technology for learning.
- Enhances creativity.
- Enhances higher order thinking skills
- Requires students to be active learners
- Allows students to use the internet as an important tool

So given these strengths, what exactly are the enhancements to traditional research that the WebQuest model has to offer? From the examination of the critical attributes in this chapter, I feel that the model offers nothing particularly new in terms of traditional inquiry fundamentals and educational precepts. However, the convenience and flexibility of the framework gives educators a model to create online tasks to their specifications, to utilize and take advantage of web-based resources, and to exploit the emergent web-based literacies that require new pedagogical approaches.

WebQuests are one way to aid in the instruction of these literacies. The process of online research, the act of web-based investigations necessitates the

skills in things such as navigating web pages, downloading files, reading and interpreting blogs, images and video, and developing search skills. All these skills are becoming vital to participating and succeeding in an information-based society.

To conclude, the underlying principles of WebQuests mostly reflect my own core beliefs as a teacher. In addition, the online research focus, combined with technological advancement, opens a vast array of educational possibilities, and the flexibility offers interesting avenues for modification and adaptation. Thus, in the next section, I will propose modifications to the current framework using ideas primarily from Schema theory and Experiential Learning.

Chapter 3

Modifications

The ubiquitous use of the Internet and the continuous advancement of Web 2.0 technology have heightened interest among educators to develop frameworks for the meaningful use of web-based resources. WebQuests provide a solid inquiry model to help take advantage of the plethora of online resources, and the underlying principles for WebQuests give educators a firm foundation for developing meaningful tasks. Given the potential of WebQuests, I think it is important to take a critical look at and explore modifications of the WebQuest framework to accommodate a broader spectrum of learning objectives.

In this chapter I will make two modifications to a commonly used WebQuest model by adding two components: a Preparation and a Reflective component. The rationale for the Preparation component will be drawn primarily from cognitive science, particularly Schema Theory. The Reflective component enhancement will reflect modifications in the Experiential Learning Cycle, as well as the work of Moran (2001).

Schema Theory

The first modification I would like to suggest for enhancing the

effectiveness of the WebQuest model draws primarily from Schema Theory. WebQuests can be seen as part of a larger movement in learning theory beginning in the 1970s that moved away from behaviorist principles toward a more cognitive-based, schema-oriented paradigm. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant first introduced the term schema in his *Critique of Pure Reason*; he viewed them as mental constructions that "stood between or mediated the external world and internal mental structures; a schema was a lens that both shaped and was shaped by experience" (McVee, Mary B. 2005, Historical Review Section).

Schema theorists view learning as essentially the recognition of patterns; schemata are the information slots in our minds that organize knowledge, that represent stored information in memory. In other words, our acquired knowledge is stored in schemata and these constructions allow us to make sense of the world as we encounter new experiences.

Schema Activation

As a corollary, the interaction of background information with any new learning experience is essential for the construction and acquisition of new knowledge. Brewer (1984, p.120), in an attempt to address the role of schema in remembering knowledge and constructing new knowledge, wrote:

In brief, [schemata] are higher-order cognitive structures that have been hypothesized to underlie many aspects of human knowledge and skill. They serve a crucial role in providing an account of how old knowledge interacts with new knowledge in perception, language, thought, and

memory.

And Carrell, a major writer on Schema Theory, in 'Schema Theory and Reading', demonstrates the importance of Schema for the interpretation and deciphering of meaning.

A text only provides directions for listeners or readers as to how they should retrieve or construct meaning from their own, previously acquired knowledge. This previously acquired knowledge is called the reader's background knowledge, and the previously acquired structures are called schemata. (Carrell, Patricia L. 1983, p.556)

So given the active nature of interpretation, the interaction of previous knowledge with new experience, activation of schemata is a productive enhancement of knowledge acquisition.

Indeed, there is general agreement among Schema theorists and educators about the role that schemata play in the cognitive organization of information. In addition, many studies [see Ausubel (2000); Carr & Thompson (1996); Carrell (1983)], have demonstrated the effectiveness of schema activation, activating prior knowledge before engaging a new learning task. Specifically these studies have shown that new knowledge can be more easily stabilized and assimilated into the learner's cognitive structure, resulting in increased retention and enhanced connections between schematic constructs. Some schema activation activities include: Think-pair-share (discussions among pairs of students), jig-sawing (used to gather a lot of information in a short amount of time by dividing tasks among group members), role playing, and

graphic organizers (t-charts, concept maps, and the fishbone).

To sum up, Schema Theory offers a compelling rationale for educators to provide groundwork for students by activating, eliciting background knowledge prior to studying a new topic, engaging a new task, reading a new text. The cognitive benefits of schema activation, namely memory enhancement and the strengthening of connections between and among acquired schematic constructs have been demonstrated by numerous studies in the field.

Schema Acquisition

Given the rationale and positive attributes of schema activation, I would like to look briefly at the process of new schema acquisition, the way that new schemata are incorporated into our existing knowledge base. There is some debate as to the origin and development of schemata, how new schemata are acquired, and I think it deserves attention in this discourse as it has implications for how schema activation is achieved in the learning context.

The discussion centers around whether schema are of a dualist nature, are discreet entities "in the mind" and separated from the external world, or whether schema are socioculturally constructed and do not exist separately from the external world (Carrell, Patricia L. 1983).

Bartlet, one of the earliest Schema Theoreticians perceived schema as cultural constructs in memory (schema theory revisited). "Bartlett's research and writing point to schemata as more than in-the-head phenomena and provide a

basis for thinking of them as patterns that extend beyond the knower into the social and cultural world (Saito, 1996, 2000)" (Carrell, Patricia L. 1983, Historical Review Section).

In 'Schema Theory Revisited', Mcvee et al. gives a readable history of the development of Schema Theory, and articulates the notion that some schema theorists have overlooked the sociocultural aspects of schema development.

Although Bartlett is widely cited as the source of the term schema as a model for the organization of memory, the application of the concept to much cognitive science and psychological theory and research washes out the 'essentially social character' (p. 225) of schema to which Bartlett (1932) pointed, (p. 10). (Carrell, Patricia L. 1983, Historical Review Section)

For the purposes of this paper, I will not attempt to reconcile these conceptions of schema on a theoretical level, but I do feel the current discussion has important implications for teaching. Rather than taking a side on the discussion of the origin and nature of schema, I think the awareness that there are benefits of more social approaches to schema activation is the key inference from the discussion. From my own experience as a learner and as a teacher, I consider the social construction of schema a necessary consideration, and thus advocate the use of interactive schema activation techniques (questions and discussion, problem-solving tasks, experiential activities) prior to engaging the main task.

Preparation

In light of the above discussion, the first amendment to the WebQuest model I propose is to add a Preparation component. Including a Preparation component, beyond the cognitive attributes mentioned above, would offer other specific benefits. The first advantage would be to stimulate interest in the task and motivate students by allowing them to apply what they already know -- for instance, making predictions or offering solutions to a problem. "Interest is not a generic trait, it is something we develop...by knowing something about the subject in the first place...or by tying the information in front of us to something we already understand" (Rude, 2002, p.40). Discovering and making explicit what they already know and want to know contributes to students' increased interest and motivation and promotes a deeper understanding of the task.

Eliciting students' previous knowledge also serves the interest of teachers. On this basis, teachers can more effectively tailor WebQuest tasks to a specific group of learners. For instance, teachers can add or delete resources and links in the Process section, and refine the Task based on information gleaned in the Preparation section.

In addition, and considering that a given WebQuest would likely be one element of a larger curriculum, the Preparation component could serve to contextualize and link up the current task with the broader learning goals and objectives of the class.

Another related benefit of activating previous knowledge is providing a benchmark for students as they go through the learning task. Saliently marking a

starting point in students' knowledge of the topic gives them more insights into what they have learned at any given point in the task. For instance, a benchmark also could also provide a clear starting point in which to undertake a reflective writing process.

I feel that reflection on content and process is an important element in a well-designed task, and leads to a second modification that I propose, namely adding a Reflective Component to replace and encompass the Conclusion.

Reflection

The Conclusion Component in most WebQuests is little more than a perfunctory look back at the Task, an afterthought, or a way to offer praise for student work. The following is a Conclusion from a WebQuest developed by Angie Gunnell for a high school class entitled 'Oprah Winfrey'. The Task was for students to choose a current event (terrorism, a natural disaster, famine, were some of the choices) and then develop a rationale for why the American Government should get involved, offer help with the issue.

Conclusion

Thank you for doing this research for me. You did a great job, and I'm proud of you. I feel completely prepared to tape the show on your topic. I'm very excited about doing this series; it's important for our audience to be informed about these world issues.

You've learned many things while doing this research. You've learned how to do effective online research, including both free websites and subscription databases. You've learned to cite sources correctly and use those sources as a way to persuade. You've practiced summarizing and writing a good thesis statement.

Your effort will help keep America informed. Great work! (Gunnell, 2008)

Gunnell's conclusion praises her students' work and comments on what they have accomplished. There is no reflection on process, content, or the final outcome. In what follows I will propose a Reflective Component in the WebQuest and suggest a way to organize it based, in part, on The Experiential Learning Cycle.

Experiential Learning Cycle

I think one of the most important roles of educators is that of helping students more effectively learn from their experiences. The Experiential Learning Cycle -- developed by Kolb, and derived from the work of Kurt Lewin, John Dewey, and Jean Piaget -- is a model that offers a framework, a strategy for learning from direct experience (Moran, 2001 p.18).

In Kolb's model, learners proceed sequentially through a cycle of four stages: (1) **concrete experience**, where learners participate directly in the experience, (2) **reflective observation**, where subsequent to the experience learners pause to consider and describe what happened, focusing on factual information and details, (3) **abstract conceptualization**, in which learners attempt to offer a theoretical explanation or interpretation based on their own ideas or drawn from other sources, and (4) **active experimentation**, where the learner decides how to use this new knowledge, how to re-enter new experiences in a more informed way, or how new knowledge relates to his

conception or knowledge of self (Moran, 2001).

Figure one below is a graphic illustration of Kolb's Experiential Learning Cycle taken from Google Images.

Cultural Knowings Framework

Moran, in 'Teaching culture', has adapted the stages of Kolb's model and uses it as the basis for his Cultural Knowings Framework, (Knowing How, Knowing About, Knowing Why, and Knowing Oneself), a rubric for the study and description of culture. In Moran's adaptation, (1) concrete experience becomes participation, with a focus on Knowing How (adopting correct behaviors in the target culture); (2) reflective observation becomes description, with an emphasis on Knowing About (learning and discovering cultural information); (3) abstract conceptualization becomes interpretation, with a focus on Knowing Why (understanding the various perspectives and beliefs behind cultural behavior); and, (4) active experimentation becomes response, where the emphasis is on

Knowing Oneself (self-awareness, self-knowledge) (Moran, 2001).

Reflection Component

Moran's adaptation of the Experiential Learning Cycle is a useful framework for cultural inquiry, and offers interesting possibilities for the WebQuest model. In a similar way that Moran's Cultural Knowings parallels the Experiential Learning Cycle, the WebQuest as a learning experience maps onto the first three stages of the cycle: (1) **Participation** is the active involvement, the experience of researching, gathering data, collaborating with the group; (2) **Description** is describing the research, presenting the details in a form that can be manipulated and analyzed; (3) **Interpretation** is the analysis and synthesis, the evaluation and transformation of the information into a product that reflects the goals and objective of the task. (These stages may collapse into each other at various points as learners move through the WebQuest Task).

The fourth stage of the cycle, the 4) **Response**, is the element that I see as lacking from most WebQuests (the example conclusion given above from Gunnell provides an illustration) and which I propose to include by adding a Reflective component.

The purpose of the Reflective component is twofold: to provide students an explicit step for reflection -- usually in writing; and to provide feedback on the process of the completed WebQuest. The Reflection component will be organized with the following subsets: (a) student reflection and (b) feedback.

The student reflection subset would primarily be used for self-reflection. In other words, as a way to link new learnings from the completed WebQuest to self-knowledge, to students own viewpoints, to possible options and areas to proceed with newly acquired knowledge or awarenesses.

I see self-knowledge as a critical educational outcome. Reflective exercises that encourage students to incorporate key learnings into their own views, beliefs, attitudes and opinions are a crucial step to creating a more fully aware, autonomous and conscious learner. Conscious of their own learning processes, and awareness of what they think and feel about themselves as human beings, about their relationships with others and their environment. In addition, promoting the development of individual viewpoint builds confidence in the learner and helps to frame and organize future endeavors and inquiries.

Below are some example questions that could be asked in the Reflection Component, and used as a reflective writing assignment:

- Do you agree with the results obtained in your group? Why or Why not?
- What do you do next?
- What were your roles in the group?
- What was most interesting about this project and why?
- What was your most significant learning or awareness?
- What more would you like to know?
- Are you satisfied with your final product? Why or why not?

The feedback subset would be primarily an evaluation of the process, and useful knowledge for teachers as they develop future learning tasks. Some possible questions:

- What about the process helped or hindered your learning?
- What recommendations do you have to improve this WebQuest?
- How could the teacher have been more useful or helpful to you?

I feel that the additions of the Preparation component and the Reflection Component enhance the WebQuest framework as a model for inquiry by making explicit the importance of key aspects of Schema Theory and Experiential Learning play in learning. The Preparation component contributes to the activation of schemata, discovers what students know and what they would like to know, thereby giving helpful information to students and teachers. The Reflection Component adds a reflective dimension that focuses on the development of self-awareness and gives valuable feedback on the process of the task as well as students' progress.

Thus, the WebQuest model from chapter one, after modifications would have the following components: Title, Introduction, Preparation, Task, Process, Reflection, and Evaluation. In the next chapter, I will provide an example WebQuest as a model for facilitating cultural inquiry, illustrating the modifications

that I have suggested in this chapter.

Chapter 4

A WebQuest Example

In chapter one, I gave a definition of a WebQuest and delineated the constituent parts of the most common template used for its creation (Title, Introduction, Task, Process, Evaluation, and Conclusion). In the second chapter, I discussed the critical attributes, which elucidated the rationale for using WebQuests. And in the previous chapter, I proposed modifications to the WebQuest model by adding a Preparation component and a Reflective component. The revised framework is as follows: Title, Introduction, Preparation, Task, Process, Reflection, and Evaluation.

At the end of this chapter, I have provided an example WebQuest to illustrate the modifications suggested in Chapter 3. The WebQuest is a revision of a lesson from my Intermediate-Advanced content-based ESL class, and a part of a larger course on community-based research. The WebQuest utilizes Patrick Moran's Cultural Dimensions to facilitate cultural inquiry.

Briefly, Moran's framework is the result of the synthesis and expansion of different schools of thought on the definition of culture. Moran expands commonly held notions of the three components of culture: Products, Perspectives, and Practices. To the triad he adds Persons and Communities, because "[p]eople -

alone and with others- make and use artifacts, carry out actions, and hold meanings" (Moran, 2001, p. 24). Communities and persons help to capture the active role of people in their culture (Moran, 2001).

In Moran's "cultural pentad," **Products** are the artifacts that are produced or used by persons and communities of the culture: tools, buildings, news pamphlets, institutions of family and religion, plants, animals, as so on. The **Practices** of a community are the behaviors and action, the rituals and the interactions that members carry out individually or collectively. **Perspectives** are the beliefs, values and attitudes that members hold about the cultural products and practices within a cultural community. **Communities** are the social contexts and groups in which members interact and carry out cultural practices. These groups might be based on race, gender, politics, and sports. Examples would be a charity organization, a baseball team, a family, co-workers, and fellow bloggers. **Persons** are the individuals within the culture that embody its values in particular ways (Moran, 2001).

Moran stresses the interrelation of the dimensions as is evinced in his definition of culture. To paraphrase: Culture is the evolving way of life of a community of persons that share a common set of practices, which are linked to shared products and based on a shared set of perspectives, and set within a specific contexts (Moran, 2001).

The cultural phenomenon under investigation in the WebQuest is Co-

housing communities. Co-housing communities are a subset of intentional communities and a typical Co-housing community has the following attributes: a focus on green building and environmental issues; the sharing of a commons building used for meetings and social gatherings; reservation of common space for things like community gardens, play areas, fishing ponds, etc.

The communities usually have meetings once or twice a month, and rules and decisions are made by consensus. Individuals own their own homes, but the remainder of community space is shared. Also, members are usually required to perform a set number of community service hours that entail duties like cleaning the commons building, gardening, and office work.

The fictional scenario in the example WebQuest below, explained in the Introduction, describes how students will undertake a federally-funded research project called *Community*. The overall goal of the project is to improve the quality of life in their community. Students will use the WebQuest to research Co-housing communities, and then present the findings to their local town council in order to initiate discussions on the communities' beliefs and practices. These discussions will be driven by the desire to look at new ideas from outside communities, to contrast perspectives and behaviors, with a focus on improving quality of life.

The Preparation component sets the stage by inviting students to discuss, in groups, their own communities through a series of guided questions. This

activation of background knowledge directs students to the topic, stimulates interest, and begins to bring focus to the nature of the upcoming research. This section also allows student input into the topic by eliciting goals of the project. This aids and encourages learner autonomy and gives students some control over the direction of the project.

The Task clearly defines the culminating product. The oral presentation gives learners an opportunity to practice language and to better understand the structure and delivery (the discourse structure) of a western-style presentation; the visual element accommodates a broader range of learning styles. The written assignment offers students a chance to develop their composition skills. In addition to building community, the collaborative aspect of the task allows practice in synthesizing and evaluating information.

The Process section scaffolds the task by providing questions and web links. Within each cultural dimension I have given a series of questions that students are to include in their final reports. The links give students a starting point for their research, and also provide information on skills development-giving presentations.

The Reflection component engages students in a self-reflective writing task. Students are asked to reflect on the process and on their most significant learnings. Students are also asked to briefly give feedback on the project, with a focus on how it could be improved. This component completes the Experiential Learning Cycle as it focuses the attention on Knowledge of Self and re-entry into

experience.

The Evaluation section gives students a clear idea of what they will be assessed on. The presentation, the written component and group process are the performance areas that students will be required to include in their work. Having this available for reference helps to lessen ambiguity in terms of what is expected of students.

What follows on the next page is the WebQuest I have created to illustrate the modifications that I have made and to demonstrate its use as a framework for cultural inquiry.

Preparation

1) Individually do a mindmap of the word 'community'. Write down all the associations that come to mind. Share your mindmaps with your group. Are there any differences? Why do you think so?

2) Discuss the following questions with your group:

a) Describe the current community in which you live- the physical layout, surrounding environment, the shops, restaurants and institutions in the area.

b) Do you interact with your neighbors? How often do you meet with them? What is the nature of your interactions?

c) Have there been conflicts or problems among the people in your community? Explain why. Can you offer any reasons why these disagreements occurred?

d) What aspects of your community could be improved and why?

e) What changes would you make to create a better living environment?

3) Having read the introduction and from the discussion with your group, what would you like to learn from this project? Are there other goals that you feel should be set for this project? Make a list with your group.

Task

Your group will research one of the many types of Intentional Communities- Co-housing. You will frame your inquiry with Moran's cultural dimensions- Persons, Practices, Perspectives, Communities and Products. All of your research will be done online. I have provided questions in the process section to organize your research, and weblinks to get you started. Keep in mind that the overall goal is to explore an alternative community in the US and see any aspects can contribute to the quality of life in your own community.

Your task will be to gather information on Co-housing, synthesize this information with your group, and give a 10-15 minute presentation of your findings. Your presentation must answer all the questions in the process section and include a visual representation- a poster, powerpoint, chart, graph, etc. Try to use examples from specific Co-housing communities to illustrate your ideas and to strengthen your arguments. Each person must have a part in the presentation and you need to provide a handout for your audience. In addition, your group should hand in a written report of your research (one per group) and make sure you include a bibliography.

You will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis- see the evaluation page for detailed information on assessment.

Process

The task will be completed using the steps below and the suggested resources. Again, try to use examples from specific Co-housing communities to illustrate your ideas and to strengthen your arguments.

1) Begin the task by answering the questions below. (I suggest that you divide the task so that each person researches one of the cultural dimensions.)

Defintion a) What is co-housing? Describe briefly its history.

Products b) What products are associated with co-housing communities? What do they produce? (This could include pamphlets, crafts, art, spiritual writings, etc.) What is the physical organization of the community? (Perhaps draw a map of a co-housing community to illustrate this.) Are there unique features to the physical environment? What, if anything, do these attributes represent about the community?

Perspectives c) What are some of the core beliefs of Co-Housing communities, and how are these reflected in the community, in individuals? (Remember, there may different beliefs among different Co-housing communities, and this could be included in your research). If there any contrasting perspectives in the community how are these managed? Are there beliefs that members hold that are different from your own?

Communities d) What communities or groups are co-housing members affiliated with? (they may be religious, political, environmental, national, gender-based, age-based, etc.) What does membership in these various communities say about co-housing and its individual members?

Practices e) Are there regular meetings in the communities? What is the purpose of these meetings? How are the meetings organized and how are decisions made? Is there a leader? How are rules and regulations formed? Are there other practices that seem to be unique to co-housing (e.g., childcare, transportation, food preparation, use of technology)?

Persons f) Try to find an individual person who is a member of a co-housing community. What is his name? How long has he been a member? Does he have a specific role in the community? What kind of work does he do? What are his views of co-housing? Is there anything

interesting or unique about him? How does this person reflect the practices and perspectives of co-housing communities?

2) How does the information in each dimension interact? For example, how are perspectives reflected in practices, in people, in products?

3) With your group, share your research, evaluate your findings, and begin work on your presentation. Refer back to the Task for specific requirements of the project.

Suggested links to initiate your Co-housing research:

Cohousing.org (Definition and a directory by state)

<http://www.cohousing.org/>

Wikipedia (general information and lots of links at the bottom of the page)

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Co-housing>

Below are useful links with information about giving presentations:

<http://www.etsu.edu/scitech/langskil/oral.htm>

<http://www.auburn.edu/~burnsma/oralpres.html>

http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~riceowl/oral_presentations.htm

<http://web.cba.neu.edu/~ewertheim/skills/oral.htm#outline>

Reflection

Congratulations on completing the Community: Co-Housing WebQuest. Now, as a closure activity, I would like you to think back over the work you have done- the research, the interactions with your group members, the preparation and delivery of your final product and answer the following two questions.

1) In a one-page response paper, answer at least one question from each of the following sections.

Feelings

- What did you like best/least?
- How did your feelings change from the beginning to the end of the project?
- What did you find surprising about the task?
- What did you find most challenging?

Learnings

- What was your most significant learning during this task?
- What important awarenesses were brought to mind?
- What did you learn about research?
- When you compare Co-housing to your own community, what is the most significant difference? What do you think accounts for this difference?

Applications

- What will you take away from this task and why?
- How will you apply new learnings and awarenesses to the future?

Group work

- Why did you divide up the task the way you did?
- What did you learn about yourself as a group member?
- What was your role and why?
- Describe the interaction between you and group members. What insights do you have about the dynamics at play between members?
- How would you interact differently with your group next time and why?

2) Write a paragraph about the process of the task.

What about the process helped you learn? What could I as the teacher have done differently to make this task more effective for you as a learner? What recommendations do you have for the next WebQuest?

Evaluation

Remember, there are no right or wrong answers for the research we are doing in this project, and our primary goal is to uncover information that will contribute to the enhancement of quality of life in our own communities.

Your group will receive a pass/fail grade and I will evaluate your project according to the Scoring Rubric on the next page. The grade you receive is negotiable as each person will be asked to complete the Rubric individually. If there are discrepancies between your assessments and mine for any of the criteria, then we will discuss them and you may be asked to write about why you feel my assessment is off the mark.

Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Fail	Pass	Exceeded Expectations
Task Completion	Information absent, irrelevant, or off task	Task was completed well. Most of the information was needed and on-task.	Task was completed very well. All of the information was needed and on-task. Extra effort given beyond the requirements.
Presentation	No visuals, serious lack of organization, transition markers, and generally unintelligible.	Good Visuals and organization of material. Engaging, interactive and interesting. Appropriate body language and good response to questions from audience.	Excellent visuals and presentation. Engaging, interactive and promotes discussion an interest from audience. Generally very close attention to detail and logic of the presentation.
Language	Incomprehensible language that impedes meaning	Good grammar, pronunciation, word choice, and register	Excellent grammar and use of a varied word choice that displays mastery o the subject matter.
Writing	No clarity and generally incomprehensible. Poor word choice and ungrammatical constructions	Good grammar, word choice, register. Good spelling, punctuation and paragraph markers. Effective expression of ideas.	Excellent command of language displayed by natural and varied grammatical constructions.
Group Work	No contribution to the group's efforts	Effective and appropriate communication with group. Observance of group norms.	Excellent awareness of the dynamics of the group. Great contribution to the group process.

Chapter 5

Final Thoughts

When I began the final summer of my MAT coursework, I had hoped to be able to incorporate everything that I was learning into this paper. I tried to find a question, a project that I could focus my classroom learning and studies on. I wanted to start out with a research project and try and fit any new information from the on-campus learning experience, any awarenesses, learnings into a whole; I had set out to make connections between classroom discussions, the reflection writings, papers, conversations, and somehow painting all this information onto a larger canvas that reflected a world view, held together by an organizing vision.

Once I started classes, I realized that this was not feasible given the intensive nature of the coursework and my own tendencies toward cursorily following a line of inquiry, culling a basic understanding, then moving on to something else. This caused me a certain amount of anxiety initially, but after I relaxed and got into the flow of studying I began to realize what I needed was a way of going about research, a framework to look into phenomena, a model for inquiry.

This paper on WebQuests is in some ways an extension of my research and classroom experience of facilitation. I began to see that in order to get

deeper into issues, to engage in purposeful discussion and dialog requires skills, preparation, it requires a questioning model, a framework that leads participants to a worthy goal.

The overall goal and vision is the key and intricately linked with the task. The components of WebQuests as an inquiry model clearly define the stages of research, the task and process. But what is the research tool being put into the service of? What is the goal of the inquiry, and how does it reflect beliefs, values, attitudes, world views of teachers, students, and other stakeholders?

In the WebQuest from chapter 4, I set up a scenario that encourages students to learn more about their own community, to engage in a discussion about the place they live with the focus on quality of life issues. My aim was to use the various conceptual frameworks underlying the WebQuest to encourage more tolerance and understanding, openness and inclusion, discussion and dialog, to learn about cultural difference and what this means, how it relates to self-conceptions and identity.

The Reflection component directs new learnings and experiences to our notions of who we are, it incorporates new learnings for future endeavors and tasks, it gives space for thinking about the process. It encourages us to ask questions like: What did we learn and why? How can we go about things differently and why would this be desirable? What did this experience teach me about my self and my interactions with my interlocutors, about the world I live in? Where do I go from here? How can this learning experience guide future

decisions?

On a final note, one thing that strikes me as I near the completion of this project is that except for one book, *Teaching Culture* (Moran, 2001), all of my resources have been electronic and web-based. With my access to databases I was able to read online and print journals, and books with full texts. The rest of my references were taken from websites and discovered using various search engines. This project itself turned out to be a quest for information and resources from the World Wide Web.

References

- A1 Halat, E. (2008). The effects of designing WebQuests on the motivation of pre-service elementary school teachers. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 39(6), 793-6.
- Brewer, William F. (1984). The Nature and Functions of Schemas. Technical Report No. 325.
- Carr, S. C., & Thompson, B. (1996). The effects of prior knowledge and schema activation strategies on the inferential reading comprehension of children with and without learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 19(1), 48-61.
- Carrell, P. L., & Eisterhold, J. C. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(4), 553-73.
- Chatel, R. G., & Nodell, J. (2002). WebQuests: Teachers and students as global literacy explorers.
- Crawford, C. M. (2001). Rubrics: Models of evaluation within a constructivist learning environment.
- Dodge, B. (1995). WebQuests: A technique for internet-based learning. *Distance Educator*, 1(2), 10-13.
- Dodge, B. (1997). *Some thoughts on WebQuests*. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from http://WebQuest.sdsu.edu/about_WebQuests.html

- Dodge, B. (2001). FOCUS: Five rules for writing a great WebQuest. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, 28(8), 6-9,58.
- Gunnell, A. (2008). *Ms. Gunnell's web site*. Retrieved September, 11, 2008, from <http://cms.fhdschools.org/agunnell/Home/tabid/679/Default.aspx>
- Johnson, L. E. (2005). Using technology to enhance intranational studies. *International Journal of Social Education*, 19(2), 32-38.
- Krasny, K. A., Sadoski, M., & Paivio, A. (2007). Unwarranted return: A response to McVee, Dunsmore, and Gavelek's (2005) "schema theory revisited". *Review of Educational Research*, 77(2), 239-244.
- Lacina, J. (2007). Inquiry-based learning and technology: Designing and exploring WebQuests. *Childhood Education*, 83(4), 251.
- March, T. (1998). *Why WebQuests?, an introduction*. Retrieved September, 11, 2008, from http://tommmarch.com/writings/intro_wq.php
- March, T. (2007).
Revisiting WebQuests in a web 2 world.
how developments in technology and pedagogy combine to scaffold personal learning. *Interactive Educational Multimedia*, 15(October), 8/25/2008-Ozline.com.
- March, T. (2008). *What WebQuests are (really)*. Retrieved September, 11, 2008, from http://bestwebquests.com/what_WebQuests_are.asp
- Marzano, R. J., & And Others. (1988). *Dimensions of thinking: A framework for*

curriculum and instruction The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 125 N. West St., Alexandria, VA 22314-2798 (\$10.00).

McVee, M. B., Dunsmore, K., & Gavelek, J. R. (2005). Schema theory revisited. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(4), 531-566.

Moran, P. R. (2001). *Teaching culture: Perspectives in practice* (1st ed.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Ngeow, K., & Kong, Y. (2001). *Learning to learn: Preparing teachers and students for problem-based learning. ERIC digest* ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication, Indiana University, 2805 E. 10th Street, Suite 140, Bloomington, IN 47408-2698. Tel: 800-759-4723 (Toll Free). For full text: <http://eric.indiana.edu>.

Ogle, D. M. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher, 39*(6), 564-70.

Pohan, C., & Mathison, C. (1998). WebQuests: The potential of internet-based instruction for global education. *Social Studies Review, 37*(2), 91-93.

Rude, R. (2002). The road to interest and curiosity it begins with a deliberate choice. *American Educator, Spring*(1), 39.

Sarner, R., Mullick, R. J., & Bauder, D. Y. (2002). Concepts & procedures. [SITE 2002 section].

Schweizer, H., & Kossow, B. (2007). WebQuests: Tools for differentiation. *Gifted Child Today, 30*(1), 29-35.

Sen, A., & Neufeld, S. (2006). In pursuit of alternatives in ELT methodology: WebQuests. *Online Submission*, 5

Unal, Z. (2008). *ZWebQuest*. Retrieved 8/25, 2008, from <http://www.zunal.com/>

Yoder, M. B. (2006). Adventures in electronic constructivism. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, 34(1), 24-27.

Young, D. L., & Wilson, B. G. (2002). WebQuests for reflection and conceptual change: Variations on a popular model for guided inquiry.

Zheng, R., Perez, J., Williamson, J., & Flygare, J. (2008). WebQuests as perceived by teachers: Implications for online teaching and learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 24(4), 295-304.

Useful Web links

Bernie Dodge's Website- <http://www.WebQuest.org/index.php>

Zunal.com

"Look Who's Footing the Bill!"- <http://www.kn.sbc.com/wired/democracy/>

"Crool Zone?" - <http://www.kn.sbc.com/wired/nonviolence/intro.htm>

The Big Wide World WebQuest - <http://www.kn.sbc.com/wired/bww>

Searching for China - <http://www.kn.sbc.com/wired/China/ChinaQuest.html>

Little Rock 9, Integration 0? - http://www.kn.sbc.com/wired/BHM/little_rock

The Tuskegee Tragedy - http://www.kn.sbc.com/wired/BHM/tuskegee_quest.html

ozline.com – helping educators work the Web for Education - <http://ozline.com>

Filamentality – the first Web site to spin WebQuests -

<http://www.kn.sbc.com/wired/fil>

Web-and-Flow – An interactive Web site for designing - <http://web-and-flow.com>

Best WebQuests – celebrating the Best in WebQuests -

<http://bestwebquests.com>