

Exploring Predictors of Secondary School Teachers' Use of Technology to Support Student-Centered Teaching

Yaoran Li, Vitality Popov, Veronica Garza, and Anne Keicher
yaoranli@san Diego.edu, vpopov@san Diego.edu, vgarza@san Diego.edu, anne.keicher@gmail.com
University of San Diego

Abstract: The current study aims to explore predictors that independently contribute to high school teacher use of technology in general and for different teaching purposes (student-centered and traditional). High school teachers (N=928) responded to a survey that consisted of measures of their pedagogical beliefs, beliefs towards technology, and perceived training effectiveness. A series of multilevel models were used to explore the independent effects of these factors on teacher use of technology in general and for different teaching purposes. The results showed that teachers' technology self-efficacy was a significant predictor of teacher use of technology in general. More importantly, teachers' instructional approach and openness towards technology were more salient when predicting teacher use technology to support student-centered teaching. Our findings suggest that teachers' pedagogical readiness is as important as technological readiness for technology integration in teaching to serve more advanced teaching purposes.

Introduction

Over the past several decades, technology implementation in schools has been a major reform effort (e.g., Berrett, Murphy, & Sullivan, 2012). Conversations in the United States around transforming teaching and learning via the use of technology is being fueled at the national level by initiatives such as the Call to Action and P21's Framework for 21st Century Learning (see Office of Educational Technology, 2010 for review). One objective is to use technology to prepare students to be critical thinkers, problem solvers, communicators, and innovators (P21 Partnership for 21st Century Learning, 2009). However, reaching this objective depends on a range of conditions and factors associated with the teacher, student, technology itself, technology-enhanced innovation, policy/legislation, and district/school-level (Groff & Mouza, 2008; Spector, 2010). While all these factors are important for successful technology integration, the teacher who serves as the "innovator" appears to play a crucial role in making pedagogical transformation regarding the use of technology in their teaching (Tondeur et al., 2016). Current evidence indicates that, despite the increased availability of technology in schools (Bulman & Fairlie, 2016), effective integration of technology into teaching and learning, meaning the teacher uses technology as a tool to enhance students' experiences in the classroom, continues to be a challenge (Inan & Lowther, 2010; Rodriguez, Nussbaum & Dombrowskaia, 2011).

Teachers use technology for various purposes to support: 1) administrative or management activities, such as tracking students' grades, 2) traditional or teacher-centered instructional practices, such as lecturing or presenting, and 3) support student-centered teaching activities, such as giving students choice on how to demonstrate their learning (Palak & Walls, 2009). However, many studies on technology integration or teacher use of technology did not differentiate the purposes of using technology and used the frequency of teacher use of technology tools in the classroom as the outcome measure of technology integration (Aldunate & Nussbaum, 2013; Mumtaz, 2000). Only a few studies examined the predictors of teacher use of technology for student-centered practices (Fu, 2013). This limits our ability to understand some important issues, such as whether the predictors of teacher use of technology for teacher-centered instructional practices are the same as the predictors of teacher use of technology to support student-centered teaching practices. To help fill this void in the existing literature, the present study explored the independent contribution of a variety of teacher factors in predicting their use of technology tools: in general, to support traditional instructional practices, and to support student-centered teaching purposes.

Theoretical framework and significance of the work

Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK, Koehler & Mishra, 2009) highlighted that teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical competencies are equally important as the technology capabilities, and suggested that a thoughtful alignment of three interconnected capabilities can support teacher effective integrate technology into teaching practice (Voogt et al., 2013). Besides these teacher beliefs and knowledge, International Society for Technology Education (ISTE) revealed that the development of TPACK requires ongoing

organizational support and professional development with dedicated time for teachers to (re)design and enact technology-enhanced lessons (ISTE, 2009). In alignment with these theoretical frameworks, a considerable amount of empirical research studies has been published over the past two decades to explore factors that influence teacher use of technology tools in teaching (e.g., Ertmer, 1999, 2005; Hew & Brush, 2007; also see Buabeng-Andoh, 2012, for review). Although teacher-related factors have been widely viewed from different perspectives, there are mainly four strands of research in the literature, which are: 1) teachers' attitudes or beliefs towards technology, 2) teachers' pedagogical beliefs, and 3) teachers' perceived training effectiveness and organizational support. Below, we reviewed some major findings in the existing literature on these factors.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted to investigate the influence of teachers' beliefs towards technology on their use of technology (see Buabeng-Andoh, 2012, for a review). Teachers' perceived competency beliefs of technology, or self-efficacy in using technology, has been found to relate to a more frequent use of technology in the classroom. Teachers with prior computer experience are more likely to learn new necessary skills, such as looking up information more quickly and seamlessly than those who have no prior experience (Groff & Mouza, 2008). On the contrary, teachers lacking confidence in their computer skills are less likely to use technology into their teaching practices (Wozney, Venkatesh, & Abrami, 2006). In addition to perceived competence in technology skills, teachers' positive attitude toward technology, such as passion about technology, openness towards technology, or feeling comfortable using technology, may also affect their technology integration practices (see Hew & Brush, 2007, for a review).

Research has also suggested that teachers' pedagogical beliefs are an important predictor of their use of technology (e.g., Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010; Ertmer, Ottenbreit-Leftwich, Sadik, Sendurur, & Sendurur, 2012). For example, Hermans, Tondeur, van Braak, and Valcke (2008) examined the influence of teachers' educational beliefs on teacher use of computer with 525 primary school teachers. They found that teachers' constructivist beliefs predicted unique variance in teacher use of computers above and beyond teachers' background variables and teachers' attitudes towards computers. As part of a large-scale national study in the Netherlands, Drent and Meelissen (2008) revealed that primary and secondary teachers' background, technology competency beliefs, attitudes toward technology, and their pedagogical approach all explained unique variance in their use of technology to support educational objectives. Based on findings from a qualitative approach, Ertmer et al., (2012) suggested that teachers with student-centered beliefs tended to use technology through a more student-centered approach. However, research in this area is still limited comparing to research in teachers' beliefs towards technology.

Some research suggests that teacher trainings are related to teacher technology use. For example, in an empirical study that employed the Teacher Attribute Survey, Vannatta and Fordham (2004) suggested that the amount of technology trainings teachers received is a predictor of teachers' technology use. Another institutional factor that have been also suggested important is organizational supports, which means to provide teachers with time and environment to practice the ways to integrate technology in teaching and getting feedback. Based on a longitudinal case study, Levin and Wadmay (2008) suggested that opportunities to practice, reflect, and interact with other teachers are crucial in the process of facilitating classroom technology adoption. Also, Wong and Li (2008) found that the collaborating and an experimentation culture set by school leaders influenced effective technology integration. Although it is intuitive to relate trainings and supports focusing on technology with increased technical skills and use of technology, trainings or supports that focus on teachers' curriculum development or pedagogical practices may be as important as efforts to improve teachers' technology using skills (Sandholtz & Reilly, 2004).

Although most of existing literature focused on predictors of teacher use of technology in general, some recent studies suggested that teachers' pedagogical beliefs, teachers' self-efficacy around technology, and received professional development support predicted teachers' use of technology in student-centered ways (Ananiadou & Claro, 2009; Chen, 2010; Miranda & Russel, 2012). These studies, however, did not differentiate and compare the predictors of teachers' use of technology for different purposes. Another layer of complexity in this research area relates to inclusive investigation of multiple teacher-related factors and their independent predictive effects. As noted earlier, only few studies investigated the independent contribution of teachers' pedagogical beliefs, teachers' technological beliefs and attitudes, and teacher training to teacher use of technology (see Tondeur et al., 2016 for review). Also, most studies focused on pre-service teachers and primary school teachers, thus, research on high school teachers is limited.

Considering these research gaps, the current study aims to include multiple types of teacher-related factors (pedagogical beliefs, technological beliefs, and perceived professional development) that can help us understand the independent contribution of each set of predictors in terms of using technology for different teaching purposes. A large set of survey data were collected from high school teachers from a large, urban school district implementing a one-to-one technology initiative. For this study, the following research questions are

addressed: 1) how are the teacher-related factors independently predict high school teacher using technology in general? 2) how are the teacher-related factors independently predict teacher use of technology to support student-centered teaching practice? 3) how are the teacher-related factors independently predict teacher use of technology to support traditional teaching practice?

Methodologies

Participants and procedure

As part of a larger longitudinal study conducted in a large, urban K-12 public school district in the Southwestern United States, a district-wide teacher survey was disseminated to high school teachers in spring 2016 with an online survey system. Researchers received teacher emails from the district and all high school teachers were sent an individual email via their school requesting their participation. The survey remained open for two weeks and during this time, teachers were sent three reminders about the survey but the survey participation was voluntary. In this school district, approximately 75% of students are classified as economically disadvantaged, and the majority of students are Hispanic (62%) and African American (25%) in 2016 as indicated by indices on the district's website. All high school teachers received the survey link, and participation was anonymous and voluntary. Within a two-weeks survey window, 1,054 high school teachers answered on survey from 38 high schools, a 52% return rate. Of the 1,054 teachers who participated, 928 respondents passed at least one of the fraud items. Fraud items are commonly used in online survey to ensure participants answer the questionnaire seriously and carefully. For example, the questionnaire stated the clear directive to "Please choose Strongly Disagree on this item." If a participant answered anything other than "Strongly Disagree," then the participant did not pass that item. Survey data of the 928 participants were included in the current study. Of the 928 participants, 26% were English teachers, 19% were math teachers, 20% were science teachers, 18% were social science teachers, and 17% were teaching other subjects. This sample included more female teachers (59%) than male teachers. Forty-two percent of the teachers had more than 10 years of teaching experience, and 28% of the teachers had less than three years of teaching experience. About 39% teachers were 24-34 years old; 26% were 35-44 years old; and the remaining teachers were 45-years-old or older.

Measures

The survey consisted of a variety of measures on teachers' perceptions and practice related to their technology use and classroom instruction. For the current study, the variables that we were interested in serving as predictors were teachers' pedagogical beliefs, teachers' attitudes or beliefs towards technology, teachers' perceived training effectiveness and organizational support, with teachers' demographics included as covariates. The outcome variables were teachers' use of technology for different purposes. Most survey items related to teacher use of technology were adapted from the Second Information Technology in Education Study Teacher Questionnaire (SITES, 2006) and the Technology - Instructional Practices Survey for Minnesota Teachers (Minnesota Department of Education, 2014), and some were developed by the researchers. Questions related to teachers' pedagogy were developed by the researchers based on multiple theoretical frameworks such as the Bloom's Revised Taxonomy Model (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), 21st Century Skills (P21 Partnership for 21st Century Learning, 2009), and ISTE Standards for Educators (2008). The researcher-developed survey items were created and refined through an iterative process between researchers specialized in educational technology and teacher education and consultants with expertise in quantitative methods and assessment. An early draft of the survey was created and piloted by the researchers in spring 2015, and 519 high school teachers from different content areas participated in the pilot study. The researchers slightly revised the survey and then piloted the survey again with a group of 14 high school teachers before it was administered for the current study. The researchers revised the survey items one more time based on feedback from the teachers to ensure that the survey items about teachers' beliefs and actual practice were relevant. Researchers also revised the item of the teacher use of technology to have a clear focus on student-centered learning versus traditional teaching methods.

Analyses

For the first research question, we explored whether the variables of interest are predictive of teacher use of technology tools in general after controlling for teachers' background variables. For the second research question, we explored to what extent teachers' pedagogical belief, teachers' technological belief and attitude, and teacher training predicted teacher use of technology to support traditional teaching purpose and teacher use of technology to support student-centered teaching purpose after controlling for teachers' background variables and teacher use of technology tools in general. With teacher use of technology tools in general being controlled, the analysis can

identify the independent contribution of the targeted predictors to teacher use technology for different teaching purposes. Preliminary data analysis showed that the random effects between schools are significant in the null models when predicting teacher use of technology in general ($p < .01$) and teacher use of technology to support traditional teaching ($p = .02$). The intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) of the null models predicting teacher use of technology in general, teacher use of technology to support student-centered-teaching, and teacher use of technology to support traditional teaching were .09, .02, and .05, respectively. To control for the random effects between schools and to have a consistent structure of the models, a random intercept was added to all three prediction models using PROC MIXED (SAS, 2004). A series of hierarchical linear models were used to investigate these two research questions. All data available for the modeling were used in this study. For each research question, we ran a model with only the teacher background variables first, and then a model added in all the personal and institutional predictors. Except for the teacher background variables, all the predictors and outcome variables were standardized using PROC STANDARD (SAS, 2004) with $M = 0$ and $SD = 1$. In these models, female teachers were used as the reference group when investigating the gender difference, teachers who were 45-years-old or older were used as the reference group when investigating the age difference, teachers who taught science were used as the reference group when investigating the content difference, teachers who taught lower grade levels (9th and 10th grade) were used as the reference group when investigating the grade level difference, and teachers who had more than 10 years of teaching experience were used as the reference group when investigating the teaching experience difference.

Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of all the predictors and outcome variables and the correlations between them. The correlation between the two pedagogical beliefs variables (Learning Goals, Instructional Approaches) was moderate ($r = .40$); the correlation between the two attitudes towards technology variables (Openness to Technology to Support Instructional Practice, Self-Efficacy in Using Technology) was moderate ($r = .27$); The correlation between the two training variables was high ($r = .59$). All the predictors were correlated with teacher use of technology tools in general to a small size ($r_s = .14-.24$), and the largest correlations appeared with the attitudes towards technology variables ($r_s = .23, .24$). Regarding teacher use of technology to the support student-centered teaching purposes, most of the predictors correlated with this outcome to a medium size ($r_s = .22-.38$). In contrast, the pedagogical beliefs variables ($r_s = .15, .18$) and the training variables ($r_s = .19-.20$) had lower correlations with teacher use of technology to support traditional teaching purpose than attitudes towards technology variables ($r_s = .23, .26$).

[Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations

Variable	Mean	SD	Goals	Approaches	Open	Efficacy	Training_T	Training_G	Tech_G	Tech_S
Goals	4.32	0.51								
Approaches	3.77	0.68	0.40***							
Openness	4.16	0.60	0.33***	0.31***						
Efficacy	3.81	0.80	0.09*	0.07*	0.27***					
Training_T	3.69	0.91	0.22***	0.22***	0.35***	-0.03				
Training_G	3.55	0.92	0.19***	0.18***	0.31***	-0.02	0.79***			
Tech_G	1.72	1.32	0.16***	0.17***	0.23***	0.24***	0.16***	0.14***		
Tech_S	3.19	1.03	0.24***	0.35***	0.38***	0.22***	0.34***	0.30***	0.35***	
Tech_T	3.69	0.90	0.18***	0.15***	0.26***	0.23***	0.20***	0.19***	0.31***	0.56***

Note: Goals: Learning Goals; Approaches: Instructional Approaches; Openness: Openness to Technology to Support Instructional Practice; Comfort: Comfortable with Technology to Support Instructional Practice; Efficacy: Self-Efficacy in Using Technology; Training_T: Effectiveness of Technology-Focused Training; Training_G: Effectiveness of General Training; Tech_G: Use of technology tools in general; Tech_S: Use of technology to support student-centered teaching purpose; Tech_T: Use of technology to support traditional teaching purpose.

Table 2 shows the estimates of the predictors when the background variables were controlled as covariates. A preliminary regression analysis showed that none of the predictor has violated the multicollinearity rule ($VIFs < 3$). When predicting teacher use of technology tools in general (Model 1B), both attitudes towards technology variables, self-efficacy in using technology and openness to technology to support instructional practice were significant ($\beta = .15, p < .01$), and ($\beta = .08, p = .07$), respectively, indicating that teachers who have higher confidence in their technology skills and who are more open to using new technology in teaching use technology tools more frequently in their teaching practices in general.

Table 2. Mixed models predicting teacher technology use with demographics, individual, and institutional predictors.

	Model 1B Using technology tools			Model 2B Using technology tech to support student-centered teaching			Model 3B Using technology tech to support traditional teaching		
	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p
Intercept	-0.01	0.13	0.96	-0.21	0.12	0.08	-0.02	0.13	0.91
Tech_G				0.21	0.04	<.0001	0.17	0.04	0.00
Content (English)	-0.22	0.12	0.07	-0.06	0.11	0.60	-0.21	0.12	0.08
Content (Fine Arts)	-0.66	0.30	0.03	0.14	0.27	0.62	-0.28	0.30	0.35
Content (Foreign Language)	-0.21	0.25	0.41	-0.05	0.25	0.84	0.07	0.25	0.77
Content (Health)	-0.48	0.33	0.15	0.13	0.32	0.69	-0.13	0.34	0.70
Content (History/Social Study)	-0.05	0.12	0.69	0.13	0.11	0.27	0.09	0.12	0.45
Content (Math)	-0.22	0.13	0.10	-0.17	0.12	0.18	0.07	0.13	0.60
Grade level (11-12 grade)	-0.04	0.09	0.64	0.12	0.08	0.13	-0.04	0.09	0.68
Gender (Male)	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.34	-0.03	0.09	0.76
Experience (1-3 years)	-0.01	0.13	0.95	0.12	0.12	0.34	0.38	0.13	0.00
Experience (4-6 years)	-0.05	0.14	0.70	0.06	0.13	0.65	0.06	0.14	0.64
Experience (7-9 years)	0.14	0.15	0.35	0.16	0.13	0.24	0.18	0.14	0.23
Age (24-34 years old)	0.29	0.13	0.03	0.09	0.12	0.48	-0.11	0.13	0.41
Age (35-44 years old)	0.34	0.11	0.00	0.01	0.11	0.92	-0.10	0.11	0.35
Goals	0.03	0.05	0.53	-0.01	0.05	0.90	0.03	0.05	0.49
Approaches	0.09	0.05	0.06	0.23	0.04	<.0001	0.07	0.05	0.15
Openness	0.12	0.05	0.02	0.15	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.05	0.18
Efficacy	0.17	0.05	0.00	0.11	0.04	0.01	0.13	0.05	0.01
Training_T	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.07	0.10
Training_G	0.00	0.07	0.96	0.11	0.06	0.08	0.03	0.07	0.64

Note: Tech_G: Use of technology tools in general; Experience: Teaching experience; Goals: Learning Goals; Approaches: Instructional Approaches; Openness: Openness to Using Technology to Support Instructional Practice; Comfort: Comfortable with Technology to Support Instructional Practice; Efficacy: Self-Efficacy in Using Technology; Training_T: Effectiveness of Technology-Focused Training; Training_G: Effectiveness of General Training; the reference group of content is Science teachers; the reference group of grade level is teachers who teach 9-10 grade; the reference group of gender is female teachers; the reference group of teaching experience is teachers with more than 10 years teaching experience; the reference group of age is teachers who are 45 years old or older.

When predicting teacher use of technology to support teaching purposes (Model 2B & Model 3B), teacher use of technology tools in general was a significant predictor in both models (β s=.17, .21, 19, p s<.01), as well as teachers' self-efficacy in using technology (β s=.11, .13, p s=.01). Furthermore, Model 2B shows that teachers' instructional approach also independently predicted teacher use of technology to support student-centered teaching (β =.23, p <.01), however, teachers' instructional approach was not significant when predicting teacher use of technology to support traditional teaching. Interestingly, openness towards technology independently predicted teacher use of technology to support student centered teaching (β =.15, p <.01) but not traditional teaching. These findings indicate that teachers who frequently use a student-centered teaching approach or who are more open to experimenting with technology are more likely to use technology to support student-centered teaching. Given the exploration nature of this study, with Bonferroni corrections, teachers' self-efficacy in using technology was the only significant predictor of using technology in general and use of technology to support teacher-centered teaching, while teachers' instructional approach and openness to technology significantly predicted teacher use of technology to support student-centered teaching.

In addition, although the perceived effectiveness of training was not significant when predicting the three different measures of teacher use of technology, the estimates of the training with a technology focus were marginally significant across three models while the estimates of the teaching training in general were higher when predicting use of technology to support student-centered teaching (β =.11, p =.09) than when predicting use of technology to support traditional teaching (β =.03, p =.64).

Discussion

Student-centered instruction is a highly-valued way to approach learning experiences for students as it focuses on the learner. In a student-centered learning environment, teachers may guide their students through the discovery of new knowledge, facilitate discussions, and/or give students the freedom to explore in their learning. Unfortunately, increased availability of technology in schools has not led to overall improvement in classroom teaching practices (Cuban, 2001; Cuban, Kirkpatrick, & Peck, 2001; Windschitl & Sahl, 2002). The technology tools only helped provide the environmental readiness, or addressed the first-order barriers; how to address the second-order barriers, or overcome the challenges related to teacher readiness (Ertmer, 1999, 2005; Kim et al., 2013) became increasingly important for this stage of technology integration in many schools and districts in the U.S. To address this challenge, one area of research indicates that teachers with more constructivist views and practices tend to not only use technology to support higher order thinking skills, but also use technology more frequently and to support more student-centered curricula (Baylor & Ritchie, 2002; Ertmer, et al., 2012; Overbay, Patterson, Vasu, & Grable, 2010). Recent research showed that "tool access", "constructivist pedagogy", and a combination of "will" and "skill" can explain a significant amount of the variance (60%-90%) in teachers' level

of technology integration (Christensen & Knezek, 2017; Knezek & Christensen, 2016; Petco, 2012). While previous studies have examined teacher beliefs and professional development factors as related to teachers' frequency of technology use, only a few have examined the predictors of teacher use technology in a student-centered way. Furthermore, according to the author's knowledge and a comprehensive literature review, no existing study has differentiated the predictors of teacher technology use for traditional teaching and student-centered teaching. Thus, results of the current study have important implications for education practitioners and researchers.

First, the findings of the current study is aligned with results from previous research on technology self-efficacy (see Hew & Brush, 2007, for a review). When background variables were controlled, technology self-efficacy was still a significant predictor of teacher technology use in general and teachers use technology to support either student-centered or traditional teaching purposes. This result suggests that teachers' confidence in using technology is directly related to their actual use of technology in the classroom. As in the well-known "Little Engine that Could" story, those who "think I can, think I can" may hold an advantage over those without such beliefs. Bandura (1989) suggested that self-efficacy may influence behavioral outcomes through motivational and affective processes. The mechanisms through which teachers' technology self-efficacy influence their technology use behaviors may involve these dual processes. Motivationally, as suggested by the TAM model, technology self-efficacy might influence both teaching-related decision-making and later engagement in technology-related instructional activities. Teachers low on technology self-efficacy may correspondingly hold a low expectancy for carrying out the optimal teaching outcomes by using technology, so they may avoid using technology when they do not have to. If technology is asked to be required for their teaching, they may flag in their efforts and work passively. Affectively, technology self-efficacy may enhance teachers' coping in the face of obstacles when designing and delivering technology integrated instruction. Teachers who have stronger beliefs may be able to experience less anxiety, think more openly and persist longer when faced with difficulties than teachers who are beset by self-doubt (Bandura, 1989).

Second, one important finding of the current study is, when predicting teacher technology use to support student-centered teaching, teachers' instructional approach was an important contributor. The effect of teachers' instructional approach was found to be independent from teachers' technology self-efficacy. Notably, when predicting use of technology to support student-centered teaching together, the estimate of teacher's instructional approach was more than double the size of the estimate of the technology self-efficacy, suggesting that teachers' pedagogical approaches and technology usage tendency are both important, but teachers' pedagogical approach is even more crucial to determine teachers' use of technology for more desired learning outcomes. This finding is aligned with the TPACK Model, which has been widely used to provide a foundation for practitioners and researchers to understand the multiple components of supporting teachers in their practice and the relationship to technology (Koehler & Mishra, 2009). The TPACK framework emphasizes the integrated roles of teachers' technological knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and content knowledge and suggests that good practice requires all three components. The current study did not focus on one specific content area, and we did not measure teachers' content knowledge, but our results highlighted the importance of teachers' pedagogical readiness and technological readiness to effective teaching with technology.

Third, we found that teachers' openness towards technology was also an independent predictor of teacher use technology to support student-centered teaching when technology self-efficacy was controlled. Although teachers who were more confident in their technology ability may be more willing to experiment and practice, these two constructs are different. Another factor that could influence teachers' openness to technology is teachers' mindset. Dweck, Chiu, & Hong (1995) suggested that people's mindsets about the malleability of ability frame the way they perceive and interpret experiences and events, which in turn influence their reactions and responses in such situations. People with a fixed mindset (also referred to as entity theory) tend to believe that ability is fixed and unchangeable, while people with a growth mindset (also referred to as incremental theory) tend to believe that through effort and appropriate strategies, learners can improve their ability. People with a growth mindset are more likely to focus on skill improvement and effective strategy use rather than documenting ability and superficial strategy use. In a new 1-to-1 program, most teachers are not skilled at using instructional technology; however, teachers who have a growth mindset may be more likely to learn how to improve their skills and take risk to try new technology and pedagogy, while teachers who have a fixed mindset would feel more comfortable using the traditional way to teach and to maintain their performance. The current study did not explicitly measure teachers' mindset, but the results on openness towards technology suggest that the teacher mindset might have an active role in determining teachers' choice of teaching approach and their performance over time. Future research can investigate how teacher mindset influences teachers' perceptions, practice, and performance regarding instructional use.

This study has important implications for practitioners organizing professional learning experiences for teachers. Research in professional learning has highlighted issues of self-confidence and coaching as important and difficult. For example, Goff and Mouza (2008) suggested that teachers lack of computer knowledge and experience is the most foreseeable challenge for teachers implementing instructional technology in the classroom. Our research confirmed that teachers' confidence in using technology is a starting point for teacher use of technology, either for traditional teaching use or for student-centered teaching purposes. More importantly, our findings suggest that developing systems of both technological and pedagogical support that accommodate teachers' technology and pedagogical skills may help teachers integrate technology into their classrooms more effectively. Only technological support is insufficient to equip teachers with the skillset to implement technology to create a student-centered learning environment. Furthermore, building a culture that embraces innovation and experimentation with new technology may be also important. Effective professional development needs to address school culture, teachers' mindset, and provide sufficient time for modeling, experimentation, and reflection, as well as follow-up support for technology integration in the classroom.

References

- Aldunate, R., & Nussbaum, M. (2013). Teacher adoption of technology. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 519-524.
- Anderson, L.W. (Ed.), Krathwohl, D.R. (Ed.), Airasian, P.W., Cruikshank, K.A., Mayer, R.E., Pintrich, P.R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M.C. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (Complete edition). New York: Longman.
- Bebell, D., Russell, M., & O'Dwyer, L. (2004). Measuring teachers' technology uses: Why multiple-measures are more revealing. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 37(1), 45-63.
- Berrett, B., Murphy, J., & Sullivan, J. (2012). Administrator insights and reflections: Technology integration in schools. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(1), 200-221.
- Buabeng-Andoh, C. (2012). Factors influencing teachers' adoption and integration of information and communication technology into teaching: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 8(1), 136.
- Bulman, G., & Fairlie, R. W. (2016). *Technology and education: Computers, software, and the internet* (No. w22237). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Carstens, R., & Pelgrum, W. J. (2007). *Second information technology in education study: SITES 2006 technical report*. The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Chen, R. J. (2010). Investigating models for preservice teachers' use of technology to support student-centered learning. *Computers & Education*, 55(1), 32-42.
- Cuban, L., Kirkpatrick, H., & Peck, C. (2001). High access and low use of technologies in high school classrooms: Explaining an apparent paradox. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 813-834.
- Drent, M., & Meelissen, M. (2008). Which factors obstruct or stimulate teacher educators to use ICT innovatively? *Computers & Education*, 51(1), 187-199.
- Ertmer, P. A., Addison, P., Lane, M., Ross, E., & Woods, D. (1999). Examining teachers' beliefs about the role of technology in the elementary classroom. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 32(1), 54-72.
- Ertmer, P. A. (1999). Addressing first-and second-order barriers to change: Strategies for technology integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 47(4), 47-61.
- Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(3), 255-284.
- Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. *Computers & Education*, 59(2), 423-435.
- Fu, J. S. (2013). ICT in education: A critical literature review and its implications. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 9(1), 112.
- Groff, J., & Mouza, C. (2008). A framework for addressing challenges to classroom technology use. *AACe Journal*, 16(1), 21-46.
- Hannafin, M. J., & Land, S. M. (1997). The foundations and assumptions of technology-enhanced student-centered learning environments. *Instructional Science*, 25, 167-202.
- Hermans, R., Tondeur, J., van Braak, J., & Valcke, M. (2008). The impact of primary school teachers' educational beliefs on the classroom use of computers. *Computers & Education*, 51, 1499-1509.
- Hernández-Ramos, P. (2005). If not here, where? Understanding teachers' use of technology in Silicon Valley schools. *Journal of Research on Technology in education*, 38(1), 39-64.

- Hew, K. F., & Brush, T. (2007). Integrating technology into K-12 teaching and learning: Current knowledge gaps and recommendations for future research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 55(3), 223-252.
- Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 493-518.
- International Society for Technology in Education, (2009). Retrieved from: <http://www.iste.org/docs/pdfs/netsessentialconditions.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- Islam, M. S., & Grönlund, Å. (2016). An international literature review of 1: 1 computing in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 17(2), 191-222.
- Kay, R. H. (2006). Evaluating strategies used to incorporate technology into preservice education: A review of the literature. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 38(4), 383-408.
- Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge. *Contemporary issues in technology and teacher education*, 9(1), 60-70.
- Levin, T., & Wadmany, R. (2006). Teachers' beliefs and practices in technology-based classrooms: A developmental view. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 39(2), 157-181.
- Levin, T., & Wadmany, R. (2008). Teachers' views on factors affecting effective integration of information technology in the classroom: Developmental scenery. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 16(2), 233.
- Minnesota Department of Education (2014). Technology - Instructional Practices Survey for Minnesota Teachers. Retrieved from <https://education.state.mn.us/mdesurvey/index.php/16773/lang-en>.
- Mumtaz, S. (2000). Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communications technology: a review of the literature. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, 9(3), 319-342.
- P21 Partnership for 21st Century Learning. (2009). Framework for 21st Century Learning. Retrieved from <http://www.p21.org/about-us/p21-framework>.
- Palak, D., & Walls, R. T. (2009). Teachers' beliefs and technology practices: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 41(4), 417-441.
- Selya, A. S., Rose, J. S., Dierker, L. C., Hedeker, D., & Mermelstein, R. J. (2012). A practical guide to calculating Cohen's f^2 , a measure of local effect size, from PROC MIXED. *Frontiers in psychology*, 3, 111.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Reilly, B. (2004). Teachers, not technicians: Rethinking technical expectations for teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 106(3), 487-512.
- SAS Institute (2004) Statistical analysis system 7.5. Cary, NC: Author.
- U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology (2010). Transforming American Education: Learning powered by technology. National Educational Technology Plan, 2010. Retrieved September 8, 2017, from <https://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/netp2010.pdf>
- Tondeur, J., Hermans, R., van Braak, J., & Valcke, M. (2008). Exploring the link between teachers' educational belief profiles and different types of computer use in the classroom. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(6), 2541-2553.
- Tondeur, J., van Braak, J., Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. (2017). Understanding the relationship between teachers' pedagogical beliefs and technology use in education: a systematic review of qualitative evidence. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 65(3), 555-575.
- van Braak, J. (2001). Factors influencing the use of computer mediated communication by teachers in secondary schools. *Computers & Education*, 36(1), 41-57.
- Vannatta, R. A., & Nancy, F. (2004). Teacher dispositions as predictors of classroom technology use. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 36(3), 253-271.
- Voogt, J., Fisser, P., Pareja Roblin, N., Tondeur, J. and van Braak, J. (2013), Technological pedagogical content knowledge – a review of the literature. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 29, 109–121.
- Watson, D. M. (2001). Pedagogy before technology: re-thinking the relationship between ICT and teaching. *Education and Information Technologies*, 6 (4), 251–266.
- Windschitl, M., & Sahl, K. (2002). Tracing teachers' use of technology in a laptop computer school: The interplay of teacher beliefs, social dynamics, and institutional culture. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 165-205.
- Wong, E. M., & Li, S. C. (2008). Framing ICT implementation in a context of educational change: A multilevel analysis. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 19(1), 99-120.
- Wozney, L., Venkatesh, V., & Abrami, P. C. (2006). Implementing computer technologies: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 14(1), 173.