

Reprinted by permission from Graham, C. R.; Allen, S.; & Ure, D. (2003). Blended learning environments: A review of the research literature. Unpublished manuscript, Provo, UT.

Discussions

	Computer-mediated environment	F2F Environment (in-class discussions)
Strengths	<p>Flexibility: Students can contribute to the discussion at the time and place that is most convenient to them</p> <p>Participation: 100% of students can participate because time and place constraints are removed</p> <p>Depth of Reflection: Learners have time to more carefully consider and provide evidence for their claims and provide deeper more thoughtful reflections (Mikulecky, 1998; Benbunan-Fich & Hiltz, 1999)</p>	<p>Human Connection: It is easier to bond and develop a social presence in a F2F environment. F2F environment makes it easier to develop trust, etc.</p> <p>Spontaneity: Allows for the generation of rapid chains of associated ideas and serendipitous discoveries (Mikulecky, 1998)</p>
Weaknesses	<p>Spontaneity: Doesn't encourage the generation of rapid chains of associated ideas and serendipitous discoveries (Mikulecky, 1998)</p> <p>Procrastination: There may be a tendency towards procrastination (Benbunan-Fich & Hiltz, 1999)</p> <p>Human Connection: The medium is considered to be impersonal by many (Benbunan-Fich & Hiltz, 1999) – this may cause a lower satisfaction level with the process (Haytko, 2001)</p>	<p>Participation: Can't always have everyone participate, especially if there are dominating personalities.</p> <p>Flexibility: Limited time, which means that you may not be able to reach the discussion depth that you would like.</p>

Benbunan-Fich, R., & Hiltz, S. R.. (1999). Educational applications of CMCS: Solving case studies through asynchronous learning networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4(3). Retrieved from the World Wide Web <http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol14/issue3/benbunan-fich.html>

Haytko, D. L.. (2001). Traditional versus hybrid course delivery systems: A case study of undergraduate marketing planning courses. *Marketing Education Review*, 11(3), 27-39.

Mikulecky, L. (1998). Diversity, discussion, and participation: Comparing web-based and campus-based adolescent literature classes. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 42(2), 84-97.