

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF READINESS TO TEACH ONLINE

By

RANDY GRAFF

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2008

© 2008 Randy Graff

To my patient and supportive wife and my understanding daughters

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank my wife, Staci, whose support has carried me these past twenty years; and also my daughters, Sydney and Emily, whose patience with my lack of presence is astounding. I thank my committee members for their encouragement. I thank my chair, Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein, my mentor and my friend, for the reassurance and faith she has given and shown me. I thank my friend and colleague Doug Johnson, for our Wednesdays' worth of work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	8
ABSTRACT	9
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	10
Problem.....	10
Purpose	13
Barriers	14
Purpose	15
Research Questions.....	15
Limitations.....	15
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Introduction.....	17
Benefits of Online Education.....	18
Students.....	19
Institutional	20
Faculty	20
Theoretical Understanding	21
Teaching Techniques.....	21
Awareness of Student Needs	22
Technical Hurdles.....	23
Conclusion	23
3 METHODS	25
The Setting.....	25
Physical Setting	26
Social Setting.....	27
Subjectivity Statement.....	28
Participants	30
Data Analysis: Narrative Analysis.....	34
Historical Overview of Narrative Analysis	35
Diversity	36
Instrumentation	38
Data Collection	38
Data Analysis.....	40
Validity	41

4	RESULTS	43
	Introduction.....	43
	What Factors Support Faculty Self-Efficacy in Readiness to Teach Online?	43
	Self-Reliance	43
	Personal Interest	45
	Technical Support.....	46
	Peer Support	48
	Experience	48
	Reflection	49
	What Factors Impede Faculty Readiness to Teach Online?	50
	Student Evaluations	50
	Technical Support.....	52
	Administrative Support	53
	Time.....	54
	Work.....	55
	Faculty Development.....	56
	What Motivations do Faculty Hold Concerning Readiness to Teach Online?	57
	Flexibility	57
	Student Needs.....	58
	Working with Peers	59
	Success and Money	60
	What De-Motivations do Faculty Hold Concerning Readiness to Teach Online?.....	60
	Time and Effort	60
	Administration.....	61
	Class Size.....	62
	What are the Perceived Causes of Faculty Resistance to Web Based Teaching?	63
	Administration.....	63
	Change.....	64
	Interactions with students.....	65
	What Attitudes and Beliefs are Conducive to Faculty Teaching Online?	65
	Faculty Presence.....	66
	Sharing with Peers.....	67
	Technology.....	67
	Respect for Students.....	69
	Pride.....	70
5	DISCUSSION.....	71
	Conclusions.....	71
	Summary of Findings	71
	Findings and the Literature	73
	Implications to Theory.....	77
	Recommendations for Future Studies.....	79

APPENDIX

A INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....83

B INFORMED CONSENT.....84

C IRB PROTOCOL.....86

LIST OF REFERENCES.....89

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....95

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
4-1 Technology, Time and Administration.....	70
5-1 Themes and Descriptions by Faculty (n=10) Connotations.....	72
5-2 Findings of Study Compared to Literature Review	80

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF READINESS TO TEACH ONLINE

By

Randy Graff

August 2008

Chair: Linda S. Behar-Horenstein
Major: Higher Education Administration

The purpose of this study was to identify factors supporting and impeding faculty teaching online. Ten faculty were interviewed to discover supporting factors, motivations, and attitudes that contributed to their success in teaching online as well as the factors that contributed to resistance and de-motivation that detracted from their success. Through a narrative analysis of the data, the qualities of self-reliance, personal interest, experience, reflection, peer support, and technical support comprised the supporting factors that sustain faculty readiness to teach online. Presence, respect for students, technology, sharing with peers, pride, subject interest, and time and patience are attitudes and beliefs of faculty who are ready to teach online. Working with peers, student needs, flexibility, success and money are the motivations of faculty who are ready to teach online.

Faculty resistance was evidenced by the administration, change, difficulty of the course management system and interactions with students. De-motivating factors were administration, class size and time. Factors that impeded their readiness to teach online were student evaluations, technical support, administrative support, work, time and faculty development.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Problem

Faculty are the individuals who create curriculum, develop objectives, compile material to teach objectives, present information in a variety of ways, provide guidance and feedback to students and assess outcomes. Readiness is a perception of the qualities one possesses when they are prepared to teach a course. Teaching online occurs when faculty members create or use an online service or course managements system, or even their own departmental or personal web space to store documents, keep grades, post discussions, and interact with students synchronously or asynchronously.

Faculty members who are ready to teach online possess the internal notion that they can succeed. This notion is known as self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a psychological theory that helps to frame the complex process behind faculty perception of being comfortable and qualified to complete some level of performance, in this case, create and teach in an online format.

“Perceived self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave” (Friedman, 1998). This theoretical perspective offers an explanation of the feelings and attitudes that builds on common understandings of believing in self. This theory has been applied to many areas of interest that exceed the scope of this study including goals of high school students (Carraway, 2000), cardiac rehabilitation (Doyle, 2000), exceptional student education (Eisenberger, Conti-D'Antonio, & Bertrando, 2000), exercise adherence at the worksite (Fox, 2000), ethics and governance (Fort, 2001), social studies (Doppen, 2002), football practice (Downey, 2002), smoking and African American males (Wallack, 2002), snowboarders with disabilities (Bright,

2004), video games and their impact on trainee gaming experience (Orvis & U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences., 2005), dealing with Chlamydia infection in college students (Thomas, 2006) and perspectives on the use of the internet in the election process (Williams & Tedesco, 2006). However, self-efficacy theory also can be useful to help explain the beliefs that faculty need to have in order to be willing and ready to teach online.

While not the first theorist to explore concepts of self-efficacy, Albert Bandura is currently the most prominent in the field (Pajares, 2006). Bandura posits that individuals possess, “a self-system that enables them to exercise a measure of control over their thoughts, feelings, motivation, and actions” (A Bandura, 1986). This power to make a decision and the decisions that are made become the indicators of self-efficacy and in turn the indicators of success for a given undertaking.

With regards to faculty perception of their readiness to teach online, efficacy can be assessed through exploring three areas of general variance: level, strength, and generality (Pajares, 2006). Within any domain, the level of task demands varies in complexity. Within online education one range begins with using email to communicate occasionally with students who are using a course management system’s synchronous tools to conduct real-time educational group experiences. The complexity of the tasks matter will be individually determined by participants in this study, based on the current complexity of faculty online courses. The current and recent past level of task demands, especially in relation to immediate future plans, are of particular interest in this study. The more comfortable an individual is with using a method, the more likely they are to continue to strive towards excellence and regain that sense of comfort within technology. It is this sense of comfort then results in moving forward that is of interest to

the researcher. Becoming aware of the range of complexity of tasks involved in online course building is a critical component of self-efficacy.

The strength with which faculty believe they can succeed (for instance in teaching on-line) is an indicator of self-efficacy (and their readiness to teach on-line). Other theories like self-confidence and personal motivation have elements of self-belief that lend support to this claim (Benabou & Tirole, 2002). The converse is also true; the strength with which faculty believe they will fail (for instance in teaching on-line) is an indicator of a lack of self-efficacy (and their unwillingness to teach on-line). This idea extends outside of the educational setting impacting beliefs in daily living with implications reaching into personal life, (in a non-academic sense) moods and behavior patterns (A. Bandura, 1982). Feelings of self-efficacy may apply to daily living may follow faculty through many settings including the online course development setting inside and outside the university walls, with the technical infrastructure, including their home office, the local coffee shop and perhaps even a hotel room while on vacation. Their experiences with personal computers and other technology, in informal teaching settings, and in conversations with friends and peers also may have an impact on faculty efficacy of teaching on-line. The perception one develops in one area of life often impacts other areas as well. Believing that one can succeed in a task (like teaching on-line) is critical to establishing a sense of self-efficacy.

Depending upon the specific situation generality comes in to play. For example, faculty may not feel as efficacious, for instance, in creating streaming video as they do in posting audio files. Tied into the concept of level discussed above, generality differs not necessarily in complexity, but in type. Generalizing the skills and comfort with attaching a file to an email message does not necessarily translate into posting files into a course management system- nor

does posting an audio file generalize to creating a streaming video and placing that content on a streaming server and linking that content in a course management system. Working with new technology can sometimes stretch us beyond our level of comfort. Taking the time to reflect on relationships between previously learned skills and new situations is a learning technique. The ability to differentiate between when and which skills generalize and those that do not are also critical components of self-efficacy.

These three areas of variance: level, strength, and generality apply to faculty perceptions of readiness to teach online as they each measure one part of faculty efficacy. Control over these elements has an impact on the success of an online course. Self-efficacy theory postulates that people can control these elements and regulate their beliefs that they can succeed.

Purpose

Many faculty in higher education are reluctant to develop and enhance courses with web based teaching methods (Surry & Land, 2000). They encounter internal and external barriers that may contribute to their reluctance. Internal barriers include personal beliefs about teaching, how students learn, trust in others, computers, classroom management, and openness to change (J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005). According to the American Association of University Presidents (AAUP) external barriers may include technical infrastructure, time for training, development, and working in an online environment (AAUP, 1999).

There will always be people who take risks and try new things. Their success or lack of success becomes a learning opportunity. At the other end of the spectrum are laggards (Rogers, 1995). They are individuals who never try new things. In between these extremes are a continuum of people who adopt new technology quickly and steadily and those who adopt new technology only after it has been accepted by a majority of their peers. This group represents the reluctant faculty; the group that this study is focused on, the large group of higher education

faculty who are skeptical, traditionally conservative, yet somewhat open to change (Rogers, 1995). This study is concerned with their perceptions, the factors that cause them or impede them from being ready and feeling ready to teach online.

Barriers

Barriers to teaching online are readily identifiable and prolific in research, professional journals and even in trade magazines (Agee, Holisky, & M., 2003; Aggarwal, 2000; J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005; Baker, Boggs, & Arabasz, 2003; M. Baker, R. Boggs, & P. Arabasz, 2003; A. W. Bangert, 2004; J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; S. Bennett & Lockyer, 2004; Carrol-Barefield, Smith, Prince, & Campbell, 2005; Faseyitan, Libii, & Hirschbuhl, 1996; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Howell, Saba, Lindsay, & Williams, 2004; King, 2002; Kinuthia, 2004; Kosak et al., 2004b; Lawhon & Ennis-Cole, 2005; Maguire, 2005; Meyer & ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education., 2002; Qing & Akins, 2005). The impressions that these authors describe are those told by faculty who use cutting edge technology, and indirectly, by educational support staff. The faculty in the middle have not been a source of information that informs the field. Instead, survey data has been compiled, high-end technology faculty have been interviewed, or written articles or trades-folk and the media have written articles about their own perceptions. The experiences of faculty in the middle of laggards and cutting edge to date have not be reported or studied.

Another barrier to faculty teaching online is a lack of representation in the governance of technology decisions (Grant, 2004). The administrative and academic structure at this southeastern university is often incongruent with information sharing and decision making processes. The university is moving towards faculty governance. For example, one of the colleges represented in this study, the College of Education actually operates under faculty governance. The body of people who make technology decisions for central campus are

administrative—either in job title or in practice, direction in technology purchases for the enterprise are made from a financial or political framework of understanding and most often made by administrators or faculty acting in administrative roles. Because these decisions are not grounded in pedagogy or educational concerns, the possibility of not being successfully adopted by the faculty is heightened (Kinuthia, 2004).

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions, attitudes, beliefs and factors that influence the self-efficacy among faculty who are skeptical but open to change with regards their readiness to teach online. How faculty perceive their readiness will be explored using Bandura's Self-Efficacy theory as a theoretical framework. Qualitative methods and interviews will be used to analyze the stories of faculty to gain a deeper understanding regarding why some faculty are reluctant to participate in web-based teaching.

Research Questions

1. What factors support faculty self efficacy in readiness to teach online?
2. What factors impede faculty readiness to teach online?
3. What motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?
4. What de-motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?
5. What are the perceived causes of faculty resistance to web based teaching?
6. What attitudes and beliefs are conducive to faculty teaching online?

Limitations

This study is bounded, as are all qualitative studies, by the lack of general transferability of the findings (Creswell, 2005). The focus on late adopters of technology may be considered limited with respect to the more immediate data that could be collected by interviewing the cutting edge and early adopters. However, the lack of qualitative data in the area of reluctant faculty perceptions of readiness makes this study timely and central to the growing demands placed on faculty for creating and conducting on-line learning. Also, the relevance of this study

to the theory of faculty perceptions may be problematic because there is no theory currently available. Reliance upon a theoretical construct of self-efficacy, one outside the field of higher education, may further the implications of the findings to higher education faculty.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Teaching online is an important part of many higher educational institutions and include benefits of increased enrollment, the appeal high tech teaching to students (Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005), improved efficiency of classroom management and reduced withdrawals and absenteeism (Woods, Baker, & Hopper, 2004). Elements of online courses vary in complexity and design. The range can begin at a low level of complexity, posting files and links to websites, where students proceed in a relative lock-step fashion at their own pace and on their own time and proceed to a higher level. For example, a higher level of complexity involves arranging learning experiences where faculty and students at a distance meet and interact in the same time in internet space. This is synchronous computer-based instruction, a more complex use of the online environment. As the complexity of the synchronous environment increases, there is a greater dependence and expectation from faculty that the system will work (Kosak, Manning, Dobson, Rogerson, Cotnam, Colaric, & McFadden, 2004).

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 48% of college-level, credit-granting distance education courses were offered at the undergraduate level of all institutions, and 22 % at the graduate level. Further, among institutions offering distance education courses, 43 % offered Internet courses using synchronous computer-based instruction (Statistics, 2005). All of these offerings require a great deal of work which is only made easier if all of the participants—students, administration and faculty-- buy in.

The purpose of this study is to work with faculty to co-construct the meaning of faculty readiness to teach online. This study is intended to offer in-depth understanding of what skills

and qualities faculty perceive as important to successfully (as perceived by participants) teach an online course or course component.

The purpose of this chapter is to present an overview of research pertinent to this study. An overview of the following topics includes: (a) the benefits of online education, (b) teaching techniques, (c) awareness of student needs, (d) technical hurdles and, (e) a summary.

Benefits of Online Education

The benefits of teaching online are dependent upon the audience—what educational tasks students are able to perform within the sphere of their learning preferences; what benefits administrators glean from faculty offering online courses; what goal(s) faculty are trying to attain with the use of online learning techniques. Students have found that it is valuable to access information from a variety of places and take tests online (Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005). They also have experienced a greater “sense of morale and overall satisfaction with the learning experience” (Woods et al., 2004). The benefits to administrators include increased enrollment, the allure of delivering “high-tech education” to students (Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005), improved efficiency of classroom management and reduced withdrawals and absenteeism (Woods et al., 2004). For faculty who have course materials readily available online, the process of grading the interaction students have with those materials becomes streamlined (Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005). This benefit is coupled with pedagogical advantages over traditional brick and mortar classroom techniques—not having to duplicate materials, pass out documents, or listen to unqualified complaints of not having access to the materials before class (Covington, Petherbridge, & Warren, 2005).

Students

Benefits of online learning to students vary. However, students are able to work on their own schedule, readily access materials, read assignments and texts online, take advantage of non-linear access to learning, and asynchronous access to discussions (Beasley & Smyth, 2004). In a face to face course that meets one or multiple times a week, students may be asked to turn work in at a specific time and place. There is flexibility, if so desired by faculty, in an online course environment to have documents and assignments turned in by a deadline outside of a regular course meeting time. According to Huang, “learners can arrange their learning around their everyday lives without being constrained by time and place” (H.-M. Huang, 2002). This deadline can be monitored after the fact by faculty (in a technical fashion) and gives students the freedom to work when and where they choose.

Many students work from a variety of locations, often in between the tasks of everyday life. Bringing books and materials into different environments is not always feasible, so access to materials during free time is beneficial. Online learning environments facilitate access to materials, assignments and articles online (Swan, 2003).

Non-linear access to course content provides a meaningful way for students to access content as opposed to the linear face to face method where information can come too slow or too fast, the student not being ready to process the content. Access to information in this manner also empowers students to direct their inquiry in a self-meaningful way (Picciano, 2002).

Asynchronous access to discussions benefits students’ ability to interact with faculty and peers in a manner that is meaningful. “Online discussion groups are characterized as being discussion-oriented, authentic, project-based, inquiry-focused, and collaborative” (H.-M. Huang, 2002). This use of the discussion tool adds to the value of the course and brings a semblance of appropriateness to a complex process.

Institutional

According to the professional organization Educause, from an administrative standpoint, online learning represents an investment from the university. The return on this investment can be quantified (Educause, 2006). From the institutional perspective, benefits include increased enrollment, participation in the competitive highly technical market (Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005), improved efficiency of classroom management and reduced withdrawals and absenteeism (Woods et al., 2004). Other institutional goals take the form of strategic planning that involves transforming the teaching and learning experience, paving the way for increased enrollment, sustaining academic diversity and gaining a competitive advantage (Baker et al., 2003).

Faculty

The benefits to faculty teaching online are well documented. Maguire (2005) has categorized the motivators and inhibitors to online teaching as: intrinsic motivators, extrinsic motivators, institutional motivators, intrinsic inhibitors, and institutional inhibitors. Of relevant interest are the intrinsic motivators which include intellectual challenges, adding to overall job satisfaction, improved working conditions, and self-gratification (Maguire, 2005). Grant (2004) recognizes the power of intrinsic factors with regards to training faculty to be ready to teach online. For example, he found that faculty find value in attending training in a facility close to and with members of their department. Attending training with members of their department often builds a camaraderie that helps faculty see value in attending training. Training provides faculty with the tools, knowledge and guided experience to feel ready to teach online. This is an opportunity for faculty to influence others in their department and college to do things, like attend training, to be ready to teach online.

Theoretical Understanding

Faculty are the individuals who are responsible for creating curriculum, developing objectives, compiling material to meet those objectives, presenting information in a variety of ways and providing guidance and feedback to students. Readiness is a perception of the qualities one possesses when they are prepared to teach a course. Teaching online occurs when faculty members create or use an online service such as BlackBoard, WebCT, or even their own departmental or personal web space to store documents, keep grades, post discussions, and interact with students synchronously or asynchronously.

Teaching Techniques

Successful teaching techniques are important to improving the quality of online courses (A. W. Bangert, 2004; J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Kosak et al., 2004b; Yang & Cornelious, 2005). Bangert acknowledges the concern educators have about the lack of quality assurance procedures in online courses and suggests using a constructivist model of teaching and learning with faculty serving as facilitators or coaches while the learners actively construct meaning and knowledge through interactive learning experiences (A. W. Bangert, 2004).

Results of Bangert's study are focused on a quantitative evaluation of student response to survey questions evaluating faculty teaching. Self or peer assessment plays an important and tangible role in evaluating faculty teaching. The evaluation of faculty effectiveness based on student perceptions provides limited insight as the results are gleaned from a quantitative de-contextualized assessment of a wholly subjective instrument. However, results from others in the field help to validate the importance of Bangert's suggested model of teaching and include assessment based on faculty input (J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Kosak et al., 2004b; Yang & Cornelious, 2005).

Awareness of Student Needs

The role faculty play in an online course is necessarily quite different than the role of a classroom instructor. Here, it is of paramount importance that the faculty member be aware of his or her students with regards to their needs, learning styles, and expectations (J. Angers & K. Machtmes, 2005; Baker, 2003; M. B. Baker, R. Boggs, & P. Arabasz, 2003; A. W. Bangert, 2004; Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Covington et al., 2005; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Levenburg & Major, 2000; Morris, Xu, & Finnegan, 2005). Teacher attitudes and beliefs are key to modifying their role as an online educator and the ability to pay attention to things they may previously have taken for granted in the past (J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005). Non-verbal cues which may have been one of these things taken for granted in the traditional classroom is an extremely significant factor in human interaction. According to Baker (2003), 60% of interpersonal communication is nonverbal. Faculty (especially those new to online teaching) must be open to this change in role and perspective including utilizing interactive elements to their course and being aware of everyday things that impact students (Covington et al., 2005).

This change in the manner of teaching can be terribly difficult. How does one notice someone sitting in their home in front of their computer nodding off to sleep? How do you hear the sneezing and wheezing of an ill student? How can you “see” a student with their arms crossed in front of them in a symbolic stance of disagreement? How can you “see” the active listening cues that are evidenced by the nodding of the head, eye contact, appropriate smiling during a conversation? A change from the way in which teaching is done in the classroom is imperative to this role change. This change is more than just at the practical level; it must occur at the theoretical plane (Baker, 2003; A. W. Bangert, 2004; Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Levenburg & Major, 2000; Morris et al., 2005).

Technical Hurdles

As with any reliance upon technology, the need for support and training is extremely important to overcoming technical hurdles that would otherwise quash development of teaching and learning in an online environment (J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Kosak et al., 2004b; Rice, 2004; Yang & Cornelious, 2005). There will always be rationale for centralized support of systems such as email or an enterprise course management system and even some of the more general aspects of support and training. However, when it comes down to the actual working with faculty, the decentralized approach often breaks down the institutional and inter-personal barriers often associated with apparently disinterested core service support. Grant (2004) advocates a decentralized approach to faculty development and cites smaller focused training workshops as important to effectively engage faculty in active learning. Bennett & Bennett (2003) also recognize the importance of removing barriers from faculty with the goal of facilitating online learning. They focus on the literature of “diffusion” where the characteristic compatibility is discussed (J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003). Compatibility looks at the measure of how much a faculty member sees the instructional technology tool as consistent with their values and philosophies of teaching. The training that faculty receive must be aware of the values and philosophies that impact the faculty in a particular field. General knowledge of values and philosophies will only serve to confound the issue. Faculty need a peer presented approach to faculty development and support through faculty mentors, administrative and technical support and collaboration with faculty and students (Yang & Cornelious, 2005).

Conclusion

One problem with online education is that traditional faculty (those who normally teach face-to-face) are often placed in the position of having to teach online. They are pressured by

their peers, administration and by students (J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003). Resources, training and other solutions are sometimes offered to faculty (Agee et al., 2003; J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Rice, 2004) but the piece that is missing is the faculty perception of readiness. Some studies have come very close and even have offered resources in a decentralized manner such as offering small group instruction on instructional technology tools at the department level (Grant, 2004). This way faculty could feel less threatened and actually discuss issues specific to their field and interests, rather than work with other faculty from a completely different discipline. However, faculty should be involved in the objectives stage of the training development (Agee et al., 2003; Lawhon & Ennis-Cole, 2005). What is it that the faculty feel is important to be successful in teaching online? What aspects of their face-to-face courses do they want to transform into an online version? Faculty are an integral part of this learning process and need to be included at an early stage in the training development.

Maguire recognizes the need “to focus on faculty attitudes and specific factors—motivating and inhibiting—affecting participation in online, web-based teaching” (Maguire, 2005). The perception of faculty members’ readiness to teach online align themselves with Maguire’s observation.

CHAPTER 3 METHODS

The Setting

The southern university where this study took place is a public, land-grant, research university. The university sprawls across the state in extension service locations, satellite campuses, and hospitals and clinics—some reaching far outside the state’s borders. There are sixteen colleges that make up the academic organization of the university, among them are the Colleges of Education, Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health and Health Professions, and Veterinarian Medicine. Participants for this study are from the Colleges of Education and the Health Science Center. The College of Education (COE), founded in 1906, has five academic departments. The college’s mission recognizes a diverse global community and is geared towards problem solving and collaborative preparation of practitioners and scholars (C. Webmaster, 2006). The mission targets a diverse world population and sees its “customers” as scholars and practitioners. There are 115 full-time faculty and approximately 1,900 full-time students (C. Webmaster, 2006).

The six health-related colleges form an academic, administrative and clinical unit known as the Health Science Center (HSC). The HSC and was founded in 1956. The HSC is an integrated academic enterprise whose main purpose is to “operate as a single campus dedicated to training a variety of professionals side by side to safeguard the health of the citizens.” The mission recognizes the diversity of its “customers” (the student community) yet sees this as an alliance with a common goal. There are 300 full-time faculty and over 6,000 students (H. Webmaster, 2006).

The College of Education and the six colleges of the HSC represent complex, dynamic and political academic and administrative units. Both areas are geographically close, yet are far apart

with regards to mission and recognition of student body. The COE produces scholars and practitioners while the HSC, for the most part, trains professionals. For the purposes of this study, interviews and observations comprised the data collection techniques as they are well suited to get at faculty perceptions (Lawhon & Ennis-Cole, 2005). Archival records, field notes and a research journal assisted in background information and with creating a detailed description of the settings and research experience of these two unique areas. The interviews took place either in the participant's office, classroom or in a centrally located administrative office. The observations take place either in the classroom, online, or in the participant's office.

Physical Setting

The College of Education is housed in a moderately refurbished 1934-built school. A major section was added on in late 1970; both sections house academic and administrative staff as well as classrooms. The offices are generally small and are equipped with a wide variety of second-hand furniture. The faculty, however, do have up-to-date computer systems, most of them are of the Macintosh variety and only a few of them are WinTel (Window Operating System and Intel Processor) based. The classrooms range from traditional "school-style" rooms with black chalk boards and 1970-ish tables, chairs and desks. The technology in most classrooms is an overhead projector. Some rooms have computers and data projectors; however, most of the projectors are old. Some offices and classrooms have windows looking out on the college grounds which are surrounded with aged oak trees and other natural features.

The HSC facility is comprised of ten buildings in close geographical proximity. The age of the buildings ranges from pre-1956 to those currently under construction. The facilities include space for administrative, academic, research and clinical responsibilities. The offices range from small open cubicles and small closed offices to large, multiple room office suites. The furniture ranges from recently purchased high-end modern to second-hand collections and isolated pieces.

The classrooms range from closet-sized to large lecture style auditoriums. The technology in the classrooms ranges from light switches and power outlets to distance education capable rooms. The higher end rooms include plasma screens showing the remote audience, “follow-me” cameras that track the speaker and follow them as they walk, and video codices that send video and audio of the classroom participants as well as computer video in simultaneous streams. In between these two extremes are the majority of rooms that are equipped with a new computer, projector and electronic writing tablet. Faculty computers are very wide ranging from the absolute latest and cutting edge to older, outdated systems. The newer buildings have windows while the older buildings usually do not. The scenery outside is mainly buildings and roads.

Social Setting

The social setting of this study will include interviews and observations which will take place in the classroom, online, in faculty offices or in a central administrative location. The interviews were comprised of open ended questions designed to facilitate conversation and elicit faculty stories. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed.

There are numerous articles about faculty development, tips for teaching online, and incentives for faculty to teach online, but lacking in the literature are articles about faculty perceptions of readiness to teach online. Additionally, training programs designed to assist faculty in preparing to teach online often times are based on “good ideas” and personal biases of professional trainers. Rarely is a gap analysis of skills performed. Instead assumptions are made and tools are taught in a lockstep and at times pedagogical (true sense of the word with trainers leading faculty by the hand, walking to knowledge, showing them the way rather than working with faculty and building upon current knowledge). Tip sheets are created, videos constructed and workshops held. Expert technology trainers, ex-faculty and even very well qualified instructional designers, describe on-line teaching, but faculty member teaching and researching

in the field have not been represented in research. Public perceptions hold that university faculty are not required to learn to teach. However, they are required to be skilled in their field. This firsthand knowledge puts them in a unique position to understand how to be ready to build and teach that content online.

For the purpose of operationalizing my concepts: Faculty are those people that are responsible for creating curriculum, developing objectives, compiling material to teach those objectives and providing guidance and feedback to students. Readiness is a perception of the qualities one possesses when they are intrinsically prepared to teach directly or indirectly a course or course section. Teaching online is when a faculty member creates or uses an online service such as a course management system, or even their own departmental or personal web space to store documents, keep grades, post discussions, and interact with students synchronously or asynchronously.

Subjectivity Statement

I have been in faculty development for the past 11 years either training faculty formally or as a faculty member myself in the classrooms of higher education institutions teaching students. In the higher education system, I work with faculty at the University's Health Science Center. Through interactions with these faculty and staff I have grown to appreciate the complexities of teaching extremely technical and personal courses and making the transition to teaching online. Some faculty approach support staff and want them to scan slides and documents so they can then upload them to a course management system. Others want to learn how to create interactive web components for an online course. Some approach staff a year or a semester before their course is held and some come for help after the semester has already begun.

For the past six years I have trained faculty in the use of technology including using the Blackboard course management system and products that support creating content for online

teaching. Most recently, I have assisted with the migration of our Health Science Center faculty to a new course management system. The migration was handled efficiently and expertly but with minimal input of faculty—from heavily weighted opinions of support staff and administrators. Through observing faculty in workshops, I have seen that many are willing participants excited about the new tool and its possibilities for teaching, some seem threatened by the technology and the steep learning curve associated with the new software. In training some are engaged and some are not as they sigh loudly with the slow pace of some of their peers and the training.

These experiences have shaped my view of teaching online. Having supported a user friendly course management system for 6 years, I have a bias towards ease of use over features and have a dislike of complex teaching environments that are too cumbersome. The training currently offered for the new system is in and of itself too complex, lengthy, and based on “good ideas” rather than informed methodology. It seems to be a combination of an immature framework (“Astronomy for Poets” is the name of the sample class within which training takes place) which is misleading and skills that are not equivalent to those used that is in stark contrast to the complexity of the system. Navigation is extremely convoluted. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) web standards and World Wide Web Consortium (WC3) standards are not strictly followed. Faculty are forced to use an obfuscated internal navigation which does not allow for the use of conventional browser controls. File management is complex and quite different from computer file systems, web space systems and previous course management systems.

Faculty development is a difficult charge. Professionals involved with faculty development have diverse attitudes and beliefs about working with faculty, as do faculty working with

trainers, ranging from full comfort and familiarity with each other to fear of technology and asking for help from a non-academic, which can lead to estrangement and lack of confidence. I believe that both extremes could benefit from engaging faculty in discussion prior to and during training.

My skills in qualitative research are grounded in coursework, intense immersion in evaluation and qualitative foundations (theoretical and practical), data collection and data analysis over the course of two years. I have worked under expert tutelage, as part of a research group, and independently as a qualitative researcher resulting in national research presentations and publications. Using Nvivo software I have analyzed data for two research publications and have also provided training to faculty and students in its use.

Participants

Ten faculty members were selected for this study. They were from the College of Education and the Health Science Center. The sampling was criterion based where participants had a major teaching responsibility (as opposed to research or clinical) of greater than ½ time and who have taught for two or more semesters over the past two years utilizing appropriate online teaching techniques in a hybrid course (a face to face course with online extension and activities that promote communication, foster group work and enhance the classroom learning experience). In this case, appropriate online teaching techniques include interactive teaching using discussion boards, chat rooms, and simulations.

These ten faculty members helped co-construct the data generated by this study through the telling of their stories. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained and then an email script that was used to invite faculty to participate in the study (See Appendix C). After receiving approval, I emailed university faculty and staff who are close to faculty and who could

facilitate access to them (gatekeepers) to request their involvement in the selection of faculty participants (or informants) of this study.

Key gatekeepers who facilitated access to participants include Jill, of the College of Dentistry; Ned from the College of Education; William, from Learning Support Systems (course management system administrator); Mark from the College of Medicine, Office of Medical Education; Justin, from the College of Nursing; and Horace, from the College of Pharmacy.

The number of colleges is limited to allow for a depth of knowledge of faculty perceptions of efficacy in their readiness to teach online. The College of Education and the colleges of the HSC have had a recent increase in the number of faculty who teach online. The combination of Education and the HSC is designed help to create a rich body of data from two similar areas with dissimilar course management systems. By selecting two areas of campus, I hoped to get a broad and deep understanding of the distinct groups and to gain insight into a diverse group of faculty.

Each gatekeeper was individually and informally interviewed in person in a mutually agreeable location during the initial part of this study to assist in compiling a list of faculty who meet the qualification guidelines previously mentioned. I initiated contact by telephone with the gatekeepers, providing each, if they agree and at a later meeting, a list of requirements. I asked them to consider the faculty with whom they worked and had them suggest those who met the criteria and who might be willing to work on this project. To help better prepare the thinking process and evaluation that each gatekeeper went through in helping select faculty I also discussed with each gatekeeper the concept and details of this study, including conceptual framework, research questions, data collection techniques, methods and timeline.

Once the informants were identified the gatekeepers assisted me in placing a phone call or email introduction of me to the faculty so they would not be entirely surprised by my first

contact with them. My first contact with faculty was on an individual basis via email using the pre-approved email script submitted to IRB. If there was a lack of response from faculty (within seven days), I followed this first message up with a second email message including a carbon copy to the associated gatekeeper.

Ana teaches in the College of Nursing. She is a warm and friendly female in her early sixties. She is a tenured associate professor who has been teaching fully online courses for the past two years. She has also taught hybrid courses for the same two years and prior to that and currently she taught and teaches face to face courses. Ana started teaching online courses out of a desire to expand her teaching. She teaches mainly graduate students and also teaches the occasional undergraduate course.

Art teaches in the College of Medicine. He is an athletic and funny male in his early forties. He is a non-tenured clinical assistant professor who has been teaching hybrid courses for the past three years. Art started adding web-based resources to his face to face course out of the desire to meet the requests and needs of his students. He teaches only graduate students.

Bill teaches in the College of Public Health and Health Professions. He is a serious male in his early forties. He is a tenured associate professor who has been teaching hybrid courses for the past three years. He started teaching online to provide his students with a means to access course documents and web-based materials in an organized and readily available manner. He teaches graduate students.

Dan teaches in the College of Education. He is an easy to get along with male in his mid sixties. He is a tenured professor who has been teaching hybrid courses for the past year and a half. He mainly teaches students face to face either on the main campus or in a cohort format on

a distant campus. He started teaching online as part of a move by his department to offer courses online. He teaches graduate students.

Doug teaches in the College of Nursing. He is a considerate and honest male in his mid forties. He is a tenured clinical assistant professor who has been teaching online courses for the past three years. He teaches an even amount of face to face and fully online courses as well as teaching clinical courses in the hospital. He was assigned an online teaching responsibility. He teaches graduate and undergraduate students.

Marge teaches in the College of Nursing. She is a critical and poignant female in her mid forties. She is a non-tenured associate professor who has been teaching hybrid and online courses for the past three years. She was asked to teach online by her administration. Marge teaches undergraduate and graduate students.

Melissa teaches in the College of Public Health and Health Professions. She is an energetic and thoughtful female in her early forties. She is a non-tenured assistant professor who has been teaching hybrid courses for the past year. She voluntarily has become involved in using the course management system. Melissa teaches graduate students.

Pam teaches in the College of Education. She is a soft-spoken and knowledgeable female in her early forties. She is a non-tenured assistant professor who has been teaching fully online courses for the past two years. She was mandated to teach online by her department. She teaches undergraduate students.

Pat teaches in the College of Pharmacy. He is an outgoing and story-telling male in his late fifties. He is a tenured professor who has been teaching hybrid courses for the past five years. He has also taught distance education via video conferencing. He was mandated to teach online. He teaches graduate students.

Stew teaches in the College of Pharmacy. He is a precise and straightforward male in his early fifties. He is a tenured clinical associate professor who has been teaching online and hybrid courses for the past six years. He began teaching online as a way to keep in touch with his students when he travelled. He is now mandated to teach online. He teaches graduate students.

As each informant confirmed their interest, I scheduled a time and place for our first interview, provided them with my cellular phone number and requested a contact phone number for them in the event that there was a problem meeting, and informed them of a backup location. One work day preceding the interview I sent a reminder email message about the time and place of our scheduled meeting.

On the day of the meeting, I checked my recording equipment for fresh batteries and recording space. I also brought an extra recorder and batteries. I arrived five to ten minutes early to ensure the location was ready for the interview.

Data Analysis: Narrative Analysis

Analyzing spoken and written words to get at meaning is a common approach that helps begin to understand the thoughts, history and beliefs of human beings (Feldman, Skoldberg, Brown, & Horner, 2004). Some of the earliest oral traditions in history take the form of stories. These stories, including the epics of Virgil and Homer through modern day delivery methods of film, book and music, fulfill one of the four critical orientations of literary criticism; namely: mimetic, pragmatic, expressive and objective (Adams & Searle, 2005). The expressive orientation informs us about the importance of telling and interpreting stories. This orientation looks to the purpose of literature and has been described by some of the most talented and thoughtful writers throughout history including Plato, Aristotle, Horace, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Dante Alighieri, Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, Alexander Pope, Samuel

Johnson, Immanuel Kant, William Blake, Friedrich Von Schiller, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, John Keats, Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe, John Stuart Mill, Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, Emile Zola, Anatole France, Sigmund Freud, and Lionel Trilling (Adams & Searle, 2005). These well written authors offer criticism on literature and may also help to inform the analysis of stories through use of Narrative Analysis.

Analyzing spoken and written words to get at meaning is an approach that helps begin to understand the thoughts, history and beliefs of human beings. This approach is used by scholars across discipline and epistemological boundaries. Positivists use structured surveys, closed questions and statistical symbols in their work. Every researcher who writes and goes through the process of rewriting uses analysis of their own work to build upon early drafts. From the constructivist point of view analysis of informants' expressive narratives helps to uncover an understanding of how meaning is made of events, how human conduct is shaped by experience, how the nature of reality for an individual is shaped by cultural messages, and a multitude of other dimensional outcomes (Hatch, 2002).

Historical Overview of Narrative Analysis

Narrative analysis has its origins in the assumption that people like telling stories and that their lives can be self-described in terms of stories because this is a primary method for people to make meaning of events in their lives (Daiute & Lightfoot, 2004). The stories that people choose to tell, the settings they choose to describe, the events they choose elaborate, the details they choose to present all have an impact on the impression made on the listener/reader. The way in which people try to make others understand something either through the use of metaphor, simile, analogy, and/or description is telling of their cultural and social influences as well as the way in which they make sense of the world.

On the individual level, researchers have explored the concept of how “self” is constructed through the act of storytelling (Sands, 2004). The actual process of how this self is constructed is well documented and assists in understanding differences in culture and psychological perspectives of organizations and individuals (Daiute & Lightfoot, 2004). Stories about organizations and other general topics are actually stories told by individuals who offer insight into the perspective and interests of the storyteller.

Narrative analysis uses methods typically used in literary studies to look at and construct meaning of the stories of informants. The method actually has its origins in the social sciences as positivist research began to have difficulty explaining things in naturalist terms (Reissner, 2005; Riessman, 2006). The narrative format for analysis is not an analysis method with clear-cut steps leading to an overall process. The steps are relatively flexibly and systematic which leads the inherent complexity of this method (Daiute & Lightfoot, 2004).

Diversity

Narrative analysis is “inherently interdisciplinary” (Riessman, 2006). The primary method of communicating with others is through telling stories which is not isolated to any specific field of study. In scholarly fields, narrative analysis is evident in Public Administration in studies that look at organizational change in city management, forms of government and public participation (Feldman et al., 2004; Hampton, 2006; Miller & Jaja, 2005). Education makes great use of narrative analysis in the areas of curriculum, inclusion of exceptional students in mainstream education, physical education, socio-economic power differentials, educational philosophy, and assessment and evaluation (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Dorries & Haller, 2001; Oliver, 1998; Ruano, 2005; Smeyers & Verhesschen, 2001; Webbstock, 1997).

Psychology also utilizes narrative analysis to look at alternative levels of narrative analysis in health education research, structure of narrative analysis as from the elderly Japanese

viewpoint, the relationship between psychology and marketing from the consumer's perspective, the meaning of child care for women raising their young children, and comparative analysis of existential and narrative analysis (Murray, 2000; Naudin & Azorin, 1998; Nomura, 2005; Sands, 2004; Stern, Thompson, & Arnould, 1998; Tokuda, 2004).

Narrative analysis is used in marketing while looking at trends in marketing research (Zinkhan & Delorme, 1995), in information technology to examine information requirements during and Enterprise Resource Planning (like PeopleSoft) implementation (Alvarez & Uria, 2002), music theory (Almen, 2003) and in religion while reconstructing a feminist Christian Doctrine. (Greene-McCreight & Carr, 2001; Lieu, 2000; Mankowski & Thomas, 2000)

Journalism looks at the act of collecting as covered by a newspaper (Bishop, 2003), Organizational Studies looks at workplace emotions (Boudens, 2005), and environmental studies uses narrative analysis in an attempt to understand environmental remediation (Campbell, 2002).

Medicine relies on narrative analysis quite a bit. Researchers evaluate community-based rotations, the relationship between a heart failure nurse specialist, their patients and their patient's family as it copes chronic illness or breast cancer (Chin, Aligne, Stroncsek, Shipley, & Kaczorowski, 2003; Patricia Davidson, Paull, Rees, Daly, & Cockburn, ; Patricia Davidson, Paull, Rees, Daly, & Cockburn, ; P. Davidson, Paull, Rees, Daly, & Cockburn, 2005; Fiese & Wamboldt, ; Lawson, 1998), among many others.

Within the field of faculty development and online learning, the literature is devoid of qualitative studies using narrative methodology. This could suggest that faculty are not readily and regularly asked to participate in discussions about developing workshops about online course development.

Instrumentation

There will be three instruments for this study: a semi-structured interview protocol, a faculty observation worksheet, and an archival/setting/background records data sheet. The researcher created each instrument and checked the validity by asking graduate student colleagues and the members of my dissertation committee to review the protocols. The interview data was collected and transcribed then verified through the use of member checking—by providing informants with a copy of the typed transcript and asking them to check for accuracy.

The semi-structured interview protocol was used to assist with the interactive interview process as discussed by Hatch (2002). Questions that asked request descriptive, structural, and contrasting information were written. Faculty were asked to discuss particulars of the social scenes that have helped create a sense of self efficacy with relation to teaching online. The researcher talked with faculty about the kinds of things, the steps in achieving and the characteristics of efficacy and readiness to teach online. The interview protocol was comprised of open-ended questions that prompt us to compare examples of related elements of their social worlds in relation to teaching online. These questions provided the data in the form of “stories” that were analyzed using narrative analysis.

Data Collection

In order to facilitate conversation, a semi-structured interactive interview and protocol with open ended questions as suggested by Hatch was used. The interviews were tape-recorded and transferred to a personal computer that was physically secured behind a locked door in an alarmed house on a password protected computer and the audio files encrypted. The encrypted audio files will be backed up to a physically secured, password protected and encrypted USB-key. Once the integrity and availability of the audio files and their backups on the computer and

removable drive were verified, the audio recording on the tape recorder were deleted and the process of transcribing the interview began. The electronic files were maintained in their secured and backed up state until after the study is completed, turned in and accepted by my committee and college.

This data were collected during the scheduled interviews. Collecting data through interviews provided a record of the co-constructed information created during the interviews. Although the term “semi-structured” was used, it is informal enough to allow for following leads as suggested by the conversation. The term “semi-structured” comes from having a set instrument, setting a meeting time and setting a place for the interview (Hatch, 2002). According to Holstein and Gubrium when discussing how meaning is elicited through the interview process, “it is actively and socially assembled in the interview encounter” (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003, p. 4). One way that people respond to a question is with a story. “Stories are useful to both participants and observers of organizations because they are a basic tool that individuals use to communicate and create understanding with other people and for themselves” (Feldman et al., 2004, p. 147). These encounters provided data that were analyzed for constructed meaning.

The protocol for the study contained open ended questions designed to elicit stories about faculty beliefs. I asked faculty to tell me about a time they may have felt confident and/or ready to teach a class online. I asked them to tell me what it was like to have something get in the way of them feeling ready to teach on-line. I asked them to take me through a motivating experience and also through a de-motivating experience they have gone through with regards to on-line teaching. In an effort to end on a positive note, I asked them to consider a faculty member with whom they are familiar that is the most reluctant to teach on-line in their department, college or university. I asked them to imagine this person recently having been extremely successful in

teaching an on-line course. Next, I invited them to describe what this conversation might look like and also have them step backwards in time to when the possible solutions to the resistance previously exhibited by this faculty member with regards to teaching on-line were solved.

Data from the observations were from the physical spaces where we met in to discuss the research questions and the physical (office) and ethereal (web) space where faculty teach online (discussion boards, white boards, chat rooms, etc.). Through the use of observation, I gained a perspective and a sense of setting and time for the narrative offered by each faculty member. Studying the physical setting of the office helped me form a fuller picture of the environment within which a faculty member creates and interacts with their course. The ethereal space helped to enhance the surrounding physical setting and also assisted in displaying a more full view of the place where students and faculty interact. The archival data consisted of previous course evaluations collected from the website (The University, 2006), training transcripts, and samples of faculty perceived successes from their previous online courses. The previous course evaluations were used to get an impression of the general like or dislike of the course/faculty member by students. Field notes and a research journal were used to provide rich detail in an effort to create a fuller picture of the setting and responses to research questions and a deeper understanding away from the research setting.

Data Analysis

Interview transcripts were analyzed using narrative analysis. The transcribed data were read thoroughly keeping the research questions in mind and noting stories that were told. I took notes in the margins to record my initial impressions. During the second read of the transcript I kept a list of my research questions nearby and referred to them as I read and consider what was said during the interview and attempted to identify narrative themes. The textual analysis proceeded in chunks.

Prior to the second interview I began with a member checking where I presented the informant with a transcript of our discussion along with a summarized version of my notes and asked if I accurately recorded their stories and if the notes were aligned with the content of their stories. After clarifying this document, I began to ask any follow up questions based on the data from the first interview. This meeting was recorded with the same care as the first interview and the data subsequently transcribed and analyzed in the same manner using narrative analysis. This process was repeated (although perhaps in parallel) with each participant. To decide if the stories and their implications were supported by the transcript data, I went back to the transcript to verify the story data.

I looked for themes that possibly similar between participants, grouping the College of Education and the HSC separately at first, and then looked for similarities between the themes for the two groups. To ensure the integrity of the data, I went back to the transcripts and verified the context of the stories. A recording of these representative stories were presented to a group of my peers for review. Next, a diagram was created expressing the relationships (if any) between and within the stories.

The findings were then reported in narrative format using excerpts from the data as referenced. These findings were summarized in a discussion and overview section. My personal reflections were written up as an interpretive commentary. References to the literature were cited and limitations of the findings discussed (Creswell, 2005).

Validity

Validity in qualitative studies is quite different than its namesake in traditional positivist studies. The latter seeks to align with a goal of a single truth. Qualitative studies seek to confirm the process in a social world through the use of truthfulness and auditable steps which form the basis of trustworthiness and in turn, validity (Bailey). By describing the methods I used,

the manner in which I collected and then analyzed the data, and by putting forth my subjectivity in an explicit manner, I hope to achieve a collegial level of trustworthiness that is credible and that my processes, although not seeking an objective reality, would be confirmable and in essence, valid.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

Introduction

Six research questions guided this study:

1. What factors support faculty self-efficacy in readiness to teach online?
2. What factors impede faculty readiness to teach online?
3. What motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?
4. What de-motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?
5. What are the perceived causes of faculty resistance to web-based teaching?
6. What attitudes and beliefs are conducive to faculty teaching online?

This chapter presents the results of these questions based on narrative analysis of faculty interviews (n =10). The results are presented organized first by research question, then by themes within that question and as appropriate by sub-themes within that theme.

This study of faculty readiness to teach online is intended to offer detailed understanding of what skills and qualities faculty perceive as important to successfully (as perceived by participants) teach an online course or course component. Success, then, is relative to faculty and multi-faceted including faculty sense of accomplishment, student evaluation of the course, student evaluation of teaching, distribution of student grades, peer review, administrative review, as well as other factors.

What factors support faculty self-efficacy in readiness to teach online?

Seven themes arise with regards to self-efficacy when soliciting faculty stories. The themes of self-reliance, personal interest, support, experience, reflection, online testing, and a simple course management system are manifest throughout their narratives.

Self-Reliance

Self-reliance is having the knowledge, ability and desire to complete tasks related to online teaching. This aspect of readiness helps to bolster faculty belief that they can be successful in

managing their online course. Four faculty members retell seven experiences with being self-reliant and help to describe the teaching landscape within their discipline.

Art shared his experience about being able to post handout files in a timely manner into the course management system. His department purchased laptops for faculty expressly for the purpose of increasing the flexibility of faculty course leaders to create or obtain and post just in time content for students:

we purchased laptops for the faculty . . . let's say that the lecturer didn't send me an email with the ppt, but in the morning you have the device and you load it, I load it from his powerstick to mine, I stick my powerstick in my computer I take the file and I send it to students and those who have laptops can now follow along with the handout.

Similarly, Ana chosen to do her own work in creating courses in the course management system so that she had control offer the distribution of materials and could respond to her students' learning needs. In addition, Ana also created a hard copy of her online course:

I have a notebook like this for every single course . . . I keep a copy of everything . . . so if something happened to Web CT . . . [I] . . . have the lectures preserved. So when a student calls me or emails me and asks me about something, I don't have to do a thing, I just flip through a book and can say it's on so and so, it's a nice little backup.

Doing things on her own and being comfortable with the technical solutions she developed adds to her self-efficacy.

Bill also liked to do his own work. He found it easier than waiting for his technical support staff and trying to keeping track of what was they did or did not post. Although his reasons differed, the timeliness of his posting supported his online teaching. Similarly, Art created videos of procedures on a camcorder and edits them on his laptop for later posting inside of WebCT on his own without technical support.

Stew, an instructor and a program director, felt that working with technology-comfortable faculty might be an indicator of successful teaching online. He reasoned that if a faculty member

is comfortable with classroom technology, then they are more likely to be comfortable using technology to conduct an online session.

Personal Interest

Personal interest is expressed by statements that are beyond faculty interest in their discipline and refer to some aspect of teaching online. Having a personal interest in teaching online is a one factor that supported faculty readiness to teach online. Six faculty relate six instances of personal interest.

Ana described her interest in using synchronous collaborative tools as a means for reaching out to doctoral students. Because she believes students have an interest in technology, she is personally motivated to learn it. Her college is beginning to use synchronous learning tools and Ana, after seeing a demonstration at a faculty retreat, is planning to learn and incorporate one such tool into her online course. Bill found that sharing his knowledge online was personally satisfying:

What motivates one to do that . . . to communicate technical content in an exciting way that's meaningful and memorable is the goal . . . So to take what I do, it applies to me personally, is to be able to share that in such a way that it's meaningful to others, and is personally satisfying.

When asked why he enjoys teaching online, he described the importance of teaching scientists communication skills so they can have "elevator discussions" about their research.

Dan expressed the personal satisfaction he experiences by being one of the pioneers in his department and in his field, "I was the first one in the college to do that and incorporate Elluminate software with that." Dan also discussed his pride in winning a grant early during the college and department's initiative in developing a distance education program.

Pat reported his belief that there is a potential for mass marketing some kinds of educational content without reducing quality. He described the power of using video based

teaching using a “build your own” course that could be an elective credit. He also discussed the implementation of a cafeteria style curriculum a little of this and a little of that; a “choose your own path” style of self-care video that taps into collective knowledge of students. At the time of this study he was in the process of looking into the feasibility of this approach.

Technical Support

Technical support involves providing assistance for faculty and students. Typically this includes receiving assistance from the help desk as well as local instructional support. Technical support was seen as a factor critical in supporting readiness to teach online. Four faculty related four experiences with technical support.

Online testing contributes to the sense of readiness for faculty by assisting with the administrative burden of teaching. Conducting online tests, mostly low stakes, is seen to provide quick feedback for students when faculty use this in a traditional sense. In addition it is used as a teaching tool to motivate students to read or complete various assignments.

Art shared his need for assistance with the grade book, “I have just found it easier to call the eLearning people, they’ve got good tech support, most people know the system, and they can walk you through how to do things.” He seemed satisfied with the availability of technical support staff. He also relied upon the technical support to assist him in creating online exams:

We . . . don’t do paper testing . . . but there’s basically this super nice guy who works hard and is easy to work with . . . if you can . . . give him your tests 72 hours in advance, he usually converts my tests for me in less than five minutes. But sometimes we have parts like the session ends today and the test is tomorrow and so we can’t get it to him a couple of days ahead of time, so it puts him in that crunch. But generally, if he knows it’s coming, you know, you tell him before hand, look I am not gonna be able to get it to you, he’s very understanding.

Art described how using online testing and the online grade book to helped to simplify the work he has to do in order to keep track and provide access for students to see their grades. It also gave them the ability to see how they stand with regards to the rest of the class.

We've got to get 60 students through in one afternoon . . . so, and online grade books allow you to keep track of their grades and give them access to their grades, then look at the statistics of their grades and the paper format, give them back their quiz and they don't know where they are in their class.

Online testing took part of the difficulty of managing feedback and automated some of the course grading.

Marge reported her perception and observation with local technical support, "and he said that, you know, you can have me come help. But you know he, he will come. People call and he will show up. You know..." Pat's impression of his media support folks was: "...having someone like Andy ... is a tremendous asset, always available, always willing to help.... Ah, how can I do this, this is what I want to do." Pam also relied upon her technical support staff with ease:

Now we are real fortunate that with our distance ed department, Lilly , before she left had been working on getting them into Flash, she put them into that format . . . didn't have to do that, I just sent them the file and told them what I needed.

She mentioned that her comfort with instructional design staff supported her readiness to teach online.

Pam found online testing to be supportive of being ready to teach online. She talked initially about using some of the test banks from publishers, but then she realized that the questions were very low level, and decided that, although easy to use, that something else needed to take the place. "So, the tests I do online now tend to be multiple choices, due to the ease of the questions, so there's a little more application. And I do include some short answers." Being able to draft her own test questions added to her readiness to teach online. Readiness due to a reduced administrative burden furthers the perception of readiness to teach online.

Peer Support

Peer support, working with colleagues on some aspect of online teaching was another factor that sustained teaching online. Three faculty discussed three instances of peer support.

Ana worked with a peer who taught the exact class that she taught and used the same course shell. This second faculty member was assigned a section of the same course Ana was teaching and Ana took advantage of the scenario to arrange for this other faculty member to conduct a peer review of her course. “So it really was a good evaluation, because she actually got to teach what I did. So she wrote a real good evaluation.”

Pam enjoyed having a distance education department staffed with people, were in her opinion were both technology and pedagogically valuable, “So I go to Dan or Lilly and I say, this is an assignment that I’ve done in class, how can I put this into a format that will work in an online class?” The individuals that she speaks about were formally trained in educational technology but they are not faculty.

Melissa recognized the importance of informal peer assistance. She explained that she had opportunities to meet with faculty in a common area during lunch and at times one of them either struck up conversations about similar situations that she experienced in online or face to face classroom settings. She also described the technical assistance she received from peers as a factor central to her success.

Experience

Having experience in or a thorough understanding of one’s field also facilitates and helps readiness to teach online. Practical experience seemed to moderate fear of technology because of the participant’s strong content knowledge. Experience was discussed three times by three participants.

Art reflected upon his experiences in clinical settings and past experiences teaching:

For instance I taught over ten of the sections over the years; I teach . . . a harder section in internal medicine . . . but also teach emergency medicine where I worked prior to coming over here.

These experiences helped him make the transition to teach online. Although she did not differentiate between online and face to face instruction, Ana also relied upon her experiences to feel comfortable with teaching online. She explained that she teaches best when she thoroughly understands the content and has examples from which to draw upon. Melissa also cited experience, as a factor in feeling ready to teach online. For example, it was around her 4th week of teaching her first online course, that she finally felt comfortable.

Reflection

Reflection is what faculty think about in response to student and peer feedback. With regards to online teaching, faculty used reflection to evaluate methods that they used to teach which often led to positive change. Three faculty described three examples of reflection.

With regards to student evaluation, Ana explained that she took the negative comments as feedback that she could use to make modifications for teaching the course during the next semester. She also talked about how peer feedback sparked changes to her work. In online teaching this can be a difficult thing to obtain. For example, she mentioned a course with a video conferencing component:

Yeah. I was going up for associate professor and I needed evaluation. Well, what I ended up doing was recording one of the sessions. And then I sent it to my peer evaluator and she reviewed it and [then we] . . . sat down together and watched the video tape of the class and . . . talked.

Even though this was for an administrative purpose, Ana mentioned that the feedback she received help her spend some time reflecting on her course structure and content.

Marge mentioned working with the university course management system and she compared it to different systems that she used previously. She described her discomfort with the

current technology as tedious and frustrating over even the simplest tasks of moving content and making sure it was available to students. While reminiscing, Melissa recalled what not to do, “it was just quite an experience. I’ve learned quite a bit just from this semester about what not to do next spring.”

What factors impede faculty readiness to teach online?

Six themes arise with regards to factors impeding faculty readiness to teach online including: student evaluations, technical support, administrative support, time, work, and faculty development.

Student Evaluations

Student evaluations are comprised of a set series of questions that are presented to students at the end of a semester. Typically the items focus on an evaluation of the instructor and/or the course. Student evaluation of teaching can be perceived as an impediment with regards to teaching online.

Art explained his anxiety after reading student evaluations.

Do you read the evals? Wait for them and anticipate them?

Absolutely, it’s horrible, it’s horrendous I mean if you bust your ass, work a 20 hour day for this week period where you are trying to answer every email within 5 minutes and do all of this extra teaching, you know like coming in at 5 in the morning to start and the lecture goes basically from 7 to 715, so you are up on a day that you aren’t lecturing answering emails, you get your butt over here to class, send out emails handouts—this isn’t even lecturing.

He explained that the administration of the course is being confused with the course itself, that he does not receive any genuine feedback from students since they either do not complete the evaluations at all, or they use it as a form of retribution. Pat also shared his anxiety and was concerned even if one student says negative things.

Art described how he tried to use the surveys as a means to get an idea of their needs and desires with regards to the course:

I had an evaluation once [where] . . . the dilemma was that the students wanted to be out of class on time. Where they are in class from 7am to 1pm and all they wanted was a 15 min break and you better not let that speaker go 5 min into my break time. Because I need to pee and get my coffee and get ready for the next class. So then as the course master, you hound that guy coming in and lecturing for you, or yourself, you go over a little bit and they get upset. That's the setting. So what can I do to help that? I talked to the lecturer when they came and I said, look this class needs to be done at 8:15 and I am going stand up in the back of the room and work my way up the lecture hall... In other words, some classes are more responsive to your personality than others; some classes want you to be more successful than others. These are all my personal observations. You know . . . the evaluations can ping a whole point on how you are positioned in the class, how you are, um and all that stuff.

While he doesn't assert that the evaluations are useless, instead he points out that the variance can depend on non-teaching matters that are out of his hands.

Ana shared that she perceived student feedback as ambiguous. On the one hand, her students seem to have appreciated the freedom and flexibility afforded by the online teaching environment, while other students were frustrated with the lack of face to face time. Ana also pointed that teaching students who have mature and practical experience in nursing and lacking experience in leadership and management was frustrating, in her nursing leadership and management course.

Bill recognized that to be successful in teaching online, he must have the right kind of student -- mature and tolerant of the online and independent learning modalities. Bill also pointed out that in the more difficult courses; students preferred face to face meetings. He shared that: "There was some positive feedback . . . [but] if you had them rate whether this was the best time they ever invested in education, they'd rather be dead." Bill pointed out that students seem to lack an appreciation for the time and effort that faculty put into developing and managing an online course.

Marge felt that students became accustomed to receiving copies of notes and slides to the extent that they would be “incensed” if they were not sent out or even if they were later in coming out than expected.

Dan described students’ reporting the course structure impeded their learning and the faculty’s ability to receive good evaluations in teaching online. However, Dan was empathetic about students’ concern about the lack of instructor-student interaction. Pam observed that lack of instructor-student interaction hurt her evaluation scores. In contrast Dan attributed students’ tech savviness as helpful and stated that: “the students helped get us up and running and actually took charge of it and ran with it.”

Technical Support

Technology and technical support although enabling, was also an impediment to teaching online. For example, Ana expressed her frustration over technology leading teaching when it caused her to redevelop courses and that this precluded her from being successful in teaching online. Bill concurred and added that the personnel’s apparent need to retain complete control over the course management system was an impediment:

Some of the technical assistance wasn’t there. I mean if I want to see something . . . get some stuff posted that afternoon, the technical staff is really busy, or if there is a limited number of them and they are out sick, well gosh golly, we can’t help that and the stuff won’t get posted.

Stew recalled how the technical support personnel obstructed his desire to post audio files of lectures inside the course management system.

Ana also described what happened when the technology did not work. She explained experiencing two different migrations of course management systems and suffering by losing work time and having to fix broken links. Marge echoed this frustration because she had to

spend a weekend retooling a course and then found out that she had been working in the wrong section:

It was communication problems So I get this email saying that they were going to move all of our courses into the same title. And I opened it up and I see this Fall 2008 template. One was 2008 in it, so I thought this must be the one I am working in. I downloaded everything into that only to find out that it was migrated to one that wasn't on list. It didn't come up on my screen. So I realized that 2 days before classes started.

Pam and Melissa experienced a similar situation, were more accepting of the problems, as if this was an expected state within that they were expected to work.

Bill described his frustration in wanting post some files in a timely fashion and finding out that the tech staff was too busy to help. Ana, Bill, Marge, and Stew described the incompatibility between their work habits and the timing of assistance. While they understood that the technical support staff were quite busy, and the importance of planning ahead, they described that things did not always occur in a timely fashion. Often things were done at the last minute and this impeded their success in teaching online.

Administrative Support

Administrative support referred to college and university academic management providing faculty with necessary resources to facilitate online teaching. Participants described there were instances in which college administrators made online teaching more difficult. Ana recalled how an enrollment cap of 30 was changed by administrators who took advantage of her being new and assigned her up to 60 students. Instead of supporting faculty, giving them resources or time they lay blame after a perceived failure or problem:

they get absolutely killed in evaluations and you've got students standing at department chair door, the deans door, etc. and they turn around and say, what kind of a teacher are you? Why didn't you re-arrange the way you teach that course . . . you shouldn't be requiring a paper from every student,

Ana and Dan recognized that online teaching has been popular with administration but not because it enhanced teaching. Instead it was seen as an opportunity to generate money for the college. Doug asserted that the administration did not understand the difference between a face to face and an online course. After creating an online course, Doug received notification that

I got the assignment that says, Oh well we need you to teach the live course, it seems like there was the impression that this was not going to be a big deal.

Contrary to this idea, it was a big deal, not only to Doug but to his students as well.

Ana and Pam lamented the lack of administrative support in conducting and facilitating peer reviews of teaching as an opportunity to help enhance teaching in this new environment.

Melissa and Pat saw peer review as an administrative function and expressed their disappointment in not having this process available to them.

Bill and Pat recognized that teaching was less valued than research in tenure and promotion, a truism they understood, but did not like. Melissa understood that writing research grants and service were imperative to attaining tenure, while Dan also felt that the administration perceived teaching as a low priority when compared to publications in the process of achieving tenure. Ana believed that service was the primary requirement for tenure and promotion in her discipline, while Pat reported his belief that the president of the university as unsupportive of online teaching, "... [he] is not a big proponent of distance ed, from what I gather."

Time

Time is the investment that faculty gave in creating and maintaining an online courses. Creating materials took a significant amount of time. Art talked about trying to encourage his students to read before a lecture and found that giving a quiz before the lecture ensured greater student readiness for class discussion. However, creating the content and uploading these quizzes

took an extraordinary amount of time. Ana reported having to perform maintenance on a course when versions of the course management system changed:

It changes, it requires me to go in and re-do stuff. It's more like sweeping the floor and painting the walls, it's more of a maintenance role.

Bill and Melissa echoed these frustrations and recalled the lack of time they had to prepare for an online course. They shared that there was an expectation that they would make these changes on their own time, beyond that which the college officially allocated to course preparation. Art mentioned that in his department, faculty were officially given two hours of paid preparation time for each 50 minute lecture. Bill reported that he needed to spend ten hours to prepare for a 50 minute lecture. He expressed his frustration with the time it took to physically upload documents to the course management system. Similarly, Pat saw this task as taking time away from instruction:

you gotta be kind of a magician, or at least the leader of the three ring circus to make that thing work.

Pat also felt strongly that the amount time required for preparation was wasteful. In setting up for a multiple point video conference, Pat describes spending more time on the technical setup than he did on the teaching.

Work

Work is the amount of effort that faculty perceived they put into a task. Similar to taking a long time to create content online, the amount of work it takes to create content and manage students can be extraordinary. For example, Art described spending an inordinate amount of time creating content. He mentioned that the work required was tedious. He reported that he needed to research each topic by first conducting a current literature review and he had to assemble this information into a lecture. After preparing each lecture, he created a PowerPoint presentation so that he could present the information in an orderly manner to his class. Rather than presenting a

straight forward, bullet by bullet PowerPoint, he described using animation so that he did not overwhelm his students.

Ana felt that the course management system required too much maintenance. She also felt that the administration pressured faculty to admit unmanageable numbers of students. Ana expressed her frustration about the amount of work that was required to do to just get her course in an operational state, often rebuilding it from scratch, whereas most courses typically necessitated changes only annually.

Bill, Marge, Pat and Pam held a strong dislike for their course management systems because of the unwieldy nature of the system. Marge stated:

It's too cumbersome and it doesn't do, it doesn't. You ought to be able to take a document from one course, cut it and paste it into the other course. You can't do that. You have to, you know, open 25 screens to that document.

This belief was also compounded by the fact that some faculty had had experience with other course management systems that were simpler to use.

Faculty Development

Faculty development was the learning opportunities that faculty had to enhance their teaching. Faculty development was offered by a department, college or by the university. Faculty development focused on teaching rather than just administrative technology.

Ana teaches at a satellite campus, but she did not have access to resources available on the main campus and described the difficulty that she had with lack of access:

Being on a satellite, an urban campus, it's not like, Joe wouldn't help you, it's just that they're not here. And Clara helps us, but she's the technical person, not the software type person... I mean she keeps me from shooting the computer.

Even though assistance might be a phone call away, as Ana pointed out the satellite campus lacked resources for faculty.

Melissa, relatively new, had had an overwhelming amount of faculty development opportunities, but these were opportunities that the faculty or administration in her department did not recommend. She mentioned that there was no central place to go to get information that was consistent and valuable. Pat also expressed similar concerns after observing peers who tried to force traditional teaching styles into an online environment. While he did not fault these faculty, he reported the lack of central faculty development opportunities.

What motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?

Participants in this study described why they taught online. They reported flexibility, student needs, working with peers, success, and money as the primary motivations in their readiness to teach online.

Flexibility

Art, Dan and Stew reported the flexibility that teaching online afforded faculty. Art explained how the use of daily quiz empowered empowering students, “they come immaculately prepared for class... it’s not like when I get up there, they’ve never heard of this before, but they’ve had to do their own research. You know, they’re smiling...it’s a big buy in to learn.” The success of his students helps motivate Art to teach online. Art also described the flexibility of time and place that teaching online affords faculty:

And then their individual faculty mentor reads that paper and makes the comments, all on WebCT. So there’s not this paper going back and forth and, you know, you can read it in your pajamas at 4 in the morning, whatever you want.

Dan reported that the time he saved conducting a course online rather than driving and searching for a parking spot on campus—which he did not do when he worked from home. He also explained that teaching at satellite campuses on weekends as part of a distance education course allowed him to avoid traffic and parking issues. In Stew’s college, many of the faculty

travelled on a regular basis and online teaching gives them the flexibility of conducting a course from Germany just as they would from their home.

Art used the course management software as a tool for teaching as well as for mentoring.

We do this portfolio concept in a class . . . the students, this is right before they go out to clinical rotations . . . we ask them to . . . take a look at how they perform this year and on that test and determine areas of weakness. And then they upload that paper into webct. And then their individual faculty mentor reads that paper and makes the comments, all on webct And then the follow up is based on how he did on that test and what you determine your strengths and weaknesses, now assess how you are going to improve your weaknesses. And again the faculty mentor who reads that paper makes the suggestion . . . it also allows a way for the faculty mentor to go inside the students head a little bit. So when that student starts having difficulty, this faculty mentor has been working with them on sort of a month or once every other month unit . . . reading their intimate work, so when they go to the second year and they've got a problem, you can pull up these files, so it's a dual role—it's a faculty mentoring too and it's a faculty assessment tool. It's all done on WebCT. You can retrieve it back; it's not looking for a paper.

This flexible use of the course management system provided faculty with one place to log into to work with their students.

Student Needs

Many student educational needs such as access to course materials, methods of communication, and the ability to post assignments are addressed by the online learning environment. The existence of these technological advances enhances the online experience.

Dan felt that the use of teaching online addressed the needs of working adult students with complex schedules. Pat also mentioned this, however it was his college's desire to increase minority enrollment that caused them to offer online education. However, he also felt that because programs pulled people away from their families and jobs that the program would be unsuccessful unless satellite locations were set up.

Stew observed that the flexibility offered by online teaching impacted how much time students devoted to tasks. He reported that students in his college made good use of time, "it's a

four hour class, otherwise they'd have four hours of inflexible time, now they only have two hours of inflexible time meaning that they only have to be there for the discussion groups.”

In Doug's case, evaluations for his online courses were higher than his college's mean for face to face courses. Thus, student feedback was a strong motivator for him and an indicator of his success, one of many other indicators.

Working with peers

Working with peers provided a supportive learning environment and provided a platform for faculty who were interested in using innovative methods in online teaching. Both the camaraderie that was developed and the innovations used helped motivate faculty to teach online. Art was motivated to teach online to help manage the large number of faculty that worked in his course:

so these are big modules going over the entire human body and coordinates with other classes and we have multiple speakers, we probably have over 360 doctors, PhDs, and PA's that come in over that and coordinate with them, so you could see that if we didn't have some sort of platform, it would be really tough.

He also explained that working with departmental colleagues motivated him to evaluate his teaching online. Along with his colleagues, they competed and tried to keep students' average grades under 90 percent by using humor about test questions, extra credit and physical prowess:

Well, this year the big thing is this batch is so bright it's hard to keep their averages out of the 90's, so everyone is giving everyone crap over having a class average of 92, and this guy is giving extra credit and his average is 95 and I'm a stud because I've got an 88 average and you've got a 95 and you've got to write better text questions.

Pat talked about learning shortcuts and tricks that he learned from other faculty in using the course management system – things that only other faculty who used that system could figure out.

every once in a while and someone will show me a trick, and it's staggering, How did you do that? And they'll say that it's easy. So it's a little frustrating in a way, ah that there is probably so many things that WebCT could do.

Pam also appreciated learning from other faculty in her college. She describes a bi-annual college-sponsored event where faculty showcased their online courses for other faculty to view.

Success and Money

The success of programs owing to its enrollment, continued existence, and financial stability motivated to faculty to teach online. Bill and Stew, for example described the overwhelming success of their programs. Bill received positive feedback from his department chair; “With exception of Hopkins, where the chair there was extremely enthusiastic and the feedback was always popular.” Stew was acknowledged for his role in ensuring that a high number of students enrolled and matriculated as well as the funding that his online program generated for the college. Bill also won a grant to create an online course. Dan was also motivated by working with cutting edge technology and his recent distance education learning grant award.

What de-motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?

Teaching online can be a difficult and frustrating task for students as well as faculty. The largest contributing factors that participants identified were time and effort, administration and class size.

Time and Effort

When the amount of time or the level of effort faculty expended reached a personal threshold, faculty experienced a de-motivation which sapped their desire to continue to teach online.

Art described his frustration about working beyond normal teaching such as creating quizzes on a very regular basis to ensure that students read before coming to class. He also described the amount of time it took him to create a lecture in his discipline:

It takes me 20 hours on average to do a lecture I haven't done in a year or two. If I have to do a de novo lecture, one from the ground up, it might take me 300 hours, 300 hours to do it, do you follow? For a 50 minute lecture. Yeah, because you have to do all the basic research, you've got to read all of the articles, you've gotta go through it, you've got to dissect everything about how to teach it and once you get a template you've got to organize that template. And then you have to put it into PowerPoint, type all of the ppt slides, work with the sequencing the animations, you know.

Although the end result may be wonderful, the time and effort that goes into this process demotivated him from teaching online.

Bill echoed this sentiment and explained that winning a grant for online teaching course was the only way he had the time to create course because he was able to hire people to assist him. He realized that when he took a personal interest in something, it became a massive project and this made him reluctant to do so again. Pam also described how refining existing courses took a large amount of time and effort. Because of this experience, she reported a reluctance to undertake such a task again.

Administration

According to the participants, the administration of academics was also a de-motivation. Misunderstandings and miscommunications diminished the faculty's desire to be successful and teach online. Ana explained her frustration with the administration and their lack of understanding about teaching online. Her administration believed that online education could easily facilitate increased class sizes and compensate for a shortage of instructors. While she recognized that this was technically accurate, she reported that having over 30 students in a course section was unmanageable. Dan felt that the administration held him back from using technology to succeed:

I've learned over time that I don't expect necessarily to be rewarded for what I am doing. I just want to make sure that whatever I am doing, I don't want to get punished for it. Yeah. I don't expect to get the recognition for it; I just don't want to be caught. Moving forward on things, you know it'll make a difference.

Pam also did not expect her administration to be overwhelmingly interested in her teaching but saw their interest in online education only as a source of revenue for the college. Bill mentioned that his administrators' lack of interest in a good teaching product as evidenced by no change in the amount of time faculty received to prepare for classes. In his case, he was expected to spend the same amount of time whether he was teaching face to face or online.

Marge discussed a lack of personal interaction with administrators after she was given an assignment to teach a graduate course online. She felt strongly that the course should be face to face, but her administration thought otherwise. Dan also talked about the lack of face to face interaction and that his effort to overcome this by traveling to satellite sites which he believed was helpful. Pat pointed out how not getting to know students because he was pressed into teaching online without being given the tools or means to have equal or adequate interaction, impacted the quality of his teaching.

Stew was discouraged from creating an online course on his own by his technical support person. Stew believed if he worked on his own course that this would threaten the job security of his technical support person.

Class Size

Each participant discussed issues pertaining to class size (numbers of enrolled students) some participants reported that most often administration viewed an online course as an opportunity to increase enrollment. However, some faculty experienced online course enrollment with double or triple the numbers they would see in a traditional face to face course as a demotivating experience.

Ana discussed being pressed to allow over 30 students into her graduate courses which she maintained was the highest reasonably possible. She spoke to colleagues in colleges where the

focus was solely on pure online courses. Also, she did a lot of research about class size to arrive at her 30 seat limit.

Bill saw the trend to teach more courses at the expense of research and publications as a sad state. He explained that the administration took advantage of distance education and had a short sighted perspective. Participants saw increasing faculty teaching load without support and compensation as a de-motivating act.

Marge and Dan felt the large size in their graduate courses diminished personal interactions. For the faculty, interacting with students was one of the most intimidating experiences. Not having those experiences was perceived as de-motivating.

What are the perceived causes of faculty resistance to web based teaching?

Resistance to web based teaching was supported by the study's participants when they discussed complications in the online learning environment that did not have remedies. Issues related to resistance that the faculty identified included administration, change, interaction with students and difficult course management systems.

Administration

Some faculty reported that the administration often obstructed their efforts to teach. For example, Bill believed that his administration wanted the course he developed to “live on.” He explained that his administration wanted to have the course be a standalone module that did not require an instructor—an idea that he described as absurd. Marge felt that administration failed to address faculty needs that were related to online teaching:

I just think it's absurd. If you told me that I had to teach in a classroom that didn't have any lights or that I had to move desks in every time I had to teach, I would be raising holy hell . . . [well], this technology stuff, is like, this is the way it is, and we're supposed to say, ok. Gee. You know, hit me again. I just think there was absolutely no concern about faculty needs.

Technology and decision-making caused Pat and faculty from his college to resist when a “decree went out over the land” that faculty would participate in this campus outreach program. Their lack of input into this decision still impacts the amount that faculty would buy into distance education in his college.

Pam talked about the lack of control that she had with aspects of her course after having made recent modifications to make it a fully distance course, changing it from the hybrid version that she had been teaching. Administrative modifications and a lack of understanding also helped make faculty resistant to web-based teaching.

Change

Change that is not communicated well or thought out has a tendency to come across in a negative manner and results in faculty resistance to teaching online. Changes in technology and tasks have become tedious. Ana shared her frustration over the seemingly constant change that the course management system goes through:

One of the aggravations of teaching only web is that every time we change a platform, then I have to go back in and make sure all the links are hot and so and so forth, I’ve had to do that for the last three years because we have changed platforms. Platforms and versions, so sometimes you have to reload your Impatica and stuff like that. So instead ofspending ... time developing more case studies..., I forego that and make sure there reference list is updated by at least a year, etc. and then I spend my planning time converting this platform....

Part of the issue with this change is the lack of solid and consistent communication. Marge believed that the technology was leading the change rather than teaching. Melissa described colleagues who were reluctant to continuously use the online course management system because so many things had gone wrong with the previous upgrade. Pat also experienced frustration in moving from an easy to use course management system to a more complex system. Likewise, Stew reported that there were some faculty who had experienced three different course management systems and eight versions of those systems.

Interactions with students

Art shared his frustration with student evaluations and their absolute link to student grades. If a student were doing very well in a course, they would rate the instructor and the course high. If a student were doing poorly in a course, they would rate the instructor and the course poorly.

Ana was frustrated over submitting grades for students based on group activities when often one group member would cause others to suffer lower grades or one would benefit from the hard work of their peers. The online format of her course necessitated this, and it was not easy for her or for her students. She saw her peers as afraid of the web and unable to communicate with students via any medium except for face to face.

Melissa felt that there was an age gap between her and her students. The lack of personal face to face interaction troubled her and made her resistant to conducting such a course again. Pat reported why he missed interacting with the students, “I believe that I can have more impact by a looking them straight in the eye and a live class room and then I can pontificating over a bunch of zeros and ones in Computer Technology.”

Marge displayed frustration while interacting with students and suggested that she modularize her course and place them on the web as a package for sale. Her dislike for the course management system was so overwhelming that did most of her interaction with students over email.

What attitudes and beliefs are conducive to faculty teaching online?

Positive attitudes and beliefs of faculty about teaching online are quite abundant within interview data. Faculty discussed their presence, sharing with peers, technology, respect for students, pride, interest in their subject, time and patience when discussing positive aspects of teaching online.

Faculty Presence

Art talked about being sensitive to his students' need to reassure student that he was present in the course. He did, however, balance this presence between guiding students in the right direction when they were going down a wrong path, with respecting their ability to think and make decisions on their own. Doug shared a similar belief, about the need for faculty to have a presence in an online course. He stated, "what I find to be perhaps the most important thing also I find that if I am absent from the discussions I start saying things like where is the instructor, it's like they wonder where I am." He calls this daily maintenance. As a new faculty member, Melissa believed that students needed to comfortable and she explained how she sought to do so in a guiding manner.

Doug recognized the difference between teaching online and teaching face to face. When asked, at the last moment, to teach a face to face version of his online course:

I am an agreeable person so I said sure, I can do it but in fact it was a whirlwind of two different courses. I had 70 people in the live class and 30 in the online. I think the online always takes me more time but it was like a separate course. Separate issues, separate problems preparations, different assignments, different ways of evaluating.

Doug described how this knowledge has helped to better prepare him for teaching courses online. Pat saw online teaching as an opportunity for faculty to focus on learning how to teach in this new environment. He mentioned that people entering teaching today need some instruction on how to teach in a didactic classroom.

Bill viewed online discussions as a community concept rather than just the faculty being present. He talked about the time when he was teaching a purely online course which at one point was so technical and content rich, that the class needed to meet physically for two sessions. He added two physical meetings because students "needed" them.

In a similar manner, Dan talked about driving to a campus to meet at a place convenient to his distance students, not for a class session, but to meet with a dissertation group.

Sharing With Peers

Art recognized the value of informal peer interactions and camaraderie:

In another person's course [you ask] . . . what do you need covered in the lecture, [or are asked] please cover this. Then you give the lecture and then ask, did I cover what you needed me to? And here are a couple of test questions. And then you have, you know I am having trouble on webct, can you help me; and I'll see if I can help you. Oh, I have to go to a conference, can you cover for me that day.

A feeling of solidarity was also shared by Ana, who discussed her willingness to share the content of lectures and test questions with peers. She also talked about sharing techniques for teaching on the web in informal conversations and more formally at a retreat in front of the entire faculty. Dan and Pam talked about a faculty showcase where they shared and showed their web course to other faculty.

Melissa expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to work with peers on an informal basis. She also valued the feedback that she received in a group setting from senior faculty:

So every other week we meet and junior faculty are invited to meet with Dean P. and Dr. K and we have another senior faculty floating in and out and they encourage us to bring anything we are working on to that meeting to get feedback not only from them, but from other junior faculty in the room who may have, getting experience with CDC grants or anything like that, so that's something that has been fairly new and I think very helpful.

She also explained that these meetings often served as a springboard to meeting with others where faculty would meet over breakfast and talk about their teaching philosophies.

Technology

Ana and Dan talked explicitly about personally enjoying distance education. Ana mentioned her success in getting her points across for a difficult course and that this process was more streamlined than face to face instruction. Dan recalled being able to use the technology to provide a lecture from a remote state.

Staying current with technology is something that Art and Ana both considered. One way that Art found out about new things was through discovery, “it’s a little bit like hunting for Easter eggs. Every now and then you come upon something, the more you learn about the system, oh, look at that; let’s use that.” Ana co-taught and shared resources with other faculty to stay current. Ana, along with Melissa, Pat, and Pam enjoyed the technology of distance education while stating that the advances in educational technology have benefited students.

Doug, although he relied upon technology, is not driven by it. He taught courses where his students were truly at a distance. However, he let his technical support staff build and release contents to students. He reported that the technology has given him the ability to delegate some of the administrative tasks and that this has freed him to teach and interact with his students.

Melissa and Pat both talked about their eventual willingness to try new technological things. Melissa contemplated about how to use the online chat to replace some of the face to face sessions she conducted and as a way to get students in larger classes to ask questions. Pat thought about his peers and their reluctance to work in a technologically rich course:

so, a lot of the people that enter into this, so called online teaching, are brought kicking and screaming from the first place, if not kicking and screaming you continue, you may even submit a little bit or you may just become an enthusiast who tries new things, some of which fail and are often called pioneers.

He also described some of the technological things he has tried in the past with video and some of the expert technical staff he has worked with including creating short videos and working with a television and radio program. More recently, Pat conducted web searches and included links to appropriate videos in his course.

Ana, Pam, and Stew pointed out new faculty across disciplines are expected to be open and experienced in instructional technology.

Respect for Students

Art, Ana Bill, Doug, and Melissa explicitly mentioned their desire for students to succeed in the online teaching environment. Art discussed walking a fine line between writing a hard test, getting low student evaluation and getting called into the director's office to be asked if he wanted to be in the program, only to be told that he should write an easy test so that the students would love him. Ana described the comments she received from a peer who evaluated her course and pointed out that her course is well organized, that students know where to find stuff. Doug also made consistent use of online teaching tools. He made a strong effort to communicate his expectations to students. Bill mentioned his conscious efforts to provide practical information to students as well as share it in a meaningful way – by taking things out of the scientific and technical realms, and sharing it in such an accessible way. Melissa assigned her students projects and had them present the projects to the university community because she respected the value of their work.

Art, Doug, Melissa, and Pat valued student intelligence and feedback. Art talked about his use of discussion boards and how he allowed students to answer one another's questions. He described their collective intelligence quotient as being greater than his alone. Doug discussed the way in which he used routine quizzes, their results and email as a method of feedback to and from students. Melissa, who was teaching a large class, talked about reworking her course based on the comments she received. However she was very anxious to get student feedback. Pat explained that how he casually quizzed students on practical detail of his course to see if they were able to assess a patient professionally a semester or two after a course has been completed. He also relied upon his students when he had a technical question about software. He described technology as "what they do."

Pride

Bill, Dan, Doug, and Pat spoke about being proud of the work they did in distance education. Bill talked about being able to “demystify anything” if given the resources to so. Dan reported enjoying that his course was organized and designed in a way that is unique to other instructors in his college. Doug reported being proud of his assignment to teach the web based portion of a graduate program. Pat spoke about his “must do” attitude, seeing errors as opportunities and seeing himself as a problem solver—all qualities that he saw as conducive to being successful in teaching online.

Table 4-1. Technology, Time and Administration

	Technology	Time	Administration
Supporting Factors	Support and personnel	Patience and awareness	
Attitudes and Beliefs	Enjoy working with		
Impeding Factors	Barriers (course management system)	Perceived current lack	Grants, research and service Lack of understanding Lack of peer review
De-motivating Factors		Anticipate	Anticipated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of understanding • Lack of recognition
Faculty Resistance			Focus only on money Control Faculty work Faculty input

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

Conclusions

The ten faculty that made up this study share the responsibility of educating and training career oriented students in the disciplines of Education, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Public Health and Health Professions. Using criterion sampling each faculty member was purposively chosen because of their willingness to teach online and their recent experiences teaching online.

Although each faculty member's experiences and perceptions were unique, there were several themes around which faculty stories were aligned. Most prevalent among these were: internal value, influential and positive peer relationships, effort of new work and difficulty with administration. While telling stories about their success, participants described an intrinsic drive to do well while holding an interest in their own subject. As faculty described the details of preparing and teaching online, they spoke about the support and knowledge they received when working with peers in informal and professional situations. Among those faculty who spoke about the effort and new work necessary to teach online, they also described their frustration. Participants frequently described college and university administrators as lacking an understanding of the time, effort, and infrastructure that was requisite to supporting distance education.

Summary of Findings

Six research questions guided this study.

1. What factors support faculty self-efficacy in readiness to teach online?
2. What motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?
3. What attitudes and beliefs are conducive to faculty teaching online?
4. What factors impede faculty readiness to teach online?
5. What de-motivations do faculty hold concerning readiness to teach online?
6. What are the perceived causes of faculty resistance to web based teaching?

Guided by these research questions an analysis of faculty perceptions of readiness to teach online revealed six themes. Positive and negative perceptions of faculty readiness to teach framed each theme. (See Table 5-1)

Table 5-1. Themes and Descriptions by Faculty (n=10) Connotations

Theme	Description	Positive Connotation	Negative Connotation
Intrinsic	Internal qualities that influence faculty success	9 (51)	0
Peers	Faculty within the university	3 (19)	0
Technology	Software and people	2 (17)	2 (14)
Students	Interactions with students	2 (17)	3 (20)
Time and work	Effort required to get things done	1 (3)	5 (29)
Administration	Higher educational management knowledge and support	0	3 (19)

The numbers in the table represent the number of cover terms in that category while the numbers in parentheses are counts of faculty comments.

Within the themes “intrinsic” and “peers” the majority of positive connotations that indicated faculty success were described. “Intrinsic” qualities refer to things like personal interest in the topic, students and teaching; self-reliance and personal enjoyment of working with technology; having positive online teaching experiences that motivate; using reflection to improve teaching; enjoying the personal flexibility that online teaching affords; and being proud of the distance education programs faculty were involved in building. The cover term “peers” refers to reliance upon, working with and sharing with peers including peer support in the form of informal conversations, camaraderie, working with technology savvy faculty, and sharing content and ideas with peers.

Time, work and administration were the themes in which the majority of negative connotations and perceived impediments were described. Time and work refers the actual changes to the fundamental course management system and the work that ensues; difficulty

using a course management system; the amount of time it takes to get acclimated to various technology tools; and the time it takes to create and manage an online course.

Administration refers to a lack of understanding of the time and effort it takes to build an online course. Participants shared their perceptions that the administration values publication and research over teaching and values distance education as a means to generate money and not as a mechanism to enhance teaching. Participants also described a lack of support from the administration, a lack of support for peer review and resistance to faculty input.

Findings and the Literature

The body of literature on distance education cites the benefits of online education, teaching techniques, awareness of student needs, and technical hurdles as elements of faculty concern (J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005; A. W. Bangert, 2004; Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Covington et al., 2005; Kosak et al., 2004a; Woods et al., 2004; Yang & Cornelious, 2005). Researchers in the field have identified the benefits for students, administration and faculty (Educause, 2006; Grant, 2004; H. M. Huang, 2002; Maguire, 2005; Woods et al., 2004). Of the topics in the online teaching literature, genuine and in-depth faculty input is the critical element that is vacant. However, it is a natural and easy fit if the time is taken to ask for and listen to the narrative of faculty who are reluctant yet willing to teach online.

Benefits of online tests and online instructional delivery modes provide flexibility for students (Beasley & Smyth, 2004), increased enrollment (Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005) and intellectual challenges for faculty, enhanced job satisfaction, working conditions, and self-gratification (Maguire, 2005).

While convenient for students, online tests also benefit faculty. Faculty interviewed saw the flexibility of online tests as beneficial to them as much of the manual grading of multiple

choice exams could be offset to such an extent that they are able to create and administer tests on an almost daily basis as reinforcement to reading course texts.

Increased enrollment, while seen as a financial boon by administrators, for faculty increased enrollment was proportionate to the lower quality of a course. Ana tells of having to fight to keep enrollment at 30, which is twice that of what professional online schools allow. She explained that the administration faulted new faculty who accepted more than the enrollment limit of 30 after students complained about a lack of quality in the course. Dan described the administration's perception of increasing enrollment in their distance education programs as a "cash cow." The administration also lacked a general understanding about the complexity of teaching online. Doug was teaching an online course and was given a face to face section of that course with one day's notice. His administration erroneously thought that since the same book was used for both sections, that the course was exactly the same.

Benefits to faculty cited in the literature (intellectual challenge, job satisfaction, working conditions, and self-gratification) were evident in faculty interviews. A major addition to these benefits is working with peers. Five faculty explicitly mentioned peer support and interaction as a significant benefit to conducting online learning. For example, Art talked about his enjoyment while he worked with multiple faculty in a course as well as the camaraderie that emerged within his teaching unit. Ana had a peer teach a section of her course and evaluate the structure and content. Pat relied upon a co-teacher for the high technical component of their course. Melissa learned how to use the course management system from a fellow faculty member. Pam valued working with knowledgeable and technology oriented faculty.

Another topic discussed in the literature was student course evaluations. Bangert recognizes the need for faculty input with regards the evaluation of teaching (2004). Faculty

interviewed expressed negative opinions of student evaluations. Art and Pat dread reading evaluations and see grade inflation resulting from faculty dependence upon good student evaluations for tenure and promotion. Faculty also discussed the ambiguous and narrow feedback left by students. Every participant interviewed discussed the need for peer review of faculty teaching. Some talked about the difficulty of doing peer review in the online learning environment while others were resistant to be reviewed by someone who was not an expert in their field. Ana told of one unique opportunity that presented itself when a faculty member used her course shell to teach an online course. Subsequently that faculty member provided her with an in depth analysis and review of the course structure and material.

Awareness of student needs in the literature was comprised of topics examining learning styles and student expectations (J. Angers & K. Machtmes, 2005; Baker, 2003; M. B. Baker et al., 2003; A. W. Bangert, 2004; Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Covington et al., 2005; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Levenburg & Major, 2000; Morris et al., 2005). Being aware of student needs was a motivating factor of teaching online for faculty interviewed. This included awareness of course management system flexibility and its usefulness as a conduit of feedback. Art, Dan and Stew recognized the benefits that students receive from access to materials via the course management system and that inflexible time was freed up for students by providing asynchronous activities online.

Faculty presence was a major theme from the interviews. Art and Doug's regular presence in a course was important, especially in the discussion boards where topics could easily go down erroneous paths. Ana, Dan, Doug and Melissa talked about faculty presence in terms of personal interaction. Personal interaction was decreased in a fully online course, but the tools in the

course management system and aware faculty can overcome this deficit. Doug goes so far as to report that he knows his online students better than he does his face to face students.

Additionally, the literature shows the importance of teacher attitudes and beliefs with regards to online teaching and the transformation of their role as an online educator (J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005). This article describes teachers' beliefs that technology is a tool that adds value to lessons and to students' learning and motivation. Contrary to this, Ana, Doug, and Pam approach technology in a more specific way. They start with a problem and look for solutions to that problem. A technology tool may be one of the solutions, but technology is not seen as a discrete and valued entity. For them teaching driving technology is a positive concept while they express frustrations with technology leading and driving teaching. Angers and Machtmes also discuss administrative support and release time as aspects of online teachers (2005).

Administration was one of the most common and negatively reinforcing elements for faculty getting ready to teach online. None of the ten faculty interviewed were given release time to develop their courses. Findings from the interviews echo the importance of faculty attitudes and beliefs, but find these specific areas to be important:

- sharing with peers;
- interest in subject;
- faculty presence;
- respect for students;
- use of technology;
- pride in their course, program and college;
- time and patience.

Technical hurdles are cited in the literature as important to overcome in order to be successful in teaching online (J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Kosak et al., 2004b; Rice, 2004; Yang & Cornelious, 2005). Faculty interviews strongly supported this need to overcome technical hurdles. Faculty interviewed enjoyed support

staff who were available and knowledgeable about teaching. Some even were very willing to give up control of their course and allow support staff to make things available to students. Others wanted full control. As discussed by Grant (2004) a decentralized approach to faculty development is preferred. Overwhelmingly supported is Yang and Cornelious's assertion that faculty need a peer presented approach to faculty development (2005).

Review of the literature revealed four major themes and 21 subthemes. Treating the subthemes as principles, Table 5-2 lists each principle along with the major author and if this study confirms or refutes that principle.

Implications to Theory

In generally assessing the efficacy of the faculty interviewed with regards to readiness to teach online, Pajares framework of level, strength and generality is appropriate (2006). Level deals with the complexity and the range of the "thing" in question. To get at level, discussion about future plans with regards to online teaching were examined. Strength is relative to the self-confidence of a person and questions about technical opinions and instances of self-confidence were analyzed. Generality looks at the ability to try and succeed at a new task based on the experience and success of working on a somewhat similar task. Exploring responses about using new technology were studied.

Faculty were asked about the future of online education to glean a sense of the level of complexity they planned on implementing in their online courses. Art talked about the relative ease and sense of surprise he experiences upon discovering new things that can be done online. He compares this to "hunting for Easter eggs." Ana sees herself moving towards synchronous learning using Elluminate. Her interest arose from other faculty showing her how they use it and also from faculty relating that students really liked the technology. Dan expressed an interest in simulation. He sees the complexity of doing something in Second Life and is quick to point out

that the concept of faculty member and support team is an evolving relationship as one that can enable his teaching to become more multifaceted. Melissa is interested in putting a course fully online and taking advantage of recording some of the more mundane and unchanging lectures. She wants to spend more time working with students via discussions and other interactions. Pat sees himself branching out in complexity through creating elective credit courses that are self paced.

Strength of self-confidence was looked at in responses to technical opinions and instances of self-confidence. Art was a specialist in the areas he taught. He coordinated and assembled handouts from multiple speakers, and created and used video to help his students understand procedures as ways to strengthen his self-confidence. Ana worked on obtaining a deep understanding of topics before she taught it, relied upon her hard copy of her course and was able to do her own technical work in preparation for starting a new course, all of which assist in strengthening her sense of confidence. Bill and Stew expressed their confidence through doing their own technical work. Dan and Pat took advantage of the flexible delivery formats of Elluminate and discussion boards.

Generality looks at the ability to try and succeed at a new task based on the experience and success of working on a somewhat similar task. This is the area where no data was found. Increasing use of one type of technology was well evidenced, but using the skills and familiarity of one type did not seem to offer help in learning that new type. Ana used video conferencing equipment to talk to remote sites. She also uses the discussion boards inside of the course management system. Elluminate is a tool that combines the use of chat, voice, and whiteboard so an instructor can conduct a lecture or use the space for a collaborative project. Although Ana talks about having seen, experienced and wants to use the software, she does not feel confident to

do so based on her past experiences. Marge, who was quite familiar with one course management system, did not find those skills particularly helpful in using a different course management system.

Recommendations for Future Studies

While collecting and analyzing the data from this study questions and themes arose that were outside the scope of this project. Success for teaching in this study was left up to the individual interpretation by each faculty member. Success is discussed quite extensively in the literature (Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Qing & Akins, 2005; Stavri & Ash). Success, however, needs to be examined for online courses including the value of student evaluations of faculty and courses, student success based on grade distribution, faculty peer review, administrative review and presence of standards within an online course.

Although there are some discussions in the literature about technology adoption (J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Kinuthia, 2004) with regards to instructional technology, the adoption process of centrally available technology at a university needs to be examined paying particular attention to faculty involvement.

Extensive articles have been written about the value and need for faculty development (Agee et al., 2003; D. Bangert, Doktor, & Johnson, 2001; Cavanaugh & NetLibrary Inc., 2004; Donohue, Kelley-Lowe, & Hoover, 2001; Duffy, Kirkley, & NetLibrary Inc., 2004; Educause, 2006; Grant, 2004; Lawhon & Ennis-Cole, 2005; Marcia Landen & Michael, 1996; McColskey, Parke, Furtak, & Butler, 2003; Payne, 1996; Sargeant, Curran, Allen, Jarvis-Selinger, & Ho, 2006; Shea et al., 2004; Stanley, ; Wallin, 2003). However, there needs to be a survey of faculty development organizations looking at what successful programs look like and what type of faculty involvement exists.

Pedagogy is a popular topic in education (Aggarwal, 2000; Breier, 2005; Doppen, 2002; Duffy et al., 2004; Knowles, 1980; Shea et al., 2004). However, what disciplines in higher education can benefit from andragogy as an approach to teaching and learning? What impact does andragogy have on teaching and learning in an online course?

The themes that emerged from this study were based on the unique experiences and perceptions from faculty stories. Major themes were: internal value, influential and positive peer relationships, effort of new work and difficulty with administration. Faculty have a voice filled with an understanding of their field and teaching that should drive distance education, faculty development, instructional design, and instructional technology.

Table 5-2. Findings of study compared to literature review

Principle	Author	Confirmed /Refuted
Benefit to faculty		
-grading	(Maguire, 2005)	Confirmed
-intrinsic-intellectual challenge	(Maguire, 2005)	Confirmed
-intrinsic-job satisfaction	(Maguire, 2005)	N/A
-intrinsic-improved working conditions	(Maguire, 2005)	Confirmed
-intrinsic-self-gratification	(Maguire, 2005)	N/A
-intrinsic-faculty development with peers	(Grant, 2004)	Confirmed
-student access to materials	(Covington et al., 2005)	Confirmed
Benefit to administration/institution		
-increased enrollment	(Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005)	Refuted
-allure of delivering high tech education	(Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005)	Refuted
-efficiency of classroom management	(Woods et al., 2004)	Refuted
-reduced withdraws and absenteeism	(Woods et al., 2004)	N/A
-return on investment	(Educause, 2006)	Refuted
Teaching techniques		
-student evaluation of teaching as a negative aspect	(A. W. Bangert, 2004)	Confirmed
-assessment based on faculty input	(J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Kosak et al., 2004b; Yang & Cornelious, 2005)	Confirmed

-successful teaching techniques are core to quality of online course	(A. W. Bangert, 2004; J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Kosak et al., 2004b; Yang & Cornelious, 2005)	Confirmed
Awareness of Student Needs		
-learning styles	(J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005; Baker et al., 2003; Baker, 2003; A. W. Bangert, 2004; Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Covington et al., 2005; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Levenburg & Major, 2000; Morris et al., 2005)	N/A
-expectations	(J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005; Baker et al., 2003; Baker, 2003; A. W. Bangert, 2004; Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Covington et al., 2005; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Levenburg & Major, 2000; Morris et al., 2005)	Confirmed
-ability to modify role as an online educator	(J. Angers & D. Machtmes, 2005; Covington et al., 2005)	Confirmed
-awareness of non-verbal cues	(Baker et al., 2003; Covington et al., 2005)	Confirmed
-role change at the theoretical level	(Baker, 2003; A. W. Bangert, 2004; Carrol-Barefield et al., 2005; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Levenburg & Major, 2000; Morris et al., 2005)	Confirmed
Technical Hurdles		
-reliance upon technology, need for support and training	(J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Howell et al., 2004; King, 2002; Kosak et al., 2004b; Rice, 2004; Yang & Cornelious, 2005)	Confirmed
-decentralized faculty development	(Grant, 2004)	Confirmed
-faculty compatibility between technology and values and philosophies of teaching	(J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003)	Confirmed
-need for peer presented faculty development	(Agee et al., 2003; Lawhon & Ennis-Cole, 2005)	Confirmed
-faculty mentors	(Yang & Cornelious, 2005)	Confirmed

-administrative and technical support	(Agee et al., 2003; J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Grant, 2004; Rice, 2004)	Confirmed
-collaboration with faculty and students	(Yang & Cornelious, 2005)	Confirmed
-faculty attitudes about participating and teaching online	(Woods et al., 2004)	Confirmed
-faculty dependence upon and expectations of systems	(Kosak et al., 2004b)	Confirmed
-pressured by peers, administration and students	(J. Bennett & Bennett, 2003)	Confirmed

New Findings from this Study

- genuine, in-depth faculty input with regards to online teaching
 - faculty presence
 - respect for students
-

The last section of this table represents findings of the study that were not evidenced in the literature.

APPENDIX A INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Epistemology: Constructivism

Ontology: Idealist/Interpretivist

Interview Questions

Initial Interview

Describe your academic field.

Based on your perceptions, tell me about your experiences using WebCT Vista.

What do you believe to be necessary skills to teach online?

What qualities or aspects do you find valuable with regards to teaching online?

Follow-Up Interview

I noticed that you did _____ during your class. How does that lend itself to your teaching?

What is your perception of the feedback about your teaching have you received from your peers?

What is the perception of the feedback you have received about your teaching from your department or college leadership?

What is the perception of the feedback you have received from students after having taught online?

What future expectations do you have with regards to online teaching?

Observations

As background information, not analyzed

Faculty learning environment (physical and online)

Faculty development and management of online course materials in an office setting

Archival Sources

as background information, not analyzed

Past online course material

Course planning documentation

Anonymous student evaluations

Faculty peer evaluations

Faculty departmental chair evaluations

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT

Protocol Title: Faculty Perceptions of their Preparedness to Teach Online

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study:

The purpose of this study is to examine the faculty perceptions of their preparedness to teach online.

What you will be asked to do in the study:

You will be asked to volunteer to answer questions in two interviews about your field of teaching and impressions of what successful online teaching looks like. The first interview will take approximately 20 minutes and the second interview will take approximately 40 minutes. In order to facilitate discussion I will ask permission to record the interview.

Between the interviews I will ask to observe you either in your classroom or in your office while you are conducting class.

At the conclusion of the interview and of the pilot study, you will be provided a copy of the study.

Time required:

1 hour

Risks and Benefits:

You will benefit from qualitative feedback of your online teaching and from increased awareness of your teaching procedures. There are no anticipated risks.

Compensation:

There is no compensation for participating in this research.

Confidentiality:

Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in a locked file in my faculty supervisor's office. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your name will not be used in any report. This data may be used for future presentations or publications.

Voluntary participation:

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study:

You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

Randy Graff, MEd. Educational Leadership and Adult Education, Assistant Director of Education and Training, Health Science Center, IT Center, Box 100152, 352-273-5018, rgraff@ufl.edu

Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein, 1202 Norman Hall, 352-392-0731 ext. 230, lsbhoren@ufl.edu

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:

UFIRB Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; ph 392-0433.

Agreement:

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.

Participant: _____ Date: _____

Principal Investigator: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C
IRB PROTOCOL

1. TITLE OF PROTOCOL:

Faculty Perceptions of their Preparedness to Teach Online

2. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(s): *(Name, degree, title, dept., address, phone #, e-mail & fax)*

Randy Graff
Med. Educational Leadership and Adult Education
Assistant Director of Education and Training
Health Science Center, IT Center
Box 100152
352-273-5018
rgraff@ufl.edu
352-273-5035

3. SUPERVISOR (IF PI IS STUDENT): *(Name, campus address, phone #, e-mail & fax)*

Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein
1202 Norman Hall
352-392-0731 ext. 230
lsbhoren@ufl.edu
352-392-0038

4. DATES OF PROPOSED PROTOCOL: From _1/19/06_ To _12/31/06_

5. SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR THE PROTOCOL:

(A copy of your grant proposal must be included with this protocol if DHHS funding is involved.)

There is no source of funding for this protocol.

6. SCIENTIFIC PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION:

This protocol is part of a pilot study to investigate faculty perceptions of their preparedness to teach online.

7. DESCRIBE THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY IN *NON-TECHNICAL* LANGUAGE. The UFIRB needs to know what will be done with or to the research participant(s).

This research will involve interviewing one staff member once to assist with background information and to help determine and two University of Florida faculty twice each; one initial interview to establish rapport and gather preliminary information followed by an observation of the faculty member in class or their office depending upon the type of course they are teaching (hybrid or purely online) and a second interview to follow up on the observation. The interviews will be tape recorded and transcribed. The recordings will be stored in a locked file cabinet and destroyed when the study is over. This data may be used for future presentations or publications.

This research will also involve examining archival data in the form of past online course material, course planning documentation, anonymous student evaluations, faculty peer evaluations and faculty departmental chair evaluations.

8. POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND ANTICIPATED RISK. (If risk of physical, psychological or economic harm may be involved, describe the steps taken to protect participant.)

The participants will benefit from qualitative feedback of online teaching and increased awareness of their teaching procedures. There are no anticipated risks.

9. DESCRIBE HOW PARTICIPANT(S) WILL BE RECRUITED, THE NUMBER AND AGE OF THE PARTICIPANTS, AND PROPOSED COMPENSATION (if any):

Two participants will be over 18, faculty and will be recruited on a criterion basis (currently teaching at least one online or hybrid course and at least one year of previous online teaching experience) with cooperation of the key informant (the third participant) who is the manager of the University of Florida, Office of Information Technology, Academic Technology, Learning Support Systems who is over 18, and involved with the University of Florida's Course Management System and knowledgeable about faculty interest and time using the system.

The faculty will be contacted by email using the attached template (see Email Template for Faculty Recruitment).

There is no proposed compensation.

10. DESCRIBE THE INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS. INCLUDE A COPY OF THE INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT (if applicable).

All participants (two faculty and one staff member) will be presented with an informed consent document and asked to sign. They will then be given a signed copy.

Please use attachments sparingly.

Principal Investigator's Signature

Supervisor's Signature

I approve this protocol for submission to the UFIRB:

Dept. Chair/Center Director Date

Email Template for Faculty Recruitment

Dear _____,

I am a graduate student in the Higher Education Administration program in the College of Education. My primary area of study is faculty development. I also have an interest in online education that leads me to the point of this message.

This semester I will be conducting a pilot study investigating faculty perceptions of their preparedness to teach online. Through conversations with Doug Johnson, Manager of Learning Support Systems (AKA, The WebCT Guy) I have learned of your interest in teaching online and would like to invite you to participate in this pilot study.

Your involvement will take about one hour (split between two interviews and one observation) and will include talking with me about your perceptions of preparedness to teach online. Please see the attached Informed Consent form for details.

Thank you for taking the time to consider working with me this semester. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Randy Graff
rgraff@ufl.edu
352-273-5018

LIST OF REFERENCES

- AAUP. (1999). Statement on Distance Education [Electronic Version]. Retrieved May 24, 2006, from <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/DistanceEd.HTM>
- Adams, H., & Searle, L. (2005). *Critical theory since Plato* (3rd ed.). Australia ; Boston, Mass. United States: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Agee, A. S., Holisky, D. A., & M., S. A. (2003). Faculty Development: The Hammer in Search of a Nail. *Faculty and Staff Development, September/October 2003*, 1-10.
- Aggarwal, A. (2000). *Web-based learning and teaching technologies : opportunities and challenges*. Hershey, PA: Idea Group.
- Almen, B. (2003). Narrative Archetypes: A Critique, Theory, and Method of Narrative Analysis. *Journal of music theory, 47*(1), 40.
- Alvarez, R., & Uria, J. (2002). SPECIAL ISSUE - Tell Me a Good Story: Using Narrative Analysis to Examine Information Requirements Interviews during an ERP Implementation. *Data base, 33*(1), 38.
- Angers, J., & Machtmes, D. (2005). An Ethnographic-Case Study of Beliefs, Context Factors, and Practices of Teachers Integrating Technology. *The Qualitative Report, 10*(4), 771-794.
- Bailey, P. H. Assuring Quality in Narrative Analysis. *Western journal of nursing research, 18*(2), 9.
- Baker, Boggs, & Arabasz. (2003). Student and Faculty Perspectives on E-learning Support. *Educause Center for Applied Research, 2003*(16), 1-36.
- Baker, J. D. (2003). An Investigation of Relationships Among Instructor Immediacy and Affective and Cognitive Learning in the Online Classroom. *Internet & Higher Education, 7*, 1-13.
- Baker, M., Boggs, R., & Arabasz, P. (2003). Student and Faculty Perspectives on E-learning Support. *Educause Center for Applied Research, 2003*(16), 1-36.
- Baker, M. B., Boggs, R., & Arabasz, P. (2003). Student and Faculty Perspectives on E-learning Support. *Educause Center for Applied Research, 2003*(16), 1-36.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. *American Psychologist, 37*(2), 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Bangert, A. W. (2004). The Seven Principles of Good Practice: A framework for evaluating on-line teaching. *The Internet and Higher Education, 7*(3), 217-232.
- Bangert, D., Doktor, B., & Johnson, E. (2001). Designing Web-based Telemedicine Training for Military Health Care Providers. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 21*(3), 162-169.
- Beasley, N., & Smyth, K. (2004). Expected and Actual Student Use of an Online Learning Environment: A Critical Analysis [Electronic Version]. *Electronic Journal on e-Learning, 2*, 43-50. Retrieved June 7, 2006,
- Benabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2002). Self-Confidence and Personal Motivation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, August 2002*, 871-915.
- Bennett, J., & Bennett, L. (2003). A review of factors that influence the diffusion of innovation when structuring a faculty training program. *The Internet and Higher Education, 6*(1), 53-63.

- Bennett, S., & Lockyer, L. (2004). Becoming an Online Teacher: Adapting to a Changed Environment for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. *Educational Media International*, 41(3), 231-244.
- Bishop, R. (2003). It's Not Always About The Money: Using Narrative Analysis to Explore Newspaper Coverage of the Act of Collecting. *The Communication Review*, 6(2), 117-135.
- Boudens, C. (2005). The Story of Work: A Narrative Analysis of Workplace Emotion. *Organization Studies*, 26(9), 1285-1306.
- Breier, M. (2005). A Disciplinary-Specific Approach to the Recognition of Prior Informal Experience in Adult Pedagogy [Electronic Version]. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 27, 51-65. Retrieved June 7, 1968, from <http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/link.asp?id=x4254n6190214032>
- Bright, L. (2004). Perceived benefits, constraints, and negotiation strategies of skiers and snowboarders with disabilities. from <http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/etd/UFE0008968>
- Campbell, R. A. (2002). A Narrative Analysis of Success and Failure in Environmental Remediation: The Case of Incineration at the Sydney Tar Ponds. *Organization & Environment*, 15(3), 259-277.
- Carraway, K. L. (2000). *Self-efficacy, goal orientation, and fear of failure as predictors of school engagement and life satisfaction in high school students*.
- Carrol-Barefield, A., Smith, S. P., Prince, L. H., & Campbell, C. A. (2005). Transitioning from Brick and Mortar to Online: A Faculty Perspective. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(1), 12.
- Cavanaugh, C., & NetLibrary Inc. (2004). *Development and management of virtual schools issues and trends*. Hershey, PA: Information Science.
- Chin, N. P., Aligne, C. A., Stroncsek, A., Shipley, L. J., & Kaczorowski, J. (2003). RESEARCH REPORTS - Evaluation of a Community-Based Pediatrics Residency Rotation Using Narrative Analysis. *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 78(12), 5.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Covington, D., Petherbridge, D., & Warren, S. E. (2005). Best Practices: A Triangulated Support Approach in Transitioning Faculty to Online Teaching. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(1), 13.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research : planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill.
- Daiute, C., & Lightfoot, C. (2004). Narrative analysis: studying the development of individuals in society.
- Davidson, P., Paull, G., Rees, D., Daly, J., & Cockburn, J. Cardiac Failure in Critical Care - Activities of Home-Based Heart Failure Nurse Specialists: A Modified Narrative Analysis. *American journal of critical care : an official publication, American Association of Critical-Care Nurses*, 14(5), 8.
- Davidson, P., Paull, G., Rees, D., Daly, J., & Cockburn, J. (2005). Activities of Home-Based Heart Failure Nurse Specialists: A Modified Narrative Analysis. *American Journal of Critical Care*, 14(5), 426-433.

- Donohue, P. J., Kelley-Lowe, M. B., & Hoover, J. J. (2001). *From Mythology to Technology: Sisyphus Makes the Leap To Learn*. Access ERIC: FullText. North Dakota. Document Number)
- Doppen, F. H. (2002). *Beginning social studies teachers' use of technology in the teaching of history*. University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
- Dorries, B., & Haller, B. (2001). The News of Inclusive Education: a narrative analysis. *Disability and Society*, 16(6), 871-891.
- Downey, K. (2002). Relationship between football practice self-efficacy and game performance.
- Doyle, M. N. (2000). The effect of phase II cardiac rehabilitation on self-efficacy and quality of life.
- Duffy, T. M., Kirkley, J. R., & NetLibrary Inc. (2004). *Learner-centered theory and practice in distance education cases from higher education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Educause. (2006). ROI (Return on Investment) (Publication. Retrieved June 8, 2006, from Educause: http://www.educause.edu/Browse/645?PARENT_ID=174)
- Eisenberger, J., Conti-D'Antonio, M., & Bertrando, R. (2000). *Self efficacy : raising the bar for students with learning needs*. Larchmont, N.Y.: Eye On Education.
- Faseyitan, S., Libii, J. N., & Hirschbuhl, J. (1996). An inservice model for enhancing faculty computer self-efficacy. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(3), 214-226.
- Feldman, M. S., Skoldberg, K., Brown, R. N., & Horner, D. (2004). Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis. *J Public Adm Res Theory*, 14(2), 147-170.
- Fiese, B. H., & Wamboldt, F. S. COPING WITH PHYSICAL AND MENTAL ILLNESS - Coherent Accounts of Coping with a Chronic Illness: Convergences and Divergences in Family Measurement Using a Narrative Analysis. *Family process*, 42(4), 14.
- Fort, T. L. (2001). *Ethics and governance : business as mediating institution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, B. D. (2000). Strategies to enhance self-efficacy to improve exercise adherence in a worksite fitness center.
- Friedman, H. S. (Ed.). (1998). *The encyclopedia of mental health- Self-Efficacy*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Grant, M. M. (2004). Learning to teach with the web: Factors influencing teacher education faculty. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(4), 329-341.
- Greene-McCreight, K., & Carr, A. (2001). Book Reviews - Feminist Reconstruction of Christian Doctrine: Narrative Analysis and Appraisal. *The Journal of religion*, 81(3), 1.
- Hampton, G. (2006). Enhancing public participation through narrative analysis. *SAGE Public Administration Abstracts*, 33(2).
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hislop, G. W., & Ellis, H. J. C. (2004). A study of faculty effort in online teaching. *Internet & Higher Education*, 7(1), 15.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2003). *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Howell, S. L., Saba, F., Lindsay, N. K., & Williams, P. B. (2004). Seven strategies for enabling faculty success in distance education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(1), 33-49.
- Huang, H.-M. (2002). Toward Constructivism for Adult Learners in Online Learning Environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(1), 22-37.

- King, K. P. (2002). Identifying success in online teacher education and professional development. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 5(3), 231-246.
- Kinuthia, W. (2004). *Impediments to Faculty Engaging in Web-Based Instruction: Clarification of Governing Policies Access ERIC: FullText*: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Washington, DC.o. Document Number
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education -- from pedagogy to andragogy* (Rev. and Updated ed.). New York: The Adult Education Company.
- Kosak, L., Manning, D., Dobson, E., Rogerson, L., Cotnam, S., Colaric, S., et al. (2004b). Prepared to Teach Online? Perspectives of Faculty in the University of North Carolina System. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 7(3), 17.
- Lawhon, T., & Ennis-Cole, D. (2005). Advice from the Trenches: Experienced Educators Discuss Distance Learning. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 20(2), 105-110.
- Lawson, E. J. (1998). A narrative analysis: A black woman's perceptions of breast cancer risks and early breast cancer detection. *Cancer nursing*, 21(6), 9.
- Levenburg, N., & Major, H. (2000). Kindling the Fire: How to Attract Faculty to Distance Education. *Faculty and Staff Development*, September/October 2000, 8.
- Lieu, J. Narrative Analysis and Scripture in John. *Journal for the study of the New Testament. Supplement series*(189), 144-163.
- Lieu, J. (2000). Narrative Analysis and Scripture in John. *Journal for the study of the New Testament. Supplement series*(189), 144-163.
- Maguire, L. L. (2005). Literature Review - Faculty Participation in Online Distance Education: Barriers and Motivators. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(1), 20.
- Mankowski, E. S., & Thomas, E. (2000). Special Section: Qualitative Research on the Narratives of Spiritually-Based Communities - The Relationship between Personal and Collective Identity: A Narrative Analysis of a Campus Ministry Community. *Journal of community psychology*, 28(5), 12.
- Marcia Landen, Z., & Michael, M. (1996). Classroom research: A faculty training opportunity for research administrators. *SRA Journal*, 28(3/4), 5.
- McColskey, W., Parke, H., Furtak, E., & Butler, S. (2003). *A Structured Professional Development Approach to Unit Study: The Experiences of 200 Teachers in a National Teacher Development Project*. North Carolina. Document Number
- Meyer, K. A., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (2002). Quality in distance education. from <http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS44875>
- Miller, H. T., & Jaja, C. (2005). Some Evidence of a Pluralistic Discipline: A Narrative Analysis of Public Administration Symposia. *Public Administration Review*, 65(6), 728-738.
- Morris, L. V., Xu, H., & Finnegan, C. L. (2005). Roles of Faculty Teaching Asynchronous Undergraduate Courses. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 9(1).
- Murray, M. (2000). Levels of Narrative Analysis in Health Psychology. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 5(3), 11.
- Naudin, J., & Azorin, J. M. (1998). Binswanger & Schapp: Existential Analysis or Narrative Analysis? Translated by Catherine Wieder. *Journal of phenomenological psychology*, 29(2), 212.
- Nomura, H. (2005). Narrative Analysis and Coherence of Narrative Structure: A Methodological Discussion of Turning Points, as Told by an Elderly Japanese. *Hattatsu shinrigaku kenkyu = The Japanese journal of developmental psychology*, 16(Part 2), 109-121.

- Oliver, K. L. (1998). RESEARCH NOTE: A Journey Into Narrative Analysis: A Methodology for Discovering Meanings. *Journal of teaching in physical education : JTPE*, 17(2), 16.
- Orvis, K. A., & U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (2005). The influence of trainee gaming experience and computer self-efficacy on learner outcomes of videogame-based learning environments. from <http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS69429>
- Pajares, F. (2006). Self-efficacy information. Retrieved 6/16/2006, from www.des.emory.edu/mfp/self-efficacy.html
- Payne, S. L. (1996). Qualitative research and reflexive faculty change potentials. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 9(2), 20.
- Picciano, A. G. (2002). Beyond Student Perceptions: Issues of Interaction, Presence, and Performance in an Online Course. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 6(1), 21-40.
- Qing, L., & Akins, M. (2005). Sixteen myths about online teaching and learning in higher education: Don't believe everything you hear. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 49(4), 51-60.
- Reissner, S. C. (2005). Learning and innovation: a narrative analysis. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 18(5), 482-494.
- Rice, J. (2004). Preparing School Technology Leaders for Online Professional Development: Training Efforts with El Paso Teachers for Online Course Facilitation in Texas STARgate. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 7(3), 12.
- Riessman. (2006). *Narrative analysis*.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Ruano, C. (2005). Understanding the cultural construction of wealth and power differentials through ethnographic narrative analysis in Colombia. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(4), 8.
- Sands, R. G. (2004). Narrative Analysis: A feminist approach. In D. K. Padgett (Ed.), *The qualitative research experience* (pp. 48-78). Belmont: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Sargeant, J., Curran, V., Allen, M., Jarvis-Selinger, S., & Ho, K. (2006). Facilitating interpersonal interaction and learning online: Linking theory and practice. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 26(2), 128-136.
- Shea, P. J., Fredericksen, E. E., Pickett, A. M., Pelz, W. E., Duffy, T. M., & Kirkley, J. R. (2004). Faculty development, student satisfaction, and reported learning in the SUNY learning network. In *Learner-centered theory and practice in distance education: Cases from higher education*. (pp. 343-377): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Smeyers, P., & Verhesschen, P. (2001). Narrative analysis as philosophical research: bridging the gap between the empirical and the conceptual. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(1), 71-84.
- Stanley, C. A. The Faculty Development Portfolio: A Framework for Documenting the Professional Development of Faculty Developers. *Innovative Higher Education*, 26 Number 1, 23-36.
- Statistics, N. C.F. E. (2005). Distance Education at Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions: 2000–2001 (Publication. Retrieved April 27, 2006, from Department of Education: <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/peqis/publications/2003017/>
- Stavri, P. Z., & Ash, J. S. Does failure breed success: narrative analysis of stories about computerized provider order entry. *International journal of medical informatics*, 72(1), 8.

- Stern, B. B., Thompson, C. J., & Arnould, E. J. (1998). Narrative Analysis of a Marketing Relationship: The Consumer's Perspective. *Psychology & marketing*, 15(3), 20.
- Surry, D. W., & Land, S. M. (2000). Strategies for Motivating Higher Education Faculty to Use Technology. *Innovations in Education & Training International*, 37(2), 145-153.
- Swan, K. (2003). Learning Effectiveness: What the Research Tells Us [Electronic Version], 1-10. Retrieved June 19, 2006, from <http://users.edte.utwente.nl/collis/2003-Selected-Issues/Gr3/Learningeff.pdf>
- The University, P. O. (2006). Student Assessment of Instructors. Retrieved June 13, 2006, 2006, from <http://www.aa.ufl.edu/aa/dass/tcheval/search.asp>
- Thomas, T. L. (2006). Chlamydia infection population specific risk factors for female university students. from <http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/etd/UFE0015382>
- Tokuda, H. (2004). A Narrative Analysis of Meaning of Child Care for Women Raising Their Young Children. *Hattatsu shinrigaku kenkyû = The Japanese journal of developmental psychology*, 15(Part 1), 13-26.
- Wallack, C. E. (2002). *Perceived racism, stress, optimism, social support and self-efficacy : factors in smoking frequency of African American males.*
- Wallin, D. L. (2003). Motivation and faculty development: a three-state study of presidential perceptions of faculty professional development needs. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 27(4), 317.
- Webbstock, D. (1997). Quality Assurance with Respect to University Teaching in South Africa: A narrative analysis. *Assessment and evaluation in higher education*, 22(2), 12.
- Webmaster, C. (2006). The College of Educaiton Website. Retrieved January 1, 2006, 2006, from <http://www.coe.ufl.edu>
- Webmaster, H. (2006). The Health Science Center. Retrieved January 1, 2006, 2006, from <http://www.health.ufl.edu>
- Williams, A. P., & Tedesco, J. C. (2006). *The Internet election : perspectives on the Web in campaign 2004.* Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Woods, R., Baker, J. D., & Hopper, D. (2004). Hybrid structures: Faculty use and perception of web-based courseware as a supplement to face-to-face instruction. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(4), 281-297.
- Yang, Y., & Cornelious, L. F. (2005). Preparing Instructors for Quality Online Instruction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(1), 1-21.
- Zinkhan, G. M., & Delorme, D. E. (1995). Qualitative Research in Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3), 99-101.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Randy Allen Graff was born in 1968, in Jacksonville, Florida. The younger of two children, he grew up in Jacksonville graduating from Wolfson High School in 1986. He earned his B.A. in political science and English from the University of Florida (UF) in 1990 and his M.Ed. in educational leadership and adult education from Florida Atlantic University (FAU) in 1993.

Upon graduating with his M.Ed., Randy began teaching in a residential/outpatient child and adolescent psychiatric facility as a middle school teacher in Daytona Beach, Florida. He has been a teacher for the past 15 years and is currently teaching faculty and staff at the University of Florida in the use of instructional and operational technology. Randy's career took him from being a classroom teacher to being a lead technology resource specialist for the district, working with exceptional education teachers and district personnel with instructional, administrative and assistive technology. Randy's career allows him to work with cutting-edge technology.

On completion of his Ph.D. program, Randy will retain his assignment to the Senior Vice President of Health Affairs and begin to focus on building a faculty development center. Randy has been married to Staci Graff (ADA Program Director) for 13 years. They have two daughters: Sydney, age 9; and Emily, age 6.