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ABSTRACT

The existence of the internet has changed the world and has resulted in many impactful changes for higher education. More specifically, online education is seen as a means to meet the demands of students including non-traditional adult students (who work full-time, go to school part-time and are financially independent) for flexible course scheduling in higher education. Delivery of online educational programs at institutions of higher learning can mean significant change for the institution, faculty, and students. Careful consideration is paramount to a successful entry of not only how but why the institution is initiating such an educational format. Recent statistics show faculty in higher education are generally less accepting of the value and legitimacy of online education as a viable educational format and less accepting ultimately of online degrees. Faculty falling into this group do not view online education quality as comparable to that of traditional face-to-face coursework and therefore not as legitimate as an educational format to traditional coursework. This study, through the theoretical framework of transformative learning, focused on business faculty and online education. Specifically, tenured faculty members who were initially resistant to teaching online, changed their perspective, and came to value and teach online in business curriculum on a world-wide basis. Additionally considered was how teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in a face-to-face classroom environment. To address this purpose, an exploratory sequential mixed methods research design was utilized. Interviews were conducted with 14 tenured business faculty across the country. Based upon the results of these interviews a survey was created and distributed to business faculty on a world-wide basis. Qualified responses were received from 206 survey participants. The findings suggest that while business faculty, including tenured, are resistant to teaching online and prefer to teach in a face-to-face environment, they are willing to reconsider to learn to teach online if requested by high ranking colleagues and are provided the necessary institutional support and training. The impact of having taught online altered business faculty’s face-to-face teaching practices through more active learning methods for students. A perspective change to teach online resulted after spending time reflecting on various factors business faculty considered key to a successful entry to teach in an online environment. The importance of resistance as a construct of transformative learning was also identified as contributing to a change in mindset. This study is important to adult education because it is intended to shed light on how the most experienced faculty group, tenured business faculty, overcame their initial resistance to online education including teaching online. This will afford institutions of higher learning the knowledge of how to construct online course design, train and reduce the impact these resistance factors have on individual tenured business faculty. It will afford students an opportunity to learn from those individuals who have gained the highest level of success within their profession.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides the framework for a mixed methods study of tenured business faculty resistance to online education including teaching online. Specifically, an analysis of tenured and non-tenured business faculty was conducted to explore their experiences with online education. Additionally, this study looked to assess the process of change in mindset of tenured business faculty. Those tenured business faculty who were initially resistant to the educational medium and now teach online and how this impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments. To address this topic, this chapter will begin with background on faculty resistance to online education and provide a problem and purpose statement including research questions. Additionally, a description of the theoretical framework applied to guide further understanding of the topic, and an overview of mixed methods research methodology utilized to inform the study is provided. Lastly, the significance of this study to adult education, including assumptions, limitations, strengths, and key definitions, are described.

Background

The existence of the internet has changed the world and has resulted in many impactful changes for higher education. More specifically, online education is seen as a means to meet the demands of students including non-traditional adult students (who work full-time, go to school part-time and are financially independent) for flexible course scheduling in higher education (Stewart, Bachman & Johnson, 2010). Delivery of online educational programs at institutions of higher learning can mean significant change for
the institution, faculty, and students. Careful consideration is paramount to a successful entry of not only how but why the institution is initiating such an educational format (Moore & Kearsley, 2012).

According to a 2014 survey conducted by the Babson Survey Research group, 5.8 million students in higher education were taking at least one online course compared to the approximate 20.5 million students who have enrolled in resident courses at degree-granting post-secondary institutions (Allen & Seaman, 2016). At the same time, recent statistics show faculty in higher education are generally less accepting of the value and legitimacy of online education as a viable educational format and less accepting ultimately of online degrees. Faculty falling into this group do not view online education quality as comparable to that of traditional face-to-face coursework and therefore not as legitimate as an educational format to traditional coursework (Allen & Seaman, 2013).

This study focuses in particular on business faculty and online education. Specifically, tenured faculty members who were initially resistant to teaching online, changed their perspective and came to value and teach online in business programs across the country. This study is important to adult education because it is intended to shed light on how the most experienced faculty group, tenured faculty, overcame their initial resistance to online education including teaching online. This will afford institutions of higher learning the knowledge of how to construct online course design, train and reduce the impact resistance factors have on individual faculty. It will afford students an opportunity to learn from those individuals who have gained the highest level of success within their profession. To provide background to this study, a discussion of general faculty resistance to teach online will be offered first followed by tenured business
faculty resistance factors second. Lastly, a review of the key literature on the predictors of faculty acceptance of online education and how individual teaching practices were altered when a change in perspective occurred will be offered.

**General Faculty Resistance**

General faculty resistance to teach online covers a wide range of factors. These include, faculty with limited or no experience with online education or course design, the perception of increased time and work load to prepare to teach online, and a general level of concern expressed regarding the quality of online education (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012; Seaman, 2009). The first resistance factor discussed is experience and how it plays a key role in educators’ acceptance or rejection of online education as an educational format. Second, the increased time and work to teach online and third, quality perceptions of faculty.

**Experience.**

Faculty that have the least experience with online education, either teaching or designing courses, perceived the barriers to online education as greater than those who had the most experience (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). This finding is not surprising because individuals who are resistant to change naturally will not be as accepting of online education if they do not perceive the educational format to be as academically rigorous as face-to-face learning in a traditional classroom. It may be that it is simply easier to not get involved in online education then to find that there are too many barriers to overcome. Further factors that inhibit faculty from gaining experience teaching or designing courses online also include fear of losing identity as a teacher, restructuring relationships with students and increased structure requirements, (Major, 2010). Faculty
who are not as resistant and open to attempting to learn to teach or design courses online may not see the barriers as oppressive as they have tackled the mental hurdle of overcoming an initial fear or perception that online education is not the same quality. Faculty who have not attempted online education and do not understand the potential benefits it can have for students may need to be educated themselves in order to reduce their level of resistance (Ross & Klug, 1999).

When reviewing experience of general faculty from the perspective of number of years teaching in higher education, the statistics do not bear much difference between more or less teaching experience. From a Babson Research Survey (Seaman, 2009) of faculty with more than twenty years’ experience in higher education, they have been found to have taught online at the same rate as those faculty with less experience. Seaman (2009) also found, however, that tenured faculty teach online courses with lower frequency than non-tenure track colleagues. What is apparent, when analyzing this further, is tenured faculty are more resistant due to perceived institutional barriers such as a lack of institutional support through training in online education and peer mentoring (Herman, 2013). Other barriers were further evidenced from a quantitative study of 75 faculty in a southeastern U.S. university. In this analysis, tenured faculty were more resistant as they did not see a reason to adopt online education due to their status and position, the costs outweighed the benefits or they may be more comfortable with the face-to-face educational format (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). In addition to the experience level of faculty and their overall acceptance or rejection of online education, another factor that creates a concern to the educational format for faculty is the time commitment.
Time.

One of the major barriers to faculty acceptance of online education is the perception that it takes more time and effort to teach or develop an online course than for a comparable face-to-face course (Herman, 2013; Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012; Seaman, 2009; Stewart, Bachman & Johnson, 2010; Tanner, Noser & Totaro, 2009). Approximately 64% of faculty surveyed from the Babson Research Survey Group indicated this sentiment (Seaman, 2009). Of the faculty surveyed, faculty with tenure, with the longest time teaching and with full-time positions had the strongest belief that it takes more time to teach an online course. This fact further exemplifies the point that faculty with less experience to teaching online are more resistant and vocal about barriers with online education and teaching online. Faculty just beginning their careers, part-time, those not on tenure track are not as vocal in their opinion on this topic but still report it does take more time (Seaman, 2009). What was not adequately addressed in the literature was exactly what about online teaching takes additional time? Is it the monitoring of email questions from students 24/7, reading discussion board questions, assisting with developing the online course and becoming familiar with the institution’s learning management system, for example? As online technology becomes more prevalent and faculty are becoming more skilled in its usage, the added time to learn to use technology is rapidly becoming less of a concern (Gibson, Harris & Colaric, 2008). Faculty who perceive that it takes an extra effort and increased time commitment to pursue teaching an educational format they may not believe is of the same quality or provides the same promotional opportunities as a traditional course are naturally hesitant. So the question becomes, why teach online? Just because something may take additional
time and effort on the part of faculty does not mean it should not be undertaken. The pedagogical practices used in a traditional face-to-face course year after year such as lecture do not work online (Stewart, Bachman, & Johnson, 2010). Instructors must find new, innovative ways to meet learning outcomes in an online environment. This may lead to a positive change for students to achieve learning outcomes in online courses and improve the quality of education.

Quality.

Instructors who are resistant to online education generally view it as being lesser quality than face-to-face education. As discussed previously under general faculty resistance and experience, instructors with no experience teaching or designing an online course perceived the barriers to online education as greater than those who had the most experience (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). From the Babson Research Survey Group, over 80% of faculty with no online teaching or development experience believe the learning outcomes for online education are inferior or somewhat inferior to those for face-to-face instruction (Seaman, 2009). However, a majority of faculty with online teaching or development experience believe that learning outcomes are as good as or better than face-to-face instruction (Seaman 2009). Those who resist less believe online education quality is good and those who resist the educational format more believe it is inferior. What is interesting from this survey is 56% of the faculty, regardless of online teaching experience, would still recommend an online course to at least one student (Seaman, 2009). Why would faculty still recommend an online course if they feel it is inferior? The research does not provide an answer to this question. Possibly, faculty view accessibility, especially for the “non-traditional” student, as more important to get a
student’s “foot in the door” and this may be perceived as more important than course quality in some instances. Another issue may be the level at which the course is recommended. Were the courses recommended at the undergraduate or graduate level? If undergraduate, the perception of quality requirements may not be perceived at the same level as a graduate course or better suited possibly for the online format. Thus far, resistance to online education from faculty has been explored on a general level. In the next section a description of why tenured business faculty resistance is a concern for students gaining a degree online and how their perceived resistance factors compare to general faculty will be analyzed.

**Tenured Business Faculty Resistance**

As the demand for online course work continues to grow, there is a need for the most experienced faculty to teach online courses and improve the perception of quality associated with an online degree to assist in overcoming apparent bias from faculty as well as from hiring managers. The perception of quality can be enhanced by setting high standards for faculty as part of the accreditation process (Rovai, Ponton & Baker, 2008). As indicated previously, tenured faculty teach online courses at a lower frequency than non-tenured faculty (Seaman, 2009). The reasons for this include perceived barriers from a lack of institutional support with training and peer mentoring (Herman, 2013), the costs outweighed the benefits, they do not see a reason to adopt online education and teaching online due to their status and position as tenured faculty and they feel more comfortable in the face-to-face environment (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). The goals of the accreditation process that institutions of higher learning adhere to center around quality assurance of the institution to assure the educational community and the general public
that the institution has clearly defined educational objectives (Rovai, Ponton & Baker, 2008). The more institutions of higher learning can improve their reputation for quality with online education courses by having tenured faculty teach these courses and overcome the identified resistance factors, the more students can benefit and achieve their academic goals by obtaining an online degree that is perceived as reputable.

For example, from a national survey of hiring executives that studied online bachelor’s degrees in entry-level position in business hiring process, 96% indicated they would choose the candidate with the traditional degree over an online degree (Adams & Defleur, 2006). In other surveys, interviews, a literature review and a conceptual piece done of individuals who make hiring decisions, indicates a definite bias against online degrees (Adams 2008; Bailey & Flegle, 2012; Columbaro & Monaghan, 2009; Linardopoulos, 2012). The findings from these analyses indicates a perception exists among hiring managers that those individuals who hold online degrees are not considered as having qualifications that are of the same quality as those who earned a degree in the traditional face-to-face environment. However, the concern about online degrees was not the delivery method of the degree rather it was the reputation of the school granting the degree. A degree earned online was in some instances seen as acceptable if earned from a traditional “known” accredited university (Adams & Defleur, 2006).

Thus, because of the flexibility of gaining an education online and the increasing demand for online coursework, institutions of higher learning recognize the need to provide online educational programs for prospective students. One such example of online educational initiatives popular with students is the online MBA degree. “The MBA has become one of the most popular postgraduate degrees worldwide today” (Cao
Even though there are many valued online MBA degree programs, there are several that are considered not as reputable. Corporate recruiters surveyed indicate that some companies will not hire a candidate with an online MBA degree unless his or her resume was very strong and they explained why they had to get a degree online (Metrejean & Noland, 2011). Thus, even though employer perceptions of online degrees vary, demand for online degree programs including an online MBA continue from students (Cao & Sakchutchawan, 2011). As a result, there is a need for more faculty including tenured business faculty to teach courses online. With this demand however, there is a lack of current research on business faculty, specifically tenured business faculty resistance to online education. The only studies that address the topic are dated and are limited to general faculty resistance. These studies included, Ross & Klug (1999) and Tanner, Noser & Totaro (2009). Since online education and technology change at a rapid pace there is a need for more current research. While these studies are dated, they do confirm some of the common sentiments of general faculty regarding resistance based on lack of experience, concern over time commitments and quality of education with the educational format. In the Tanner, Noser and Totaro (2009) research study, a random sample of 1,175 business faculty members throughout the United States was taken representing accounting, economics, finance, marketing, and management. The purpose of this analysis was to compare business faculty and undergraduate students’ perceptions of online learning. Usable questionnaires were completed by 200 respondents. The findings from this group indicate that they perceive online learning as having numerous other deficiencies. These include, a lack of instructor-student/student-student interaction, no structured classroom environment,
students tend to teach themselves the course material, the difficulty of teaching qualitative courses online, and the challenges associated with administering exams online. To expand further on these deficiencies, faculty indicated that they miss the social interaction with students. They felt it was important to be able to meet with students outside the classroom which is an important aspect of taking a course. This analysis does confirm the different motivations of students and faculty with online education. Students see online education as meeting a need to gain a degree with flexible scheduling to meet their busy work schedules. Faculty are not as quick to engage with the educational format due to the concerns listed above and lack of familiarity with use of technology.

Administrations adopting online coursework need to keep in mind the resistance factors described of both general and tenured faculty when building an online degree program in order to overcome these concerns and allow their faculty to move past these issues and successfully adopt online coursework. Thus, if tenured business faculty continue to resist online education, the perceived bias against online degrees from hiring managers may continue which will negatively impact student’s ability to achieve success and employment opportunities.

**Faculty Change and Online Adoption**

With the lack of current research on business faculty including tenured business faculty resistance to online education, there is even less information about what may have led this group to a change in perspective and begin to teach online. General research studies on education and technology focus primarily on how to incorporate technology into the curriculum but little address how teachers adapt to the educational format or what led to a change in mindset with their approach to teaching. As previously described,
tenured faculty resistance factors include a lack of institutional support with training and peer mentoring (Herman, 2013), the costs outweighed the benefits, they do not see a reason to adopt online education and teaching online due to their status and position as tenured faculty and they feel more comfortable in the face-to-face environment (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). With these resistance factors it is easy to see why the tenured group does not readily adopt online coursework or see a need to place themselves in a position to teach online when they have already gained success in the traditional classroom environment. Perhaps, those tenured faculty that challenge their closely held assumptions and beliefs may consider alternative educational formats to gain a change in perspective with online education and have a true transformation. Perspective transformation is described as adults examining their beliefs, assumptions and values after acquiring new knowledge and experiencing a shift in their world views while incorporating this new knowledge (King, 2002). King (2002) conducted a study of how faculty alter their viewpoint of technology in the classroom. King’s study of teachers was grounded in transformative learning theory. Transformative learning is defined as “learning is understood as the process of using a prior interpretation to construe a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one’s experience in order to guide future action” (Taylor, 2008, p. 5)

From the data gathered in King’s study (2002), 89.1 percent of the participants had experiences consistent with perspective transformation as described above. Participant’s revealed technology changed their perspective and transformed their concept of the role of the educator and worldview of education. What was missing from this analysis was what led to the teachers’ desire to want to utilize the technology which
ultimately led to their individual perspective transformation. King’s research also focused on technology use in the classroom, whether it is online or a traditional setting. While this research study is about online education and teaching online, the importance of perspective transformation of individual faculty and use of technology can serve as an important theoretical framework for explaining how faculty learn to accept teaching in an online environment.

Similarly, in McQuiggan’s (2012) study also grounded in transformative learning theory, of faculty perspective change made use of a purposeful sample of six full-time and one part-time faculty member teaching a mix of undergraduate and graduate level courses in education, engineering and public affairs over a six week summer professional development program. The purpose of this action research study was to explore transformative learning among faculty as a result of participating in professional development activities to teach online. The major finding from this analysis was learning to teach online has potential to transform individual assumptions and beliefs about teaching and altering their face-to-face teaching practices. While both studies focused on faculty perspective change and how teaching practices were altered, the studies did not address what led faculty to engage in use of technology in the classroom in the first place and did not address tenured business faculty teaching practices.

There are a few other studies that examine faculty perception of online education (Gibson, Harris, & Colaric, 2008; Stewart, Bachman, & Johnson, 2010) that will be discussed further in Chapter 2, but there are no other studies that specifically examine how tenured business faculty change, particularly from a transformative learning theory.
perspective. Given the lack of such studies of how tenured business faculty achieved a change in perspective, more research is necessary.

**Problem Statement**

Faculty resistance to online education is a growing concern for institutions that plan to adopt or have adopted the educational format. General faculty resistance factors to online education include the categories of experience, time and quality. For tenured faculty, the resistance factors stem from a lack of institutional support with training and peer mentoring (Herman, 2013), the costs outweighed the benefits, they do not see a reason to adopt online education and teaching online due to their status and position as tenured faculty and they feel more comfortable in the face-to-face environment (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). One of the major subjects of many online degree programs, as previously discussed, is a business curriculum. Overcoming tenured business faculty’s resistance is paramount for the success of the institutions offering accredited online degree programs from a quality and reputation standpoint in order to meet the educational goals of their students. With the lack of research that addresses tenured business faculty resistance, the larger question is specifically, if tenured business faculty initially resisted online education but later overcame their initial resistance, what factors serve to positively impact a change in perspective with teaching online?

By understanding what led to a change in perspective to teaching online and ultimately accepting online education as an educational format, this knowledge can help adult education on a broader scale to address concerns with faculty upfront and serve students more successfully to achieve their academic goals. With this background, the purpose of this study will be described next.
Purpose and Research Questions

Given the lack of data-based research studies on faculty resistance to online education in general and business faculty more specifically and what may have led to a change in perspective regarding teaching online, the purpose of this mixed methods research study was two-fold: one, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments.

Based upon the purpose of this study, this research was guided by the following questions:

1. For tenured business faculty, who initially resisted online education but later reconsidered and now teach online:
   a) What were the resistance factors to teaching in an online environment?
   b) What factors contributed to a change in perspective and what was the learning process associated with this change?

2. How has teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment?

3. How does transformative learning bring understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that guides this study is transformative learning theory. Transformative learning is defined as “learning is understood as the process of using a
prior interpretation to construe a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one’s experience in order to guide future action” (Taylor, 2008, p. 5). Transformative learning’s focus is on critically self-reflecting on one’s assumptions and beliefs to understand why a particular perspective is held. Without developing a deeper understanding of our own perspectives, there is little probability that change can be fostered and significant learning can occur (Mezirow, 2000).

The process of learning is shaped overall by an individual’s frame of reference (meaning perspective) which is how individuals view their world. A frame of reference has two elements, habits of mind which are the assumptions used to make meaning of an experience and point of view which are specific expectations, beliefs, feelings that direct and shape a specific interpretation (Mezirow, 1994). For example, a frame of reference is that online education is a viable educational format. A habit of mind is that both student and teacher share responsibility for learning and a point of view are teachers should use more collaborative techniques to engage learners online. Overall, a frame of reference including habits of mind and point of view are considered meaning structures that can be transformed through reflection (Mezirow, 1994).

By taking time to understand what happens to, within, and around us, an individual may engage in various levels of reflection prior to gaining a revised point of view. These levels of reflection are termed content, process and premise reflection. Content reflection occurs when an individual reflects on the content of the problem—what is happening? With process reflection, an individual considers how the problem came to be and what strategies can be considered to solve the problem. With premise reflection, an individual considers why do I care about this and why is this a problem? This is where
there is potential for transformative learning to occur. The individual may come to see their world in a different light. Through these various reflective stages, a revised point of view may occur or meaning schemes related to a point of view (Cranton, 2006).

The reason for selecting transformative learning theory as the theoretical framework was due to the purpose of investigating experiences of tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and then later changed their perspective to the educational medium. To determine what led to this change in perspective and how it impacted their teaching in both face-to-face and online learning environments. The purpose of transformative learning theory is to attempt to understand how adults learn and the goal of transformative learning is to bring about change with how a person views the world. Not only to understand how a person learns but to understand how one critically analyzes a particular view of the world and comes to an altered personal viewpoint after critical self-reflection.

Transformative learning theory plays a role with online education for teachers who are at the center of increasing demand and pressure to teach online. These faculty are being challenged to re-think their underlying assumptions about teaching and learning (Baran, Correia & Thompson, 2011). As institutions of higher learning may impose requirements on faculty to teach online, some are more resistant than others. These forces create an intense demand for educators to cope with constantly changing technology and may cause tension and further resistance (King, 2002). The focus of this study, however, will be to gain the perspective of tenured business faculty who chose to teach online after initially being resistant without being forced into the educational format by their employer. While a person may not always experience a change in perspective about
teaching after teaching online and initially being resistant, the focus of this study will be to gain an understanding from individuals who had a change in perspective about teaching and how transformative learning plays a role in the process of change.

As faculty examine their beliefs about online education and their own willingness to learn new technology and teaching practices, the role that transformative learning plays in analyzing the individual’s change in perspective is critical to understanding what led to their change in view (King, 2002). While all participants in this study may not experience a perspective transformation when developing new views on teaching and learning online, those faculty who do will need to critically self-reflect on their assumptions and beliefs and have a willingness to be open to differing viewpoints about effective teaching methods (McQuiggan, 2012). Transformative learning involves transforming frames of reference through critical reflection on assumptions, validating contested beliefs through discourse and taking action on one’s reflective insight (Mezirow, 1997). Transformative learning theory provides a solid framework for this study to gain an understanding from which to view faculty perspective transformation and overcoming resistance to online education.

The core constructs of transformative learning theory that will be analyzed in this study include critical reflection, critical self-reflection and discourse, frames of reference (meaning perspectives), habits of mind, points of view (meaning schemes), emotions and other ways of knowing and lastly, experience. These concepts will be more fully discussed in Chapter 2.
Overview of Design and Methodology

This study will use an exploratory sequential mixed methods research design. In this mixed methods design, a qualitative phase is used as the initial starting point and a quantitative second phase is utilized to explain the first phase in more depth (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). A qualitative semi-structured interview was conducted with a purposeful sample of 14 tenured business faculty that had a change in perspective about teaching online and how they altered their approach to teaching in their face-to-face classroom. A quantitative survey was requested on a large sample of business faculty (tenured and non-tenured) across the world to get various viewpoints on online education and if individuals had a perspective change with the educational format.

The purpose of qualitative research was to explore individuals’ experiences and perceptions (Merriam, 2009). In the qualitative portion of this study, the criteria considered for selection of participants to conduct a semi-structured interview included:

1) The educator previously was against online education as a viable educational medium but now finds teaching in this context enjoyable and productive.

2) Tenured business faculty.

3) Previously taught in a face-to-face format and now teaches online courses.

The reason for selecting mixed methods was this method of combining both qualitative and quantitative data will overcome the weaknesses of doing a qualitative only or quantitative only study. More specifically, a mixed methods approach will allow for triangulation of data by directly comparing and contrasting qualitative findings with quantitative statistical results to achieve validity and dependability (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). By collecting data from both approaches, the intent is that it will lead to a
better understanding of the research problem than only one data type alone could produce. As a mixed method approach is not accepted universally, the design will have to be detailed and considered rigorous to be accepted (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

**Significance of the Study**

As the demand for online education continues to grow with students in higher education (Allen & Seaman, 2013) and institutions of higher learning continue to develop and offer online business curriculum including online MBA courses (Allen, & Seaman, 2010; Cao & Sakchutchawan, 2011), the need for qualified instructors to teach these courses will continue to rise. Overcoming the barriers that faculty, including tenured business faculty have described toward the educational format, is paramount for online education to be perceived as viable. Viable not only for higher education but also the business world and the managers who will be making hiring decisions with online graduates (Columbaro & Monaghan, 2009).

This research is important to adult education because the study may lead to increased awareness of the need for the most experienced faculty to teach online and also help to improve understanding of the factors that led to a change in perspective with acceptance of online education as an educational format. By gaining an understanding of what led to a change in perspective and how this impacted teaching approaches of the most experienced faculty, this may assist higher education overall and adult education specifically by gaining an understanding of how to address the barriers perceived by faculty upfront and ultimately gain acceptance on a broader basis (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). By improving the perception of a degree amongst faculty and employers earned online by students who otherwise would be unable to complete their educational
initiatives will allow more individuals to realize their true potential and contribute their skills for the benefit of society overall.

Eliminating bias against online degrees will not be achieved unless the causes and solutions are researched. Some online degrees are not of the same quality. Only through a thorough analysis of a school’s reputation and accreditation will hiring managers become comfortable with hiring an online graduate. As online education continues to grow and more graduates populate the work world, a better understanding of the quality online institutions will become known and students will not be as subjected to unfounded bias.

The research on student learning outcomes in online courses versus face-to-face indicate that no significant difference can be found on student learning (Arbaugh, 2000). If student learning outcomes do not show a significant difference and more students can have access to higher education through online coursework and degrees, another significance of the study will be to highlight these factors and examine what is being done to eliminate or reduce the bias that exists. Some efforts to reduce bias that institutions of higher learning have taken are to ensure that they are designing and delivering challenging, high quality distance education programs (Metrejean & Noland, 2011). This can be accomplished by hiring and training faculty so they have a better understanding of technology in the classroom. Along with training, ongoing mentoring throughout the course to make sure faculty are comfortable and confident in their approach to teaching as they transition from the face-to-face educational format is recommended (Bower, 2001; Moreland & Saleh, 2007). By offering quality educational initiatives to mentor tenured faculty with online educational practices will further increase acceptance.
Another significance of the study will be to gain an understanding of how faculty successfully transitioned from face-to-face to online teaching and how it has impacted both educational formats. “Most teachers teach as they are taught” (Schmidt, Hodge & Tschida, p. 132, 2013). Transitioning from a place of comfort of the traditional classroom for some teachers is something they are unwilling or unable to do. For those that are willing and able, they should personally reflect on what their individual educational philosophy is to teaching and learning (Cuellar, 2002). In an online environment, the role of the instructor changes. Rather than being a content expert, the teacher interacts with students. They facilitate, guide and advise students with appropriate resources and encourage students to utilize these resources (Davis & Benson, 2009). By gaining an understanding of how faculty gained a change in perspective and if they reflected on their educational philosophy before committing to teach in an online environment, for example, will be an important component to understanding if a perspective transformation occurred. This will be especially important when analyzing tenured business faculty and gaining an understanding of their potential change in perspective.

Lastly, this study has personal significance as I am an online educator, have taken higher education courses online and have experienced the resistance personally from other colleagues who do not share the viewpoint that online education is a viable educational medium. I began my pursuit of a Doctoral degree online because that was the only means afforded for me to gain an education working full-time. I have a goal of being a professor and decided I wanted to teach full-time when I am closer to retirement. I fully researched the online educational institutions, learned of their accreditation, commitment to quality learning outcomes and pursued a university that I thought
matched my goals, had a good reputation, and was not considered a “diploma mill”.

After taking two courses in a business Ph.D. program, I felt like the course work was rigorous and well designed to achieve learning outcomes. My outlook on online education quickly eroded after speaking with a tenured faculty member from a major research institution. Having attended a seminar to gain an opportunity to speak with this faculty member about my educational initiatives, I was anxious to gain a perspective from someone within higher education about their perception of online education and the value of gaining a Ph.D. online. The first question he asked was what school was the degree from? I advised him it was an online institution only and he said he never heard of the university. My chances of gaining a position in higher education with a Ph.D. earned online were minimal according to his viewpoint. This faculty member gave me a few other pointers but it essentially ended my dream of gaining a doctoral degree online.

There are not many part-time Ph.D. programs offered in the traditional classroom setting so online education is the main method of gaining a degree for individuals who work full-time. I should not have my goals of pursuing education to enhance my abilities shut down because of a perception concern with online education that may or may not be true. Time may allow for other students to gain a degree online without incurring bias against them but until that time comes, perception concerns about the quality of online education and a degree earned online need to be addressed. Gaining an education for myself and millions of students who otherwise would not be afforded an opportunity to gain a degree must be fostered and encouraged in the means that are available with technology and the internet. To not encourage learning online is paramount to oppression.
Assumptions, Limitations, and Strengths of the Study

Every study has assumptions, limitations, and strengths embedded in its purpose and methodology. Here I will outline some of these factors.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are embedded in this research:

1) The demand for online education from students of higher education will continue to grow.

2) For purposes of this study on tenured business faculty, it is assumed initial tenured business faculty resistance to online education will occur or the purpose of the study will no longer be relevant.

3) Critical self-reflection may occur with a portion of tenured business faculty toward online education and faculty will be able to articulate how it happened.

4) Tenured business faculty will adopt different teaching perspectives when transitioning to online education, their face-to-face courses, and will be able to express how.

5) Institutions of higher learning will continue to develop online education formats to meet demand of students, endeavor to support faculty training to enhance their skills, and lower resistance overall.

Limitations and Strengths of the Study

Potential limitations of the study included:

1) This study was dependent on tenured business faculty being exposed to online educational formats, having formed an opinion, and being willing to participate in a study. As a result, a degree of selection bias may occur as
these participants may have had either a positive or negative experience with online education.

2) What constitutes acceptance by faculty? Because someone does not wish to initially teach online but eventually agrees to do so does not mean they experienced a perspective transformation. Some tenured faculty may do so for different reasons other than they had a change in an assumption or belief. The intent of the study was to see what led to a change of perspective of tenured business faculty whether it is a perspective transformation or another reason. By reporting the findings, it is hoped this will lead to a better understanding of what leads to a change of view so others can learn from this. If a change in perspective stems strictly from the institution required the educational format and not much reflection is occurring, this information will be of little benefit to education as a whole and adult education in particular.

3) A sample size large enough for quantitative data to be considered to have significance will be necessary. Identifying and selecting a purposeful sample for qualitative interviews that will allow for rich, thick data to understand how individuals make meaning while interacting in their social world will be necessary to achieve results that are dependable and confirmable (Merriam, 2002).

In spite of these limitations, the strength of this study was the use of a mixed methods research approach that allows data gathered to be both dependable and confirmable from a qualitative standpoint and valid and reliable from a quantitative standpoint. The reason mixed methods research continues to gain acceptance is due to
the increasing belief that by combining qualitative and quantitative research, this will lead to increased sophistication in evidence and a combination of both forms of data provides the most complete analysis of a research topic (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

**Definition of Terms**

1) **Constructivist View of Knowledge**—“meaning is seen to exist within ourselves, not from external sources” (Cranton, 2006, p. 23).

2) **Diploma Mills**—the characteristics of a diploma mill are, “no classrooms, faculty are undertrained and officers are unethical self-seekers that are no better than their offerings.” Diploma mills are not new and still exist in the world today. Because online websites are easy to create and not easily recognizable, these disreputable firms create confusion amongst the public and distrust (Chau, 2010, p. 187).

3) **Discourse**—is defined as “dialogue involving the assessment of beliefs, feelings and values” (Cranton, 2006, p. 65).

4) **Frame of Reference**—is “a meaning perspective, the structure of assumptions and expectations through which we filter sense impressions. It provides the context for making meaning within which we choose what and how a sensory experience is construed” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 16).

5) **Perspective Transformation**—perspective transformation is described as the change that occurs within our core to make sense of our experience, due to a disorienting dilemma that causes a person to question his or her long standing beliefs and assumptions (Taylor, 2008).
Summary

This chapter provided an overview of a research study that examined non-tenured and tenured business faculty and their experiences with online education. Additionally, this research assessed the process of change in mindset of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and determined how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments. The background of the study was discussed including the problem and purpose statement, research questions, and the theoretical framework which guided the study. Also included was a discussion of the study’s significance, assumptions, limitations, strengths and key definitions were provided.

In the following chapter, Chapter Two, a more detailed review of the literature that this study is based upon is provided. Chapter Three provides a detailed description of the research methodology and design. This will be followed by Chapter Four, which presents the qualitative findings of the study and Chapter Five which presents the quantitative findings. This study will conclude with Chapter Six which will provide an analysis of the research findings and their implications.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction/Problem Statement

Faculty resistance to online education is a growing concern for institutions that plan to adopt or have adopted this educational medium. From a 2014 survey conducted by the Babson Survey Research group, 5.8 million students in higher education were taking at least one online course compared to the approximate 20.5 million students who have enrolled in degree-granting post-secondary institutions (Allen & Seaman, 2016). However, despite the growing participation of students in online courses, research has found that faculty in higher education are generally less accepting of the value and legitimacy of online education and ultimately online degrees. From a separate Babson Research Survey in the fall of 2012, only 30.2% of chief academic officers believe their faculty accept the value and legitimacy of online education. This percentage was 27.6% in 2002, an increase of only 2.6% in ten years (Allen & Seaman, 2013). General faculty resistance factors to online education include the categories of experience, time and quality. For tenured faculty the resistance factors stem from a lack of institutional support with training in online education, peer mentoring, the costs outweighing the benefits and they may be more comfortable with the face-to-face educational format.

Of the many online degree programs, business programs have been very popular in this educational medium. Educational institutions continue to look for opportunities to increase revenue and see online education as a means to accomplish this goal due to the high demand from students for business degrees earned online (Meyer, 2014). Tenured faculty teach online courses at a lower frequency than non-tenure track colleagues.
Overcoming tenured business faculty’s resistance is paramount for the success of the institutions offering such degree programs in order to meet the educational goals of their students while improving the perception of quality of a degree earned online. With the lack of research that addresses business faculty resistance, the larger question is: if tenured business faculty initially resisted online education, but later overcame their initial resistance, what led to a change in perspective?

By gaining an understanding of what common factors lead tenured business faculty to a change in perspective with teaching online and ultimately accepting online education as an educational format, it could benefit adult education and institutions of higher learning. Specifically, the knowledge gained through this study can be communicated to tenured business faculty in an effort to alleviate their concerns which will ultimately serve students in their quest for quality higher education.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

Given the lack of data-based research studies on faculty resistance to online education in general and business faculty more specifically and what may have led to a change in perspective regarding teaching online, the purpose of this mixed methods research study was two-fold: one, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments.

Based upon the purpose of this study, this research was guided by the following questions:
1. For tenured business faculty, who initially resisted online education but later reconsidered and now teach online:
   a) What were the resistance factors to teaching in an online environment?
   b) What factors contributed to a change in perspective and what was the learning process associated with this change?
2. How has teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment?
3. How does transformative learning bring understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses?

**Design of Literature Review**

The design of this literature review will begin with a discussion of the theoretical framework, transformative learning theory. Specifically, I am interested in transformative learning and the role of critical reflection in understanding the process of change in perspective among tenured business faculty who teach in an online environment.

Next, the history of distance education is analyzed to provide background regarding the long history of this educational medium and also include the common definitions of what is meant by distance education vs. online education. This will be followed by current trends with online education, including the factors for resistance and acceptance by faculty with online education to provide an understanding of what the barriers are to teaching online and how some faculty have overcome these hurdles as exemplified by the literature selected on this topic. I will then compare and contrast online vs face-to-face teaching practices to provide insight as to what is known about
teaching practices and how they may have or have not been altered based on the different classroom environments. I will then review why demand is high for online education from students’ perspective. After conducting a general overview, the literature review analyzes business curriculum and online education. I hope to understand why online business curriculum is popular including MBA programs with students in higher education.

After reviewing business curriculum and online education, I reveal a gap in the literature regarding tenured business faculty in terms of what factors enable this group to overcome their initial resistance and how it has impacted their teaching practices in face-to-face classrooms.

The literature review process began with a search through the Penn State Harrisburg Library for textbooks providing background on the topic of distance education and analyzing my own prior Penn State University course texts on the topic. For the various topics outlined in this literature review, I have searched for journal articles in SAGE, ERIC, ProQuest, and Academic Source Complete (EBSCO) that are peer reviewed and published during the time frame January 2010-March 2015. Due to the speed of change with the topic of distance education, I chose a timeframe of within five years that I believed to be most relevant for the study. The search terms selected included faculty resistance, distance education/online education/popular, current trends, distance education and demographics, online teaching, faculty teaching perspectives, teaching or pedagogy, teaching practices, face-to-face vs. online and online pedagogy, business curriculum, and MBA.
Other search methods included using Academic Search Complete (EBSCO) and using an advanced search using key words such as faculty or instructors or tenured and resistance or reluctance or avoidance or barriers or conflict and distance or online and education or learning. I then narrowed the search to adult education/learning instead of education and learning. I utilized Business Source Premier to further refine my search but did not locate any new articles. I used the same search terminology under ProQuest but added conference papers and proceedings. I also utilized key words such as college teachers attitudes, technology, virtual classroom, web based instruction teaching methods, and online courses pertaining to faculty experiences teaching online. For this literature review I identified 50 sources including 8 books on adult education and online education, 13 qualitative studies, 16 quantitative studies, 3 mixed-methods studies, 8 conceptual articles, and 2 website sources on the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. News & World Report. For the theoretical framework of transformative learning I identified 26 references including foundational journal articles, books, and literature reviews. My focus for the search included fundamentals of transformative learning including criticisms, the role of technology in online education, resistance and learning and its implications for transformative learning.

**Theoretical Framework: Transformative Learning Theory**

The theoretical framework for this study was transformative learning theory. As understanding what may lead to a change in previously held assumptions and beliefs was the central focus of this study, transformative learning theory was the most appropriate framework for this analysis. In this section, a brief background of the learning theory is provided including the eleven phases which lead to a perspective transformation and a
definition of transformative learning is provided. The core constructs of critical reflection, critical self-reflection, discourse, emotions and other ways of knowing, and experience are also included. The core construct of frames of reference including habits of mind and point of view will be the first topic analyzed. Additionally, an analysis of the literature on transformative learning and online education, the common critiques of transformative learning and the implications for transformative learning with resistance and learning are offered.

**Phases of Transformative Learning**

Transformative Learning Theory originated in 1975 with a study by Jack Mezirow of women returning to post-secondary education or the workplace after an extended time away. Mezirow conducted a qualitative study of 12 re-entry programs with 83 women from four two-year colleges to explore the impact on their progress with the re-entry programs. This began a nine phase process and increased in later years to a total of eleven phases that resulted in an unplanned finding of change in meaning perspective for these women. A meaning perspective is “psychological structures with dimensions of thought, feeling and will” (Taylor & Cranton, 2012, p. 101). The phases begin with a disorienting dilemma and then proceeded to a self-examination of feelings of guilt or shame, critical reflection, recognition of one’s discontent, exploration of new roles, planning a course of action, acquiring knowledge, provisionally trying out new roles, renegotiating relationships and negotiating new relationships, building competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships and reintegration into one’s life (Mezirow, 1994). (See Figure 1, Appendix A). With these eleven phases which led to a
meaning perspective change complete, a definition of transformative learning is appropriate at this time.

**Defining Transformative Learning**

Transformative learning is defined as “learning is understood as the process of using a prior interpretation to construe a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one’s experience in order to guide future action” (Taylor, 2008, p. 5). The theory is based on a constructivist view of knowledge which is defined as “meaning is seen to exist within ourselves, not from external sources” (Cranton, 2006, p. 23). Constructivism’s basic premise is “we create reality as we make meaning of whatever happens to, within, and around us” (Kasworm, Rose & Ross-Gordon, 2010, p.54). The central theme of the learning theory surrounds individual perspective transformation. Perspective transformation is the change that occurs within our core to make sense of our experience, due to a disorienting dilemma that causes a person to question their long standing beliefs and assumptions (Taylor, 2008). Because our perspectives may be faulty, it is through a process of critical reflection of our assumptions and beliefs that we can gain a perspective transformation and gain meaning from within. The purpose of transformative learning theory is to attempt to understand how adults learn and the goal of transformative learning is to bring about change with how a person views the world. Building on this background, an analysis of transformative learning theory’s individual core constructs is necessary.
Core Constructs

The core constructs of transformative learning theory include critical reflection, critical self-reflection and dialogue, emotions and other ways of knowing, experience and frames of reference (meaning perspectives), including habits of mind and points of view (meaning schemes). A discussion of how individual’s construct their individual meaning structures comprised of meaning perspectives (frame of reference) which include habits of mind and points of view (meaning scheme) is provided first to provide background to the other core constructs which lead to a new individual perspective.

Frame of reference.

A frame of reference can be interpreted as how we view ourselves in the world and have been constructed since childhood. Whether we are liberal or conservative, good or bad, introverted or extroverted are examples of a frame of reference. A frame of reference (meaning perspective) has two dimensions—habits of mind, which are assumptions we use to make meaning of experiences and point of view which are considered clusters of meaning schemes (Taylor, 2008). Points of view are specific expectations, beliefs, feelings, attitudes and judgments that direct and shape a specific interpretation (Taylor & Cranton, 2012). For example, in terms of habit of mind, one may view education as a process where both teacher and student share responsibility for the student’s achievement academically and have a point of view as a teacher to use more active learning or collaborative learning techniques while another teacher may have a point of view of being an expert and conveyor of knowledge.

Transformative learning is considered learning that transforms problematic frames of reference to make them more open, discriminating inclusive, reflective and
emotionally able to change (Mezirow, 2003). Mezirow adopted the learning domains of Jürgen Habermas in his transformative learning theory. These learning domains include instrumental learning and communicative learning. Instrumental learning involves resolving a problem through empirical tests or learning tasks. Communicative learning is trying to understand what someone means. Often this learning involves critical reflection and discourse to understand values and beliefs (Mezirow, 1994). How an educator applies these learning domains to foster transformative learning in the classroom is by first understanding individuation and its role in fostering authentic relationships with students. Individuation can be described as the process of becoming aware of who you are and where you fit in the world (Cranton & Roy, 2003). Second, the educator must take time to come to know the students as individuals and determine their preference for learning (Taylor, 2006).

An individual educators’ frame of reference can explain their attitude regarding learning to teach online. Faculty, who have a view of teaching for the benefit of students, will undertake teaching online as a means to accomplish a goal of allowing more access for students who otherwise would not be in a position to gain an education (Seaman, 2009). Those educators, whose frame of reference does not see online education as a viable educational format, will choose not to participate. They may view the face-to-face classroom as the only effective means of discourse and learning and discount online education (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Through frames of reference, habits of mind, and points of view, dictates the attitude an educator has towards their choice of teaching or not teaching in an online format. How an educator arrives at a different viewpoint or attitude is through critical reflection and critical self-reflection.
Critical reflection and critical self-reflection.

Critical reflection and critical self-reflection are key components of Mezirow’s transformative learning theory. Critical reflection is “seen as conscious and explicit reassessment of consequence and origin of our meaning structures” (Taylor, 2008, p. 6). Mezirow defines reflection as “the process of critically assessing the content, process and premise of our efforts to interpret and give meaning to an experience” (Taylor & Cranton, 2012, p. 105). Individuals must first be open to the idea of considering viewpoints that differ from their own and also take time to examine (critical self-reflection) their well-established assumptions and beliefs in order for perspective transformation to occur (Mezirow, 1991). Critical self-reflection is an individuals’ capacity to reflect critically on their assumptions and beliefs, especially those assumptions and beliefs that are unfamiliar (Taylor & Cranton, 2012). Thus, in summary, critical reflection is being open to reflecting on various viewpoints and critical self-reflection is being open to considering an altered viewpoint after taking time to reflect on closely held assumptions and beliefs. For purposes of this study, critical reflection will be utilized to encompass both concepts of reflection.

Critical reflection is comprised of three levels: content reflection, process reflection and premise reflection. Content reflection is thinking back on what is occurring; an examination of the content or description of the problem, for example. Process reflection is reflecting back on how an issue came to be or the origins of the action. With premise reflection, a person may consider the question, why do I care about this? Why is this issue a problem? While content and process reflection may lead to a transformation of a specific belief, premise reflection has potential to lead to
transformative learning due to the potential for an altered world view (Cranton, 2006). Premise reflection is critical to the process of transitioning to teach online because those who have taught in a face-to-face course may not see that teaching online is necessary. Why is this educational format necessary may be a reaction of some faculty who resist online education. The assumption would be that as the demand by students for online education continues to grow, the need for online educators will increase in order to keep up with the demand from students (Cuellar, 2002). After considering these points and reflecting on the need for online teaching, an altered viewpoint may occur.

For faculty transitioning to teaching online, these individuals need to critically reflect on why they teach in the first place (Cranton, 2006). If a teacher is focused on their approach to teaching or what they teach as opposed to why they teach they have not reflected on their philosophical viewpoint as to why they do what they do. Thus, a potential shortcoming with the application of transformative learning is when educators’ do not take the step in the process of transformative learning to sit back and reflect on their practice through premise reflection. They do not engage in an examination of their long held assumptions and beliefs. It is assumed by Mezirow and others that through reflection that we see through the habitual way we have interpreted everyday life (Mezirow, 1991). One may take time to critically reflect on their assumptions and beliefs but did a fundamental change in mindset occur just because reflection occurred?

Another shortcoming with the application of transformative learning with faculty transitioning to teach online, is the role of the disorienting dilemma as a phase in the process of transformative learning. Many faculty are stepping into online teaching because the institution they work for is requiring courses to be taught online or the
educator feels pressure due to demand from students (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). As a result, transformative learning is not occurring for these faculty as these factors are not considered a disorienting dilemma. A disorienting dilemma could involve a major life changing event such as a divorce, death of a significant other, or job loss (Taylor, 2008). For example, a disorienting dilemma may occur for educators who are advised their traditional face-to-face course is no longer available and is only offered online. These educators must now teach online without having learned how to teach effectively in this medium and experience a true disorienting dilemma. If educators have taught traditional classes as a content expert and lecturer and now find that this approach does not work online, they have to reexamine their philosophy about who they are as an educator and if they can adapt to different educational practices.

Transformative learning could be said to have occurred for these educators to explain the process of how they approach teaching and what steps they must take to change their approach to teaching (Cuellar, 2002). Transformative learning could offer insight into the process of overcoming change and resistance to teaching online.

**Discourse/Dialogue.**

Another critical component in the transformation process is discourse. Discourse combined with critical reflection is crucial to bringing about transformative learning. Discourse is critical to transformative learning because by discussing our assumptions and beliefs with others it may lead to new perspectives that had not originally been considered. Discourse is defined as a “process in which we have an active dialogue with others to better understand the meaning of an experience” (Taylor & Cranton, 2012, p.78). Discourse is dialogue “devoted to searching for a common understanding and
assessment of the justification of an interpretation or belief” (Taylor & Cranton, 2012, p.81). For example, a key for educators is to have peer mentoring when transitioning to teach online (Napier, Dekhane & Smith, 2011). By speaking with colleagues who have taught successfully online allows faculty to have confidence that they too can achieve success teaching online. “Learning is a social process and discourse becomes central to making meaning” (Mezirow, 1997, p.10). Discourse is dialogue where individual’s focus on content and justify their beliefs by providing reasoning along with examining competing points of view. Individual’s settle on what they believe is the most informed, objective and rational viewpoint. The best judgement is good only until new evidence, arguments and viewpoints are raised in which case the process of discourse continues (Mezirow, 1994). Being able to find mutual understanding through the exchange of ideas, and grievances with the possibility of gaining consensus are all benefits of discourse. It is through critical reflection and discourse that frames of reference are transformed (Mezirow, 1998).

In addition to critical reflection, and discourse in examining assumptions, beliefs and learning through our experiences, in the next section a review of how emotions, other ways of knowing and experience play a role in examining closely held assumptions and beliefs.

**Emotions and other ways of knowing.**

Thus far, the discussion has centered on rational thought processes and reasoning when attempting to understand transformative learning theory. When a disorienting dilemma occurs, emotions play a large role in how much learning occurs or does not occur. When one experiences a loss of a job for example, does the person storm off and
burn bridges on his or her way out the door or do they take time to reflect on what occurred and try to learn from the situation to avoid another occurrence for the next job or do a combination of these two? By critically reflecting on the job loss and conditions which led to the occurrence and critically reflecting on one’s assumptions and beliefs regarding his or her relative position with the job and reasons for dismissal, this may lead to a “greater self-awareness and change in meaning structures” (Taylor, 2001, p. 225). Rationality in concert with emotional awareness, allows for individual growth through difficult life experiences. By engaging in critical reflection an individual can gain a better understanding and insight into real versus perceived needs and toward greater authenticity (Taylor & Cranton, 2012).

For instructors who have experienced an embarrassing experience when teaching online for the first time because they were uncomfortable with the technology and felt like they were a new learner instead of the expert, for example, the role of emotions in transformative learning is key. Because of the emotional upset, the teacher may gain additional motivation to understand the technology and improve their performance. It is the emotion that may allow a teacher, who was initially resistant to teaching online, to reconsider this approach to teaching and gain a perspective transformation. “Emotions focus attention and provide guidance and motivation for action” (Taylor & Cranton, 2013, p. 38).

Conscious reasoning, however, does not always have to occur for transformative learning to take place. Implicit memory, which involves the non-conscious development of thought and action (Taylor, 2001) may allow for altered meaning structures outside of a person’s conscious knowledge. For example, procedural knowledge, which is a type of
implicit memory, are skills and habits that can be learned and outside a person’s conscious awareness. This procedural knowledge was displayed in Taylor’s research (2001) of intercultural competency, where a study was conducted of individuals and their coping ability when going to a new country. The study found that people adapted better when they did not think about what they needed to do to function in the new environment. One respondent indicated “I just tried to accept every situation as it was instead of trying to think” (Taylor, 2001, p. 229). Thus, a perspective transformation occurred, but on an unconscious level. For those who choose to teach online, a barrier that must be overcome by faculty is learning technology and employing different educational practices. For example, not using traditional lecture but web based tools to engage students and use of discussion/chat rooms to teach (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). Thus, instructors’ must rethink their approach and will not be in a position to employ procedural knowledge when first beginning to teach online, but it may become apparent as they gain more familiarity with the processes of teaching online. Both emotion and unconscious learning can play a large role in perspective transformation.

Having completed the analysis of the core construct of emotions and other ways of knowing, in the next section, the role of experience in the process of transformational learning will be discussed.

**Experience.**

Experience plays a vital role in the process of transformative learning. From an initial experience that raises conflict with a prior interpretation and feelings of disorientation, to a process of reflection about the experience and a new understanding to
be shared with others and ultimately integration of the a new meaning into daily life, lead to a perspective transformation (Taylor & Cranton, 2012).

Previously, perspective transformation was described as the change that occurs within our core to make sense of our experience, due to a disorienting dilemma that causes a person to question his or her long standing beliefs and assumptions (Taylor, 2008). A critical element of perspective transformation is experience. Adults bring a significant amount of experience to the learning environment. “It is experience, particularly prior experience, that is the primary medium of a transformation, and it is the revision of the meaning of experience that is the essence of learning” (Taylor & Cranton, 2013, p. 35). The experience adults bring to a learning environment shape their assumptions about the world (meaning perspectives) and how we make meaning of these experiences (habits of mind). The findings from research conducted on faculty acceptance of online teaching, for example, shows that those teachers who have experience teaching online do not see the barriers as oppressive to learning a new approach to teaching. Those that have not taught online see the barriers as too much to overcome and are resistant to the educational approach (Ross & Klug, 1999; Seaman, 2009). What is important for transformative learning is to consider how experience plays a role in a change of perspective. For those educators who gained experience and are comfortable teaching online, what led them to take the step to gain the experience? Was it due to something that occurred that made them critically reflect on their beliefs and assumptions to make them reflect and reconsider? For those that have not experienced teaching online, will they require a transformative experience to occur to make them reconsider? For transformative learning to occur and explain the process of learning to
teach online, new discrepant experiences that contradict prior experiences must take place. This leads to reflection and a perspective transformation has occurred (Taylor & Cranton, 2013). Perspective transformation described as the “engine of adult development” (Mezirow, 1994, p. 227), is a process that challenges the many taken-for-granted assumptions adults use to make meaning in their lives. Through a process of critical reflection and discourse, emotions and other ways of knowing, individuals heighten their understanding and make meaning of experiences they encounter which can lead to a change in world view.

With an analysis of the core constructs complete, attention can now turn to online education and how faculty perspective transformation may or may not occur in this educational medium.

**Transformative Learning and Online Education**

If a teacher does choose to teach online what are the factors that contribute to transformative experiences? There is a scant amount of current research that was done analyzing transformative learning and online education. Three research articles were found that addressed the topic. Only two provided relevant information for this review (Taylor, 2007; Dhillon, Rabow, Han, Maltz & Moore, 2015). The first was a critical review of transformative learning, and the other a quantitative study of fostering transformative pedagogy online and how it can impact student social consciousness. In the critical review of the empirical research on transformative learning (Taylor, 2007), the analysis indicated there were key factors for students that contributed to transformative experiences while online. These factors included the degree of life experience among participants and the significance of having time to reflect on written
accounts of intellectual and emotional connections during asynchronous discussions. “The greater life experiences provide a deeper well from which to draw upon and react to discussions that emerged online” (p. 182). The key factors that contribute to transformative experiences while online may arise from a deep well of experience, however, it is hard to know if a perspective transformation can occur simply by reading the narrative of a fellow classmate or teacher. One must consider the context with which this individual has been situated. Simply reacting and reflecting to discussion from a personal viewpoint without meeting a person face-to-face to gain an understanding of the context from which the perspective emanated is problematic when determining if a perspective transformation occurs.

Additionally, learning cannot occur without becoming critically reflective and being open to other points of view, however, critical reflection does not always lead to a perspective transformation. One can critically analyze a situation but decide that their assumptions and beliefs do not warrant a change in perspective. An individuals’ frame of reference may change due to a change in circumstance, however. For example, in Taylor’s study of Americans who lived in another country for two years, the development of new habits of mind and living in a different culture produced a transformation in frame of reference without the people being aware of the change. Sometimes change is produced through assimilative learning. This is defined as “adjustment or accommodation to a difficult situation by accepting it as conforming to one’s desire” (Mezirow, 1998, p. 191). Gaining an experience through reflection of another students experience in an online course has potential to provide for critical reflection. However, not understanding the context within which the student taking the course has posted a discussion or if they
have come from another country and may assimilate learning through other means that require more face-to-face interaction than online education can afford, will impact whether a true perspective transformation can occur online in the ideal manner as outlined by Mezirow.

In another example of transformational learning and online education, a quantitative study, again from a student perspective, examined the way in which the selected use of transformative pedagogy affects student’s consciousness about race, gender and sexual orientation (Dhillon, Rabow, Han, Maltz & Moore, 2015). This was a study of thirty honor students at a major public university designed to introduce students to the inequalities perpetuated within the public education system. The belief was that transformation may occur when students could express their thoughts, feelings, beliefs and prejudices about fellow students. Students were assigned to react to activities in six weekly web posts on the class online forum. The forum also created a safer space to continue conversations beyond the classroom as instructors did not have access to these forums. Over 781 web posts were generated in response to 28 activities.

From this analysis the finding was that transformation of racial, gender, and sexual identities can occur through a process of free self-expression, self-examination, and confrontation. The main difference from Mezirow’s theory that was demonstrated from Dhillon’s et.al., analysis was the idea that transformation can occur with more than one identity in a group setting when transformative pedagogy is employed. This analysis also indicates that transformative teaching pedagogy will allow students to engage in social action to reduce inequalities in race, gender, and sexual orientation. The limitation with this article is that the analysis never really explains what pedagogy was considered
transformative. The students engaged in web posts? What about this is transformative? Simply expressing feelings and beliefs, as indicated previously does not necessarily bring about a change in perspective. The fact that the class is online also brings about challenges for students to engage in social action to reduce inequalities. These thirty students can engage in a group action but if they continue to post other classmates at other geographic locations it may become more challenging logistically to bring about a true social action for change. The limited number of students reduces the validity of the research and the fact that they are honor students may possibly limit the perspective from this more privileged group. Thus, there is limited research on transformative learning and what pedagogy is considered transformative online. Further research is necessary to not only understand what is transformative online but also how online pedagogy may also impact teaching in a face-to-face course.

What does the literature say about critiques to Mezirow’s theory? In the next section a review of the more common criticisms of the learning theory are provided.

**Common Critiques of Transformative Learning Theory**

One of the criticisms to transformative learning theory, as cited in Mezirow (1994) by Mark Tennant, is specifically evaluating what the distinction is between a change in meaning scheme versus a transformation in perspective. Mezirow defines a meaning scheme or point of view as the beliefs, judgements and feelings that shape a particular interpretation. For example, a persons’ view that lecture is a viable teaching method online is an example of a point of view. Tennant asserts that points of view are more identifiable with normative life cycle changes and a progression of learning through life’s experiences. A transformation in perspective, however, would involve more radical
reflection on the life cycle itself, identifying its origins and consequences (Mezirow, 1994). For example, it is not whether lecture can be used to teach online but rather that online education is as good as traditional coursework as an educational framework. A perspective transformation is a shift in world view as opposed to developmental progress. Identifying educators who truly have a perspective transformation versus a change in meaning scheme or point of view will be critical to gaining a true understanding of transformation with tenured business faculty in this study.

Another criticism of transformative learning theory is that it is said to not address the context of learning. In Clark & Wilson’s (1991) critical review of Mezirow’s transformational learning theory, they indicate that the underlying belief of Mezirow’s work is the need to understand the meaning of an individual’s experience within its historical context. What they indicate Mezirow fails to do is “maintain the essential link between the meaning of experience and the context in which it arises and by which it is interpreted” (p. 76). The study of the women reentry program, for example, was focused on the internal experiences of the women. The study overlooked the various personal and historical contexts of the experiences of the group included in Mezirow’s study and what impact the context (class of the group, sociocultural context, historical climate, setting) had on the study (Clark & Wilson, 1991). While Mezirow’s view is based on ideal conditions that lead to an understanding of the meaning of an experience as a basis for decision and action, the context in which the learning occurs is not considered and ideally does not happen neatly in 11 phases of development.

As discussed above, social action to bring about change for a society has been an area of criticism for Mezirow’s transformative learning theory due to the individual
nature of the approach to perspective transformation. For example, Mezirow’s-transformative learning theory as stated by Tennant (1993) does not adequately acknowledge the problems associated with fostering ideal learning in a social environment where inequalities exist. As cited in Mezirow (1994), Michael Newman is another critic that shares the viewpoint that Mezirow’s theory lacks attention to societal concerns. In support of the societal consciousness Newman invokes Freire’s concept of conscientization (consciousness raising) which involves becoming critically aware of and challenging dominant ideologies. Newman sees perspective transformation as a “sophisticated form of self-knowledge, assertion and personal growth and adults need to participate freely in social change in order to fully participate in discourse and make meaning of their experience” (Mezirow, 1994, p.231). Mezirow’s response is that not all significant transformative learning is sociolinguistic in its focus (Mezirow, 1994). Mezirow’s concern is with the social perspective within the individual. Adult education is responsible for supporting public initiatives of political, economic and social change to assist adult learners. Adult education must work to overcome constraints that hinder students’ participation in discourse. As Mezirow indicates, perspective transformation is about the perspective of the individual not society (Tennant, 1993). Thus, from an online education perspective, an online course attempting to create group transformation seems to conflict with the underlying focus of change within the individual.

With an analysis of the common critiques complete attention is now turned to resistance and learning to overcome resistance to change. A discussion of overcoming resistance to change and its implications for transformative learning as it pertains to the study of tenured business faculty is provided.
Resistance and Learning-Implications for Transformative Learning

From the review of literature regarding resistance and learning to overcome resistance to change it is apparent that this topic and its implications for transformative learning have not been thoroughly analyzed. How individuals learn to overcome resistance to change is the central point of this research study and is important for adult education to help alleviate tenured business faculty concerns with teaching online. Before analyzing this concept further, a few definitions of resistance are appropriate. Resistance is defined as “behavior which is intended to protect an individual from the effects of real or imagined change” (Dent & Goldberg, 1999, p. 34). It is also seen as behavior indicative of “active non-acceptance and objection” (Illeris, 2004, p.87). Resistance to change and learning to overcome this resistance have multiple interpretations. People may be resistant to learning something new due to loss of status, loss of pay, or loss of comfort (Dent & Goldberg, 1999). The fear of loss, therefore, is the common denominator with resistance to change. Resistance and learning to overcome resistance to change can also occur from a teaching perspective. Tenured faculty who have taught the same way for many years can be resistant to teaching online because of a lack of confidence in their own abilities to teach in an alternative medium such as online education (Sockman & Sharma, 2008). Why do many faculty rely on lectures, for example, if students do not learn best with this approach to teaching? Being tenured and attempting to teach online, may be seen as a threat to individual identity as a successful educator if they deviate from their known, comfortable teaching practices. As described later in the section on faculty resistance with online education, resistance from faculty also stems from their view of the worth of the educational medium. Faculty do not always
view the quality of online education as offering the same quality learning outcomes that traditional classroom environments create (Allen & Seaman, 2015). This resistant view to teaching online due to the perception that it lacks the same quality as traditional classroom learning conditions is the same issue as addressed in the literature regarding resistance and learning. That is, individuals’ fear of the unknown originates from a concern for loss of their own status, identity, pay or comfort. Being open to change and overcoming these fears though allows some to realize success as an instructor online. An instructor’s main purpose is to help students learn. Individuals who accept teaching online may go through a change in perspective. These individuals reconsider their current assumptions and beliefs and view how learning can occur successfully in the online format (Sockman & Sharma, 2008).

With individuals who reconsider their prior assumptions and beliefs and are now willing to teach online, the relationship of resistance to transformative learning therefore becomes a central issue. What is the learning process that allows someone to experience a change in perspective to teach online when they were initially resistant to the educational format? How does emotion, the unconscious and socialization play a role in learning when individuals are initially resistant? Closely related to the concept of overcoming resistance to change is resiliency. How does a person become resilient, reflect and overcome obstacles when in an emotionally charged state?

After reviewing the Pro Quest database using the search terms “transformative learning”, “resistance”, “reluctance”, “resilience” and eliminating newspapers, and dissertations, 27 sources of journal articles (peer reviewed) were located. Nine were considered for this section of the literature review after evaluating the abstract and
confirming relevance to learning, resistance and transformative learning. Of these nine articles, resistance was defined in two of the articles (Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Illeris, 2004) and was a central theme in seven of the nine (Bates & Sangra, 2011; Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Illeris, 2004; Sockman & Sharma, 2008; Spear, 2014; Storrs & Inderbitzin, 2006; & Wells, Jones & Jones, 2014). Transformative learning was specifically described in relation to resistance and learning in five of the nine articles but no additional definitions of resistance were provided. The central topics addressed under transformative learning are emotions and the unconscious in adult learning and implications for classroom instruction (Illeris, 2004; Malkki, 2012; Sockman & Sharma, 2008; Spear, 2014; Storrs & Inderbitzin, 2006).

The key findings from this literature include how emotions and unconscious play a significant role in learning to overcome resistance, understanding, overcoming ambivalence (non-learning) and fear (Bates & Sangra, 2011; Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Illeris, 2004; Malkki, 2012; Sockman & Sharma, 2008; Spear, 2014; & Wells, Jones & Jones, 2014). Socialization of individuals and its role with resistance to educational practices (Storrs & Inderbitzin, 2006) and how resilience and coping strategies impact learning when managing life challenges (Palmer, 1997) are also common themes from the literature. A discussion of each of the key findings is provided below about resistance and transformative learning.

**Emotions and the Unconscious**

The process of learning and understanding can be thought to involve not only cognitive processes of knowledge acquisition but also emotional dimensions of feelings and motivation (Illeris, 2004). Resistance to learning new tasks may be considered to be
rooted in the emotional dimension as a mental defense as a repression of impulses that are not considered bearable by an individual. These impulses can be repressed to the unconscious and have unknown effects on behavior (Illeris, 2004). From a transformative learning perspective, individuals must critically reflect in order to potentially gain understanding and learn to teach online. This understanding is said to occur after a life changing event or disorienting dilemma. The question though is how can true reflection occur if an individual is in a state of emotional chaos (Malkki, 2012)? The purpose of this study was to understand what leads to a change of perspective for those tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now teach online. When an individual feels threatened by the concept of teaching online it may be due, for example, from a fear of losing one’s identity as a teacher. They are no longer the “sage on the stage but guide on the side” (Sockman & Sharma, 2008). This is an emotional response and the defense is to react with resistance or ambivalence to the proposed change (Illeris, 2004).

Conscious awareness of emotional states, however, is not the only way individuals react to potentially disturbing or chaotic events. The unconscious is also an essential aspect in learning and development. In a conceptual analysis by Spear (2014), the concept of conscious cooperation which describes the “attitude of acceptance and receptivity toward the unconscious that the ego must adopt if individuation is to proceed” (p.243) is described. Spear argues that a person must be willing to accept that the unconscious yields a considerable amount of influence over our reactions and behavior. As stated in Spear (2014), Mezirow acknowledges that “what is to be transformed in both rational and extra rational approaches to transformation resides in the unconscious and must be first brought into conscious awareness” (p. 239). Thus, the assumption is that a
person who has conscious cooperation will be open to how our unconscious will continue
to influence our conscious mind. These individuals are thought to have a thin boundary
between the conscious and unconscious because of their willingness to take the
unconscious seriously and consider the possibility that there is something to learn from
the experience of the unconscious. Those individuals with a thick boundary are not as
willing to be open to the concept of learning from the unconscious. As cited in Spear
(2014), Dirkx (2001) indicates “it is the adults’ emotional imaginative connection with
the self and with the broader social world that yields personally significant and
meaningful learning” (p.64). Can it be said then that educators who initially resisted
teaching online and later had a change in perspective have a thin boundary and therefore
are open to the idea of how the unconscious can impact the conscious mind? Are those
individuals who are not as open minded and believe that the conscious mind is the only
way we can learn more resistant and therefore less open to a change in perspective? From
a transformative learning perspective, what triggers an individual to be open to a change
in assumptions and beliefs if initially resistant to the idea that the unconscious mind
exists and only considers rationalized thought? Are there any connections with a true,
perspective transformation and an individual who is aware and understands how
significant, meaningful learning can occur through the unconscious mind? The
unconscious informs our understanding of resistance in that by becoming aware of what
is behind our emotions allows for a more conscious connection of one’s self and a more
satisfying experience for the individual. It is only after having lived through an emotional
experience and overcoming a particular crisis that a person can attempt to accept and
reflect on the experience and life after the crisis occurs (Malkki, 2012).
How an individual is socialized also plays a role in the person they become and their assumptions and beliefs. In the next section, the role of socialization and learning to overcome resistance to change are discussed under the framework of the classroom experience.

**Socialization**

The social aspect of resistance to change plays an important role in attempting to understand what an individual believes and why they believe a function or role exists (Dent & Goldberg, 1999). Our identity as a teacher or as a student for example, is rooted in societal definitions and helps to serve as our frame of reference and habit of mind. A frame of reference is how an individual views the world. Habits of mind are the assumptions we make to help to make meaning of an experience (Taylor & Cranton, 2012). A teacher may have a frame of reference as teacher as expert and a habit of mind that assumes students will learn from the knowledge they disseminate. Years of socialization to a particular role or function lead to resistance and a fear for loss of identity if these societal frames of reference/habits of mind are challenged (Storrs & Inderbitzin, 2006).

The theme of resistance and learning was the central focus in a study by Storrs & Inderbitzin, (2006) in terms of how individuals are socialized to learn in a simulated learning environment. Even with critical reflection on assumptions and beliefs the study provides evidence that individuals who were brought up in the traditional educational experience of a structured classroom, provided strict rules of conduct, a core curriculum and hierarchical authority, just were not able or willing to consider alternative educational methods. Thus, the context within the educational experience with which an
individual frames their reference is a key aspect of understanding what leads to students’ resistance in the first place. Understanding context is also a criticism of Mezirow’s transformative learning theory as it is not fully considered in what leads to a change in perspective (Clark & Wilson, 1991).

The study conducted by Storrs & Inderbitzin (2006) involved incoming first year students enrolled in a simulated course designed to help students see alternative educational environments and encouraged self-reflection about individual educational freedom. Students were encouraged to “claim your education” as opposed to “receive an education” (p.178). The classroom was divided into two sections: a) “Whyville” which was more learner centered, no one individual was more valuable than another, equality was valued, and fun was encouraged and b) “Omega” a more traditional class with lecture, little interaction and individuals were placed in groups based on intellect. Individuals also were not encouraged to have a voice. The finding from the study was that even though students preferred “Whyville” because of the more personal attention and freedom to learn, they felt as though structure and hierarchy were necessary for effective schooling. They did not think they would go too far in life with the skills learned in “Whyville”. The tie in to context therefore is students’ in American educational settings are engrained to believe that the only meaningful way to learn is in the traditional classroom setting according to the results from this article. Freire, as cited in Storrs & Inderbitzin, (2006), referred to this type of educational experience as the “banking model of education” that “positions students as passive recipients of knowledge” (p.177). Resistance in this analysis can be characterized as individuals not willing to imagine learning taking place outside their accepted world view of the
educational experience. The students who favored the traditional classroom experience are a reflection of years of socialization and alienating schooling experiences. It suggests that more transformative learning experiences are needed as central components in current educational curriculums. The more transformative learning experiences and environments are created that challenge bureaucratic standards, the more students can overcome initial resistance, fear of the unknown and arrive at an altered worldview of learning. Again resistance occurs because of fear of unknown or fear of loss. Students are not willing to participate in an experimental classroom outside what they have been socialized to understand will benefit them due to fear of how it impacts their future abilities, skills and earning potential.

For some tenured business faculty who are so engrained in their own context of the traditional classroom and style of teaching, they are unwilling to put forth the effort into another style of teaching. They are socialized to believe the one approach is the best since this is how they gained success in higher education. Resistance to other mediums of education cannot be easily changed just with critical reflection that is key to a potential perspective transformation. Individuals have to be willing to learn new methods and see how other colleagues approach teaching online to have an impact. Not only to see how other colleagues implement change but see that teaching online is just as powerful a tool to engage learning of their topic as their tried and true methods (Sockman & Sharma, 2008).

Strongly associated with resistance is resilience. Resilience to cope with life’s challenges or a disorienting dilemma is a key phase in the eleven phases of transformative learning (Mezirow, 1994) that an individual experiences before potentially
experiencing a perspective transformation. How resilience and coping strategies impact learning when managing life challenges (Palmer, 1997) is also a relevant topic for this research study.

**Resilience**

While conducting this literature review and looking for key words such as resistance, and reluctance, the term resilience also was a term that became apparent in the search to understand how learning occurs with resistant individuals. It is critical to not only analyze how resistance plays a role in learning and its implications for transformative learning but also what leads to a change in perspective and resiliency in light of deep-seated assumptions and beliefs. Before embarking to explain the findings of the research articles a definition of resilience is appropriate. Resilience is described as “essential threads that enable a person to weave cumulative life experiences into an enduring fabric of self” or “behavior and cognitive competencies and problem solving skills that contribute to self-enhancement” (Palmer, p. 202).

For tenured business faculty who overcame their initial resistance to online education and began the journey to develop and teach courses online what was the process that led them to this point? This question was fundamental to the purpose of this research study, to gain an understanding of the learning process that may occur and what led to a perspective change. Resilience in the face of turmoil or chaos is a necessary means of achievement in life. For transformative learning, resilience is key to establishing the point at which one decides they will either persevere and look to overcome a particular hardship to gain a perspective transformation, choose not to address the concern and avoid a problem altogether or something in between. An
example of literature that can translate to this research study was a qualitative study by Palmer (1997) of resilience in adults who were children of alcoholics (ACOA’s). Understanding what allows some people to overcome a devastating life event or circumstance is the purpose of Palmers’ study of children of alcoholics. A Differential Resiliency Model (DRM), developed by the author, was used as the framework to understand resiliency within this group. The DRM model is premised on the notion of life in continuous motion or change. DRM offers 4 descriptive categories to recognize the degrees of competency in navigating through life changes. These stages include Anomic Survival, Regenerative Resilience, Adaptive Resilience and Flourishing Resilience.

Anomic Survival is characterized as people who live life on the edge or a constant state of chaos. Regenerative Resilience is individuals learn new, more effective ways of dealing with life challenges. Adaptive Resilience individuals have sustained periods of regular use of competencies and coping strategies. Flourishing Resilience is an example of Maslow’s “self-actualized” individual. They are characterized as having extensive coping strategies and a strong self-image (Palmer, 1997). This stage can be compared to that of an individual who has critically reflected on their assumptions and beliefs. The findings from this qualitative study suggest that the model is beneficial in addressing the whole person and offers a nonpathological perspective of the evolving life in process. What was important from this analysis was to examine what common ingredients individuals demonstrated through various dimensions to help them overcome life’s hardships.

This discussion is not attempting to compare the burdens of adults who experienced life with alcoholics to that of tenured business faculty who overcame their
resistance to online education and teaching online. What is pertinent with this discussion is that the whole person needs to be considered when viewing the impact of transformative learning and the occurrence of eleven phases which may lead to a perspective transformation. Institutions of higher learning need to consider the emotional impact on the conscious and unconscious mind when asking individuals to take on new roles and learning experiences after having been so engrained in one educational medium for most of their adult life. It takes a resilient individual willing to undergo many hardships to reach the category of Flourishing Resilience (Palmer, 1997).

As seen from the literature reviewed thus far on resistance and learning to overcome resistance to change, the implications for transformative learning and tenured business faculty has not been thoroughly addressed and is one of the central research questions of this study.

With the analysis of the theoretical framework of transformative learning complete, attention will now be made to providing a brief background of distance education. Additionally, the key findings of the literature review will be analyzed for the topics outlined.

**Distance Education**

Before embarking on the specific findings for each category of the literature review, a general overview of the history of distance education is necessary to provide the background to gain an understanding of the key aspects of learning from a distance and why resistance from faculty occurs in higher education. This analysis will also include a summary of the key points that differentiate distance education versus online education and why this distinction is important to the purpose of this study.
As stated by Eric Gough, “It is the development of distance education as an academic discipline that will have the most profound effect on its practice in the future” (Keegan, 1996, p.3). For many, the topic of distance education conjures up images of the internet and learning taking place at home with a computer and coffee cup and at any time of the day. The topic of distance education, however, is not just a recent phenomenon. The first technology used for distance education was correspondence through the mail in the early 1800’s (Keegan, 1996; Moore & Kearsley, 2012). From a historical perspective, there are considered five generations of distance education. The first generation is described as postal correspondence, second, teaching by means of broadcast radio and television, third, open universities, fourth, teleconference via telephone, satellite, cable, computer networks and fifth, online-internet/web based technology (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). Distance education has been viewed as a means to educate those who were not able to utilize traditional methods of education for longer than a century (Moore & Anderson, 2003). From the early days of postal correspondence, the use of radio and television to deliver educational topics and open universities set up by the British government in the 1960’s utilizing television and radio to open access to higher education for the adult population, distance education has continually evolved over a long period of time (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). Teleconferencing technology for educational purposes began in the 1980’s for group purposes along with audio conferencing and satellite communication which allowed for training for corporations and continuing education for business professionals (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). The fifth generation is when computers and internet technology based classes emerged. In the late 1980’s increasingly more households had a personal computer because of cost barriers
being reduced. The internet first emerged in education in 1980 at Duke University (USENET). City University of New York (CUNY) and Yale University invented what was termed BITNET (Because its time network) as the first major internet dedicated exclusively to education. The World Wide Web then emerged in 1993 with the first web browser termed MOSAIC. This technology opened a new path to learning at a distance (Moore & Kearsley, 2012).

Distance education has been defined as “all arrangements for providing instruction through print or electronic communications media to persons engaged in planned learning in a place or time different from that of the instructor or instructors” (Keegan, 1996, p. 43). Online learning can be defined as education that uses the internet as a means of both learning and teaching (Moore & Kearsley, 2012).

For this research study, the term online education was utilized because this research study was focused on tenured business faculty and teaching online using the internet specifically as opposed to other forms of technology utilized in the educational process. From the literature reviewed (Allen & Seaman, 2015; Keegan, 1996; Moore & Kearsley, 2012; Noreen, Qureshi & Kalsoom, 2012; Verdin & Clark, 1991) the common terms included within the definition of distance education include, teaching and learning, different place and time, separation of teacher and learner and technology. It is not only the separation of teacher and learner but the use of technology, specifically the internet, that is of importance with online education.

Online education, as a result, is revolutionizing higher education for what are considered “nontraditional” (adult learners) students, older than 25, have a full-time job and family responsibilities (Essary, 2014). Nontraditional student enrollment is expected
to increase at a higher rate than traditional enrollment. Between 2007-2018 enrollment is expected to increase 9% for ages 18-24, 25% for ages 25-34, and 12% for ages 34 and older (Essary, 2014). In the 1970’s the American society was changing. A service and information economy replaced the industrial economy and of importance to education, the number of eighteen year olds began to decline. Currently, the number of students graduating from high schools nationwide is projected to increase 5% from 2004-2017 but this is a significant decrease from the 24% growth that occurred in the previous 12 years (Essary, 2014). Colleges were looking for ways to increase enrollment and began recruiting adults (Cyrs, 1997). Education needed to change like the economy, from an industrial model to informational/technology based model. Today, traditional and “adult learner” students demand a choice and flexible schedules when enrolling in online courses (Cyrs, 1997). With the increasing demand from students to meet their educational goals, this places a higher degree of emphasis on higher education to respond in new ways to meet these demands through online education (Moore &Anderson, 2003).

Institutions of higher learning view online education also as a means not only to serve the rising demand from students but also as a means of raising revenue in an increasingly competitive market place (Cahoon, 1998; Moore & Anderson, 2003). With this background, a review of the literature surrounding current trends with online education will be conducted.

**Current Trends with Online Education**

In review of the 12th annual report documenting online education in the United States administered by the Babson Survey Research Group (Allen & Seaman, 2015) using survey data from more than 2800 colleges and universities as well as Integrated
Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), several categories involving online education were analyzed. The key themes among the data analyzed for purposes of this literature review are if online learning is strategic for institutions of higher learning and the current level of faculty acceptance of online education. From a strategic standpoint for the institutions surveyed, 70.8% of the academic leaders reported that online learning is critical to their institution’s long-term strategy. This compares to only 48.8% in 2002. The increase stems from for-profit institutions reporting a higher rate than public institutions (Allen & Seaman, 2015). With the decline in public two year college enrollment and subsequent enrollment increases with for-profit universities the question is what is accounting for the difference in enrollment? For-profit universities are able to overcome bad press about high student debt and few professional prospects for jobs after graduation because they are more adept at advertising and promoting earning potential for sub-baccalaureate degrees and they have developed good counseling departments to help students not only with academic goals but also economic and social concerns (US News & World Report, 2015). This information is relevant to this study because it demonstrates partially why online learning with for-profit institutions is growing in popularity with students. It is also important because it exhibits why other institutions of higher education must continue to address online education to stay current with their competition and have experienced well trained faculty to deliver coursework online.

As indicated previously, for-profit institutions in 2014 reported higher rates that online education is critical to an institutions’ long term strategy. Private non-profits have had an increase in the number of academic leaders who view online learning as critical to their long term strategy however, they still lag public institutions (Allen & Seaman,
A gap is indicated though with the institutions that state online education is critical their long term strategy and those who have actually included online education within their strategic plan. For example, with public institutions, 72.9% indicate online education is critical to their strategy but only 42.4% indicate it is in their plan. For private, not-for profit institutions, 63.5% indicate online education is critical to their long term strategy yet only 40.9% report online education is in their institution’s plan (Allen & Seaman, 2015).

The characteristics of for-profit institutions are that they offer vocational, career, and technical studies or are considered as offering educational opportunities both on campus and online for students. Examples of such universities include the University of Phoenix, Capella, Devry University, Strayer University, Walden University and Argosy University to name a few (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). Moore & Kearsley provided the best explanation of the characteristics of for-profit universities. These are that these institutions are all large and can take advantage of economies of scale in providing students with cost effective services, course material and technical support. From the standpoint of curriculum, most of the for-profit institutions compete for a portion of the high demand courses such as business management, technology applications and certain health sciences which are considered subjects in high demand from a large number of students in well-paid employment. This is considered the “low hanging fruit” from a curriculum stand point (p.47). This topic of why student demand is high for online coursework will be discussed later in the literature review but this is a typical reason for why institutions of higher learning are cultivating curriculum online around business courses.
As continuous learning for adults is becoming an essential element as jobs change, career tracks are eliminated and new ones develop, access to education from any location, at any time for any age is critical for the success of a nation (Moore & Anderson, 2003). Reductions in public subsidies for higher education are forcing even traditional campus-based universities to find new ways of generating revenue. This coupled with adults’ expectation that institutions of higher learning be responsive to their needs for convenient, easily accessed and independent of fixed times and locations (Moore & Anderson, 2003) has stimulated the growth of online education.

While the number of students taking online courses has grown in the millions over the past decade, one of the main concerns has been with the fact that faculty continue to not accept the value and legitimacy of online education (Allen & Seaman, 2015). As stated in the introduction, faculty acceptance of online education is minimal. From a survey done by the Babson Survey Research Group in 2014, the rate of acceptance with online education declined even further. Only, 28% of academic leaders say that their faculty accept the value and legitimacy of online education. This rate is substantially the same as what was recorded in 2003 and is down from an all-time high which was reported in 2007 of 33.5% (Allen & Seaman, 2015). As indicated in Chapter 1, faculty resistance centered around concerns with a lack of experience to the educational format, the additional amount of time and effort and concerns with the quality of education. The findings from the literature reviewed (Allen & Seaman 2015; Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012; Ross & Klug, 1999) indicate though that the more intensive the online presence is at an institution, the more likely faculty are to accept it. The reason for this is not entirely clear though. This is the purpose of this research study.
To attempt to conduct an analysis of the most resistant group—tenured faculty, specifically in business, and gain an understanding of what led to a change in perspective with online education and how it altered their teaching practices in their face-to-face practice. Through this research, it is intended to benefit adult education by addressing the concerns of faculty with online education and thereby enable students to realize their educational goals in this medium. Gaining a more thorough understanding of the specific barriers and acceptance factors by faculty to online education is imperative to this study. Details on what the literature indicates as the reasons for these resistance factors are an important part of understanding faculty perceptions regarding online education.

**Faculty Resistance with Online Education**

An analysis of faculty resistance factors was conducted to gain a more complete understanding of the details behind what causes faculty to resist online education. The analysis included a review of thirteen research articles, five qualitative and six quantitative studies, one mixed methods study and one conceptual analysis. These studies were conducted at public institutions of higher learning across the United States (Allen & Seaman, 2015; Bailey & Flegle, 2012; Battin, 2015; Herman, 2013; Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012; Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012; Major, 2010; Mandernach, Mason, Forrest & Hackthorn, 2012; Seaman, 2009; Stewart, Bachman & Johnson, 2010; Sword, 2012; Tanner, Noser and Totaro, 2009) and Turkey (Sancar & Sancar, 2012).

Before embarking on the specific resistance factors, a definition of what resistance means is appropriate. While no clear, concise definition was clearly outlined in the literature analyzed, the main consensus gathered from the research was resistance
from faculty means that faculty are not convinced of the worth of online education as an educational medium (Allen & Seaman, 2015). Because there is a pervasive view that online education requires a considerable amount of time and effort to teach and to develop as well as concerns with quality of education, faculty are not as willing to get involved without more experience or understanding of how it benefits student learning and how they benefit in their individual careers (Seaman, 2009). With this background, a review of the findings from the literature on faculty resistance is offered.

Faculty concerns with online education are a significant barrier to the adoption of online education as a viable educational medium (Major, 2010). The common themes raised regarding general faculty resistance to online education surround experience, time, and quality of education. These themes will be described in greater depth beginning with experience. For faculty, taking the first step to gain experience to teach online is inhibited by concerns raised regarding a fear of losing identity as a teacher, restructuring relationships with students and increased structure requirements, (Major, 2010). These three concerns require further analysis.

**Losing Identity and Restructuring Relationships**

Faculty who are engrained in the traditional classroom lecture style and view themselves, for example, as a content expert may lose a sense of their personal identity when teaching online. The findings regarding losing identity as a teacher when online indicate that faculty changed their public presentation style and often were more reserved online (Major, 2010). The loss of familiar ways of teaching keep experienced faculty from pursuing online education. For example, in a study of nurse educators transitioning to online teaching, one faculty member said “I prefer the classroom. I love to lecture. I
am a ham and like to tell jokes. You really can’t do that so much online” (Sword, 2012, p. 269).

Similarly related is the restructuring relationships with students was also expressed as a concern inhibiting gaining experience teaching online. Some faculty expressed concerns about losing relationships with students because they could not physically interact. Gaining an understanding of visual cues such as body language, facial expressions, voice qualities were missed when teaching online. Faculty cannot rely on sensory and expressive skills to establish and maintain relationships with students (Major, 2010). Because faculty are unfamiliar with teaching online and lack information in some cases to get started, they are naturally hesitant. A shift in roles is also expressed in the literature as a concern from faculty. Online, the instructor is seen more as a facilitator, to keep the discussion moving along and raising questions. Faculty are also seen as having more reservations about gaining experience teaching online because of the permanence of the written word. A feeling of additional scrutiny and accountability for their responses is indicated by faculty (Major, 2010).

**Increased Structure**

Another inhibitor to faculty gaining experience teaching online is faculty feels as if there is a need for increased structure when teaching online. The common sentiment raised is faculty felt a need for additional planning and outlining the course from start to finish. A loss of spontaneity was described. Faculty felt as though the technology was restrictive and prohibited them from approaching teaching in the ways they were previously comfortable with (Major, 2010). Other concerns noted with increased structure was displeasure expressed over not engaging creative lecturing, dynamic group
work, imaginative activities and tailoring teaching based on visual clues from students (Sword, 2012). What is interesting is that in one of the few research articles which included business faculty perspectives, of their many concerns, a lack of structured classrooms was included as a shortcoming for online education (Tanner, Noser & Totaro, 2009). The reason for concern centered on faculty concerns with meeting students outside of the classroom as opposed to the planning and design of the course from start to finish. Tanner, Noser and Totaro also was cited by Mandernach, Mason, Forrest & Hackthorn, 2012, as reference for explanations for faculty resistance and in addition to a lack of structured classrooms it indicates business faculty were much less favorable toward online education than students were. Other notable resistance factors from this analysis included resistance stemming from lack of interaction, fear that students teach themselves the material which would lead to instructors becoming obsolete and difficulty in administering exams.

Even with the concerns noted by faculty with teaching online and increased structure, students are increasingly enrolling in educational courses online because they have more autonomy in their ability to be in control of their own learning. Due to the asynchronous nature of the coursework, online educational programs offer varying degrees of autonomy for learners. The attraction to online education from students, to be in control of their own learning, while faculty still wish to control learners is a dichotomy with online education. Faculty who want to continue to control their student’s learning and at the same time students wish to be self-directed and control their own learning process (Moore & Kearsley, 2012).
For the next resistance factor, faculty have concerns about what their role will ultimately be when leading an online class and how this will impact their workload. Will they, for example, facilitate a class only, be responsible for design, handle technology questions, create content? These concerns are summarized under the barrier of time.

**Time**

For faculty concerns regarding assuming additional responsibilities with an online class, this falls under the second theme of time. By assuming additional responsibilities, this will equate to additional time spent with an online class that may not have been required under the traditional approach to teaching. The resistance factor of time was prevalent in several studies analyzed under this topic (Herman, 2013; Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012; Seaman, 2009; Stewart, Bachman & Johnson, 2010; Sword, 2012; Tanner, Noser & Totaro, 2009). In some cases, faculty were not clear on what additional tasks they would be responsible for. Are they a teacher or an instructional design developer, for example? Taking time to manage student’s technological problems, accessing sites and dealing with student computer literacy concerns diminished the willingness of faculty to teach online in some instances. Work is no longer tied to a certain place and time. Students expect faculty to be online and accessible 24/7. The most frequently cited issue in the literature with additional time was responding with students through emails and postings. Faculty also felt as though if they were in a classroom with students they could respond to student questions immediately instead of taking the extra time to write responses (Major, 2010). As tenured decision making authorities do not value distance education or the time to develop an online course, faculty are not willing to spend extra
hours working in an online environment when there is not an expected reward (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012).

**Quality of Education**

The third major theme regarding resistance to online education is quality of education. From the most recent survey done by the Babson Survey Research Group in 2014 it is apparent that for the significant growth and demand for online courses from students and institutions offering online degrees, there are still many that question the quality of these offerings. As there is no agreed upon measure of education quality for online or face-to-face education, the report done by the Babson Survey Research Group, surveyed academic leaders for their perspective. The percent of academic leaders in 2003 who rated learning outcomes in online education as the same or superior to those in face-to-face was 57.2%. This figure rose to 77.2% in 2012 and is reported at 74.1% in 2014. As indicated previously, faculty with experience in online education respond favorably to the educational format and those without experience respond less favorably. Interestingly a similar response occurs with academic leaders regarding their opinion of learning outcomes for online education. Chief academic officers at institutions without distance education courses are more than twice as likely as institutions with distance education courses to indicate online learning outcomes are inferior or somewhat inferior to comparable face-to-face courses (Allen & Seaman, 2015; Tanner, Noser & Totaro, 2009). Even with these varying perceptions from academic leaders regarding learning outcomes and the difficulty in truly measuring learning outcomes, faculty perceptions of online education significantly impact the viability of coursework offered by institutions of higher learning. Faculty can play a major part in the successful implementation of an
online course or degree program. If a negative attitude continues to prevail, these faculty will not be as likely to consider online courses as satisfactory pre-requisites for example, in their own advanced coursework and limit student educational opportunities (Mandernach et.al., 2012).

From a hiring manager perspective regarding online degrees, a research study (Bailey & Flegle, 2012) on the value of an online MBA program from a hiring managers’ perspective helps to provide clarity. In this analysis, the common factors contributing to a lower perception of an online degree indicate a perception that those students who completed their MBA in a traditional setting were more serious about their degrees and felt students could buy a degree in the for-profit (online) environment. The MBA gained in the traditional classroom environment is viewed as more valuable because of robust interaction in the classroom.

The commodification of learning in business schools and making institutions of higher education venues for corporatism is an increasing concern expressed regarding the quality of education received online (Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012). As universities continue to struggle with decreasing budgets, finding sources of revenue contributes to the commodification of education. One way universities raise revenue is through the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) by “standardizing and packaging knowledge and make it available online” (Sancar & Sancar, 2012, p.249). The problem is that there is no distinction between knowledge and information (Battin, 2015). Both student and teachers become consumers under the power of corporations to influence educational programs in the United States. This makes the relationship between student and teacher less significant to learning and promotes
superficial learning due to a lack of thoughtful insight as education is delivered more in a mechanical method. “Universities become business and knowledge as instructional material is viewed as the commodity” (Sancar & Sancar, 2012, p. 249). The concern with these viewpoints is that they are biased against online education as an educational format and the studies reviewed utilized very small sample sizes. The sample, for example in the Sancar & Sancar research was based on four participants who were being subject to pressure to attract and recruit students in an attempt to gain additional revenue by offering courses online. A blanket statement that online education results in commodification of learning based on findings from participants under pressure to conform to an educational format from their institution cannot be considered all encompassing.

With the apparent bias against degrees earned online from faculty and hiring managers, gaining an understanding of what the acceptance factors to online education as found in the literature is therefore a necessary point of evaluation and will be analyzed further at this point in the literature review.

**Faculty Acceptance of Online Education**

The advantages to students with online learning are many. Increased flexibility and convenience with schedule since formal classes are not typically required, access to information online is plentiful, wide array of course offerings are just a few of the cited benefits (Cahoon, 1998; Hartz, 2012; Major, 2010; Verdin & Clark, 1991). As stated by one faculty member who changed their mind about teaching online “Do I like online courses? It doesn’t matter. The students like them and we have to adjust to their demands” (Hartz, 2012, p.3). For some faculty this is a foreign concept as evidenced by
the statistics regarding faculty resistance to online education. For others, however, online education is viewed as a new means to enhance their individual skills and knowledge. In the study conducted by Major (2012), faculty experienced professional rejuvenation from teaching online. Initial trepidation was experienced by some faculty who participated in the interviews about venturing online and teaching students but eventually engaged with the technology and overcame their fear. Faculty in the study described a new appreciation for teaching and formulated new ideas and skill sets. The view is that of a new frontier to be tackled and successfully implemented.

A study on predictors of faculty acceptance of online education (Stewart, Bachman & Johnson, 2010) was conducted on 125 faculty and administrators at an open enrollment public university who completed an online survey examining acceptance of online course and degree programs. The findings from this analysis concluded that faculty members who were motivated to teach traditional courses were interested in teaching online only if they believed online education was easy and necessary support from their institution was provided to assist them in how to teach online.

In another study analyzing faculty associated with both a college of business and college of education from a large regional university was undertaken to gain their perceptions of online education (Gibson, Harris & Colaric, 2008). A PhD, EdD, MD, or other terminal degree was held by 77% of the respondents. Approximately 28% reported teaching undergraduate courses online, 49% teaching graduate courses online and 19% of the respondents were full professors. The results of the study indicated that the perceived usefulness of online education is a strong indicator of faculty acceptance. Perceived usefulness is defined as the extent to which a person believes that using a particular
technology will enhance his or her job performance. As this analysis is outdated and only partially addresses business faculty who are tenured, further research on tenured business faculty and what led to a perspective change after initially resisting online education is warranted to be undertaken to fully understand the problem. Engaging tenured business faculty to teach online, what leads to a perspective change and how teaching practices are altered in the traditional classroom is the central research problem and purpose of this study.

Even with some of the initial findings indicating that faculty resist online education because they miss the face-to-face interaction, visual cues, and feel they do not have the same relationship with students, other faculty report much different perspectives. Faculty in some instances indicate that they actually have increased closeness with students due to discussions online and through email. Gaining an increased knowledge of students at an intellectual level replaced visual cues and physical presence (Major 2010).

In addition to gaining an understanding of interaction methods with students online, the question that arises is how teaching practices are altered when faculty accepted teaching online and what insights does teaching online have on the traditional classroom environment? For example, in a qualitative study which analyzed the experiences of online facilitators teaching asynchronous and synchronous interprofessional education (IPE) of pre-licensure students, semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with 19 online facilitators. 90% were female, 31-50 years of age. They had previous experience in face-to-face teaching practices and either 1-2 years of experience in online IPE facilitation. The major finding from this analysis was that
facilitators valued the asynchronous nature of class as it could fit around their schedule. “They enjoyed the added flexibility and the opportunities to develop their skills as facilitators” (Evans, Knight, Sonderund & Tooley, 2014, p.1053). However, how teaching practices were impacted in the face-to-face environment was not evaluated. Online and face-to-face pedagogy may vary amongst institutional disciplines. An in-depth review of the various pedagogical practices in these educational formats is necessary to understand how faculty do or do not alter their practice.

**Online vs. Face-To-Face Teaching Practices**

Malcolm Knowles (1970) constructed a framework to address instructional methods that are effective with adults (andragogy). These methods utilized are consistent with the characteristics of adult learners who are considered to be self-directed, mature, have a vast amount of personal experience and seek learning experiences related to real life circumstances. Adults are also motivated by intrinsic rather than extrinsic promises or rewards (Gonzalez, 2010). Knowles main emphasis was to employ instructional techniques that worked with adults rather than using techniques that treated adults like children. The key elements of andragogy include, creating an environment conducive to communicating, creating a climate based on mutual respect, involve students in the planning process of the course, and both teacher and learner share responsibility for learning objectives (Gonzalez, 2010). To the extent these conditions exist in the classroom are determined largely by the degree to which the instructor fosters critical consciousness raising through reflection and discourse (Taylor & Cranton, 2012).

Engagement in dialogue with the self and others is one of the core elements of a transformative approach to teaching. Dialogue is the essential medium through
which transformation is promoted and developed. Dialogue becomes the medium for critical reflection to be put into action, where experience is reflected on, assumptions and beliefs are questioned, and habits of mind are ultimately transformed. (p.355)

With this background of key instructional methods for adults described, the findings from the literature reviewed on online and face-to-face teaching practices is necessary to enhance understanding of these concepts.

A review of online and face-to-face teaching practices was conducted to explore what is known about how teaching online impacted instructors approach to teaching in face-to-face environments. Ten research articles were analyzed (Chapman & Henderson, 2010; Cole, Shelley & Swartz, 2014; Cummings, Foels & Chaffin, 2013; Delotell, Millam & Reinhardt, 2010; Glynn Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012; Gonzalez, 2010; Jain, Jain & Jain, 2011; Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012; Saltmarsh, Sutherland-Smith, 2010; VandeBunt-Kokhuis & Weir, 2013). Three mixed method studies, two qualitative studies, two quantitative studies and lastly three conceptual pieces. The key findings from the literature reviewed for online and face-to face teaching practices are very consistent in the themes they address. First, for online teaching practices, the common themes for best practices to teaching online include, the instructor as a facilitator or steward of the class (Delotell, Millam & Reinhardt, 2010; Gonzalez, 2010; VandeBunt-Kokhuis & Weir, 2013). Faculty must gain support and training to teach online from their institution (Chapman & Henderson, 2010; Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012; Glynn Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012). The key to a successful teaching experience online includes the instructor being

Dangers of distance education were also described in the literature as promoting techno teaching and teachers becoming obsolete (Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012; Vandebunt-Kokhuis, & Weir, 2013).

Second, from a face-to-face teaching practices standpoint, the common theme addressed in the literature is sound pedagogical practices drive academic success whether done in a face-to-face course or online (Cummings, Foels & Chaffin, 2013; Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012; Jain, Jain & Jain, 2011; Saltmarsh, Sutherland-Smith, 2010). Additionally, another theme for face-to-face teaching is the process of moving from the face-to-face classroom to online. Research has shown it to be challenging, creating tension for instructors, and potentially provoking reflection on assumptions and beliefs about teaching (Saltmarsh, Sutherland-Smith, 2010).

With the background provided for online and face-to-face teaching practices completed, discussion of the themes identified for best practices with online education is offered.

**Instructor as Facilitator or Steward**

The instructor in an online environment is viewed as more of a facilitator of the course or a guide working with students to build knowledge and gain collaboration (Gonzalez, 2010). Instructors who bring real-world experience and have a consistent approach to learning, encourage students to expand on their discussion posts, interacts frequently during the course without monopolizing the discussion allows for a more
engaged student (Delotell, Millam & Reinhardt, 2010). The more instructors can facilitate learning online and have students interact by providing deep explanations for what they believe, was the purpose of research done by Delotell et al.,(2010) involving studies of online business courses which analyzed the impact the concept of deep learning has on student retention. Deep learning occurs when “students are able to connect with course topics, find value in them, and see how to apply them to real-world situations” (Delotell, et al., 2010, p. 49). A facilitator of an online course utilizes deep learning concepts that are more learner-centered and encourages students to use higher order thinking skills. These skills are promoted by the facilitator through collaborative problem solving, setting clear expectations including examples of prior work that was successful, offer positive reinforcement as well as real-world examples (Delotell, et al., 2010). The ultimate goal of the concept of deep learning is to drive a deeper learning process that will ultimately improve student retention. For example, statistics offered in this analysis indicate that online course retention ranges from 50-80% while in traditional courses at universities range from 80-90% (Delotell et al., 2010). What was not considered and is also important to consider with retention is the type of student and to what degree outside influences have on their lives. Working adults participating in online courses who work full-time, have a family, and juggle many issues a traditional student attending a traditional college or university may not have to negotiate, is a factor that should also be contemplated with retention.

The concept of stewardship by the instructor in an online environment was also the focal point in research done to highlight how future teaching in business schools will take place in an online classroom (Vandebunt-Kokhuis & Wier, 2013). To better serve e-
learners it is suggested that instructors adopt a stewardship role and nurture talent and develop the student. The business school instructor should increasingly facilitate and coach students online to enhance the learning experience. While this analysis was conceptual and explored the assumption that all e-learning is taking place without instructor involvement in the future, seems to be an exaggeration. The research does point to the need for the instructor to engage students through coaching, mentoring, including a stewardship role as a common theme regarding online education.

The second theme identified from the literature with online teaching practices is they must be provided with proper techniques and training from their institution.

**Institutional Support for Faculty Online**

Many college faculty have had very little training in online instruction and as a result are not as likely to participate in teaching online due to a perception that coursework is unsettled and requires considerable effort (Glynn Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012). With the growing popularity of online education, educators must ensure that students receive quality instruction for successful learning to occur (Chapman & Henderson, 2010, Kress, et al., 2012). Online instructors also need support beyond instruction in terms of gaining familiarity with the use of technology in the course itself as well as requiring assistance to keep up with the teaching load due to the extra time involved in teaching online (Glynn Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012).

In a study of business teacher educators that examined the extent to which quality measures or benchmarks are present in online business education courses, faculty support by the institution of higher education is one of the key components to establishing quality online educational coursework (Chapman & Henderson, 2010). This analysis included
the self-reported perceptions of business teacher educators and distance learning coordinators from the National Association for Business Teacher Education (NABTE). Respondents to the survey included 16 of 62 distance learning coordinators and 33 of 64 business teacher educators all from institutions of higher education in the United States and Canada that offer business education online courses. The majority of the respondents included adjunct faculty from non-research institutions and had taught online from 1-10 years. The findings from this analysis of business teacher educators and distance learning coordinators confirms that one of the key aspects of successful quality assurance benchmarks in online courses includes institutional support for its faculty. This is important for administrators to understand how critical the institutions support of faculty is to the overall success of their online curriculum. What was not determined from this analysis, however, is what specific support is required to assist faculty in their efforts to teach online. As the majority of faculty were adjunct that responded to the survey, their needs may be different than full-time faculty who have more time and resources to devote to learning technology or monitoring other colleague’s professional techniques while teaching online. From a quality standpoint, the National Education Association (NEA) has developed a guide designed to provide an overview of the development of an effective online education system. In order for all faculty to gain the necessary skills to effectively teach online, institutions need to consider adopting these guidelines to assist all faculty members who endeavor to teach online and do so effectively (Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012).

The key to a successful teaching experience not only includes the institution providing support for its instructors but the third theme identified from the literature with
online teaching practices is online educators must also be interactive, maintain presence, be timely and also be accessible. These concepts will be explored in greater depth.

**Key Online Education Practices**

As reported throughout the literature reviewed on best online educational practices, the common themes of teacher interaction, having a presence in the course and being timely/accessible were all practices reported as critical attributes of effective educational practices of instructors in online courses (Chapman & Henderson, 2010; Cole, Shelley & Swartz, 2014; Cummings, Foels & Chaffin, 2013; Delotell, Millam & Reinhardt, 2010; Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012). As some faculty find it difficult to be placed in the role of learner again to master online teaching and having to endure many mistakes, it may be tempting for instructors to dismiss online education and the technology that supports the educational format. Faculty also dismiss the efforts of other teachers who embrace online education and find the format just as useful as traditional coursework (Kress, et al., 2012). When analyzing what students believe are important for effective online teaching practices it becomes apparent that students desire instructors who actively participate in discussion boards, answer student questions, and guide students with probing questions throughout the course. This is certainly a quality that should transcend all educational formats regardless of an instructor’s relative inexperience with technology but is extremely important in an online environment in order to keep students actively participating in the course. The issue of satisfaction with online instructions was examined through a mixed-methods study of business students, both graduate and undergraduate at a university in southwest Pennsylvania. The finding from this analysis was building a sense of community in the
online environment through interaction led to more engaged students and allowed for the instructor to be considered present and accessible (Cole et al., 2014). Students from this same study also indicated that a lack of interaction and timeliness with response to questions or assignments were the main reasons cited for dissatisfaction with online instruction. The more interaction demonstrated by the instructor to engage students and establish a sense of presence is even more important online due to the lack of face-to-face contact. A lack of presence of the instructor online or a lack of timeliness in response to students online (Cummings, et al., 2013) can lead to the impression that the students are teaching themselves the material was another theme found in the literature regarding online teaching. The dangers of distance education was the last theme identified from the literature on online teaching practices. This topic is described in the literature as promoting technocratic teaching and teachers becoming obsolete (Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleeton, 2012; Vandeput-Kokhuis & Wier, 2013). The critics of online education indicate the dangers of the educational medium as promoting technocratic teaching, meaning online education is a venue for capitalism, an increased commercialization in higher education. (Kress et al., 2012). Additionally, the teacher is considered to be replaced in some instances in the online classroom through electronic means such as video, TV, CD’s and the iPAD. These electronic devices provide for flexible e-learning and create 24/7 connectivity in business schools which makes the learning process more learner-centered (Vandeput-Kokhuis & Wier, 2013).

The perception of online education as commodity promoting superficial learning is one of the factors that contribute to resistance from faculty regarding concern over the quality with the educational medium. The more educators embrace best practices and
overcome the perceived barriers to teaching online, the more students will gain an education that can be considered just as rigorous as a degree earned in the traditional manner. The key questions institutions of higher learning should consider before embarking on delivering courses online include, “why is this educational format necessary? What are the problems that are meant to be solved through online education? What services will be required to effectively train faculty to teach online and what new problems may arise by using online education with current faculty” (Kress et al., 2012 p. 75)? After considering these questions thoughtfully, institutions of higher learning will be better positioned to effectively deliver online coursework for their students and provide faculty with the skills necessary to be successful teaching online.

Thus far, best practices to teaching have centered around online education. The question guiding this section however, is to determine what is known about how teaching online impacted instructors approach to teaching in face-to-face environments. A review of the literature from a face-to-face perspective is now necessary.

**Face-to-Face Teaching Practices**

Concerning the literature regarding face-to-face teaching practices, the review was selective, reviewing only research that addressed face-to-face and online teaching practices. The intent was to determine what the literature said about changes in face-to-face teaching practices occurred due to experiences teaching online. The common themes that emanated however, was first, sound pedagogical practices drive academic success whether done in a face-to-face course or online and second, a move from the face-to-face classroom to online is challenging, can create tension for instructors, and cause a reflection on assumptions and beliefs about teaching (Cummings, Foels & Chaffin, 2013;
Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang & Cleton, 2012; Jain, Jain & Jain, 2011; Saltmarsh, Sutherland-Smith, 2010).

To demonstrate the theme that sound pedagogical practices drive academic success regardless of the classroom environment was exemplified in a study conducted by researchers at the Rocky Mountain University (Jain, Jain & Jain, 2011) whose purpose was to analyze the design and development of online instruction by reviewing 19 total courses which included business courses. The main finding from this analysis was again that interaction with faculty and other students is an essential characteristic as well as providing feedback to students in a timely manner. This analysis also indicates both the learning environment of a face-to-face course as well as online courses are “considered to be equally as effective” (p. 539). What was missing from this analysis though is what teaching practices performed in the face-to-face environment are considered to be as effective and how did teaching online impact the approach to teaching in the traditional classroom environment.

In a mixed method analysis comparing distance education and classroom based formats for a clinical social work practice course (Cummings et al., 2013) similar findings were reported to the analysis conducted by Jain, et al., (2011). The purpose of this analysis was to examine the usefulness of distance education for teaching clinical coursework by comparing outcomes of students who participated in distance education sections of a graduate social work practice with students in the face-to-face section of the same course. This analysis was completed in response to concern over teaching group therapy online and face-to-face. The use of video tutorials was used to teach the online group to mimic in-person class work. The findings from surveys of students both online
and face-to-face revealed comparable overall satisfaction with instruction and no significant difference in learning outcomes. The analysis conducted with clinical work is still inconclusive regarding effective teaching practices online versus face-to-face when providing instruction for more comprehensive clinical knowledge and skill which requires more in-person training. This same study noted, however, that through technology such as Web Ex (web and video conferencing), audio and visual interaction is possible and can replicate the face-to-face training offered when teaching clinical skills. This analysis, however, also did not address how face-to-face teaching practices may have been altered after teaching online courses.

The findings from the literature reviewed indicate effective teaching practices drive academic success whether it is online or the traditional class environment. From the literature reviewed, it takes a lot of effort and personal sacrifice for teachers to adapt to new technologies and online teaching methods which can be very different than their face-to-face experience (Kress, et al., 2012). While it is true that sound practices for teaching will lead to positive outcomes for student academic success, the question remains though what practices are sound online versus face-to-face? As discussed previously, much of the literature speaks to transitioning from face-to-face to online and lists some specific practices to replicate in-class presence but no research was found about specific changes that occurred with face-to-face teaching after teaching online. Resistance to online education from faculty is high. Could the potential exist that with the resistance to understanding the art of teaching online lead to blanket statements from inexperienced faculty without proper training from their institution? For example, what works in the face-to-face classroom will transfer online and therefore teaching online has
no impact on face-to-face teaching practices? If this perception exists among faculty, could this transcend to students that report there is no significant difference in learning outcomes when they are asked to evaluate their experience in the various educational formats?

The second theme that emerged from the literature regarding face-to-face teaching practices is a move from the face-to-face classroom to online is challenging, can create tension for instructors, and cause a reflection on assumptions and beliefs about teaching (Saltmarsh, Sutherland-Smith, 2010). The more the demand for online education from students grows, the more faculty will need to alter their long held assumptions about how teaching and learning occur. For example, in a study of teacher education faculties in five Australian universities reviewed the various ways that a transition from face-to-face to online teaching impacted their existing attitudes about online learning and teaching (Saltmarsh, Sutherland-Smith, 2010). For those educators in the study who already had considerable experience in online education, they saw themselves as innovators and collaborators. The educators saw their job as an educator online as promoting stimulating or controversial topics for discussion. These educators indicated they set up their face-to-face course in a similar manner but there was not an indication of how this occurs or if the online course altered the educators’ view of how to approach their face-to-face course.

Many of the teacher educators in the study also felt as though online learning should replicate the face-to-face classroom. This indicates that there is still a high level of resistance to online education from the participants of the study. From the study, it is indicated a number of the participants transitioning to an online course are new and this
poses considerable challenges to strongly held views and practices. In one example an educator inexperienced with online education felt online teaching and learning was entirely inappropriate and completely ineffective. Going as far to indicate “how can you possibly teach skills that teachers require without being face-to-face” (p.21). After further consideration, this participant has taken the challenge of mastering the necessary technological skills to make the transition to teaching online. The reason for learning to teach online was because of personal pride. This participant was not going to let “online teaching get the better of her, so I kept at it” (Saltmarsh et al., 2010. p 21).

Even though there was much resistance and tension indicated from the participants of this analysis about online education, many pushed through and gained the necessary skills to teach online. What was not indicated from the study was even though the educators persevered and gained the necessary skills to teach online, did they truly have a change in perspective with the online medium? Also, as these educators engaged in online teaching, did this have an impact on their face-to-face teaching practices? (Saltmarsh et al., 2010).

The analysis of the literature thus far has focused primarily on faculty viewpoint. Gaining an understanding of the student’s perspective as to why they demand online education and why business curriculum is one of the most popular areas of study is also necessary. This perspective is important in order to appreciate why it is critical that faculty be open to the online educational format in order to allow students flexibility and convenience to realize their educational goals.
Student Perspectives with Online Education

As educational institutions continually look to improve enrollment, ensure quality learning opportunities, and increase graduation rates at less cost, online education is seen as a an educational format to resolve these economic and educational goals (Meyer, 2014). As educational institutions are adopting online education course work, students continue to enroll to realize their academic goals. As previously reported, 5.8 million students out of 20.5 million in higher education were taking at least one online course in 2014 (Allen & Seaman, 2016). What are the reasons for the popularity of online educational initiatives especially when faculty are less than enthusiastic about the educational format? This topic will be addressed to provide further enlightenment as to why faculty resistance and later adoption of teaching online is of importance to adult education.

A review of the literature (Bal, Bayar, Anitsal & Anitsal, 2014; Baxter, 2012, Butz, Stupnisky, Peterson, & Majerus, 2014; Carnoy, Rabling, Castanao-Munoz, Montoliu & Sancho-Vinuesa, 2012; Cavico & Mujtaba, 2010; Cole, Shelley, & Swartz, 2014; Fedynich, Bradley, & Bradley, 2015; Horspool, & Lange, 2012; Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang, & Cleeton, 2012; Kim, Lee & Skellenger, 2012; Meyer, 2014). regarding student perspectives with online education and in particular business curriculum was conducted to understand what contributes to the popularity of the educational format. Eleven total research articles were analyzed. One qualitative study, two mixed method studies, five quantitative studies, and lastly three conceptual pieces. Other than the flexibility and convenience the educational format affords, the key findings from the literature reviewed regarding why online education is popular amongst
students are described as follows: Business curriculum is the most popular online degree program, satisfaction and learning correlates online to student engagement and motivation, social interaction is less important to students in the online medium, and learning at a distance can lead to an understanding gap due to the reliance on technology (Butz, Stupnisky, Peterson, & Majerus, 2014; Cole, Shelley, & Swartz, 2014; Fedynich, Bradley, & Bradley, 2015; Horspool, & Lange, 2012; Kress, Thering, Lalonde, Soonhyang, & Cleeton, 2012).

**Business Curriculum**

Business curriculum was reported as the most popular degree program at undergraduate and graduate levels in a study of over 1500 online students (Meyer, 2014). Also, one of the more popular post graduate degrees is the Master of Business Administration degree (MBA). The MBA degree was developed in the United States in 1908 and is considered the “must have” post graduate degree (Bal, Bayar, Anitsal & Anitsal, 2014 p.35). As educational institutions develop online courses, various types of online MBA degree programs have become popular (online, virtual, web, distance). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), more than 156,000 students are graduating from traditional and online MBA programs in the United States. The primary reason for this is that the MBA degree is designed to provide key executive management skills for students. Returns on student investment are reported to be up to 18%, even for graduates from business school programs not reported to be included in the top 10 (Bal, et al., 2014). The demand is high for students with post graduate MBA degrees and the return on the student’s dollar can be lucrative. Institutions of higher learning must be able to engage students with high quality educational initiatives. When
economic conditions are a concern, these schools must make educational opportunities available for students at convenient times and places. The flexibility of a degree program, especially for working adults pursuing a post graduate degree such as an MBA online will be a large selling point to entice students seeking to earn a degree (Cavico & Mujtaba, 2010). For example, in recent surveys of online students in the United States, and Spain indicated students believe their online education was worthwhile financially and as a valuable time investment due to the flexibility with asynchronous study due to the need to manage multiple responsibilities (Carnoy, Rabling, Castanao-Munoz, Montoliu & Sancho-Vinuesa, 2012; Meyer, 2014). The findings from these studies indicated that students expected a return on their education to improve their current job position or to legitimize an already preferred position. Thus, students have an expectation that by receiving an online degree will result in financial benefit as do the institutions offering the educational format.

**Engagement and Motivation**

Another finding from the literature regarding student perspectives with online education is student satisfaction and learning correlates to engagement (participate in class activities) and motivation (Baxter, 2012; Butz, et.al., 2014; Fedynich, et al., 2015; Meyer, 2014). In only one quantitative study analyzing 101 graduates level of satisfaction with distance education versus an on campus visual impairment program at Western Michigan University, did the results show that students reported overall greater satisfaction with on campus programs over distance education in terms of engagement (Kim, Lee & Skellenger, 2012). Much of the literature reviewed above discussing student engagement and motivation online centered around concepts to promote student
satisfaction as opposed to which classroom environment was more conducive to engagement. As more and more students utilize online education to reach their academic goals, it becomes less relevant which format produces the greatest level of satisfaction for students but more appropriately what can be done to enhance the experience for students learning online and what are the specific traits of online learners.

The characteristics of students learning online are they are part-time status with many demands on time from family and work obligations. These characteristics can be significant barriers to learning and retention. Less experienced or successful students may need assistance getting started in an online format. None of these characteristics precludes a successful experience online for the student. However, the more institutions and educators can assist learners to overcome these obstacles through encouragement, early intervention and proactive advising, the more the student increases their chances of a successful experience online (Meyer, 2014). What factors though contribute to student satisfaction and increased engagement or motivation when taking a course online? A quantitative study of 249 graduate students (including Business Administration) at a South Texas University were surveyed to determine what factors in an online course affected overall satisfaction. Of the 249 graduate students surveyed, 38% were age 20-29, 28.5% were age 30-39, 20% were age 40-49 and 11.6% were >50 years of age. The majority of the students surveyed were female (61.5%) and 38.5% were male. The findings from this survey were that the students were generally satisfied with their experiences in online courses. The greatest need identified was related to students having ample opportunities to interact with one another. Of the 249 students surveyed 93% felt students had to be self-motivated to be successful in online programs. Interaction had the
lowest level of student satisfaction in the study (Fedynich et al., 2015). Thus, if interaction or engagement is key to successful experience online for students why was it rated as the lowest level of satisfaction and the students felt that they had to be self-motivated to succeed online? One possible explanation is graduate students have many more conflicting responsibilities than the traditional age student and likely have little time other than class for interaction. It is important to keep in mind that this analysis was of graduate students only from one university. It does, however, raise a key point that if interaction/engagement is considered key to a successful online experience, it is paramount that the instructor engage students. The instructor can have a significant impact on student satisfaction by facilitating various activities to promote interaction of students and being engaged themselves though live chat rooms, threaded discussion board, blogs, and prompt responses to all inquiries (Fedynich et al., 2015).

Social Interaction

In a study that researched social interaction in a synchronous hybrid graduate business program with an on campus counterpart (Butz, et al., 2014) indicated significantly lower levels of social interaction in the online format. The purpose of this quantitative analysis was to determine how online vs. on campus attendance in synchronous hybrid graduate business programs affects the relationships, motivation and perceived success among students. The participants in the study totaled 112 synchronous hybrid MBA and MPA programs at an internationally accredited college of business at a large research university in the Midwestern part of the United States (Butz et al., 2014). The demographics of this analysis included 68 males and 44 females, 76 in the MBA and 36 in the MPA program, 60% were online while 40% were on campus with 59 part-time
and 53 full-time. The age of the participants ranged from 20-59 years of age and the majority were white. The findings from this analysis were that the online learners have fewer opportunities or less desire for social interaction compared with their on-campus counterparts. The reason for this is online graduate business students are returning to school while maintaining work and family obligations and enter the synchronous hybrid learning environment focused on program completion. The students are not seeking social engagement to be successful in an online environment or to assist in keeping them motivated/self-directed. As this analysis again was a sample of graduate students with differing motivation than potentially traditional age students without family and work obligations, results may differ significantly if compared with a traditional college age group exclusively. Also, this analysis was unique in that it was a synchronous hybrid study. There were opportunities for online students to engage with their on-campus counterparts as a group for synchronous instruction. The analysis, however, was not clear on how the online group was determined to be less desiring of social engagement than the on-campus group. While there are fewer opportunities online for social interaction than what students experience in a face-to-face class, the fact that these are graduate students with less time to engage in social activity is the same premise whether an education is pursued in a traditional classroom or online. Students are said to need to be self-directed to stay motivated to learn online (Butz, et al., 2014) but this can be said of students taking courses in the traditional classroom environment when faced with the multitude of life commitments, for example.
Understanding Gap

The more support a student receives from all sources including other students, the instructor or the institution, the more chance of success the individual has to earn their degree. The gap in understanding with online learning versus traditional educational formats is not that the students either do or do not desire social interaction based on their life status, it is that online education is different from traditional class environments because of transactional distance. Transactional distance theory emphasizes not only the geographical distance between instructor and learner but also the psychological distance as well (Meyer, 2014). Initially, with transactional distance, a psychological and communication gap was said to occur with potential misunderstandings between the instructor and learner when teaching online. Learning at a distance was thought to contribute to feelings of isolation and disconnectedness that may reduce student motivation and engagement. Today, with improvements in technology to connect students and instructor as well as classmates, the gap is said to occur only in understanding due to reliance on technology rather than being physically in class to participate and ask for immediate assistance when a topic is unclear or difficult (Meyer, 2014). This gap in understanding can be improved through instructional methods that keep the student engaged in dialogue both visually and in text. This understanding gap, however, may not totally be able to be overcome when reliant on technology to connect student and instructor. The more the instructor can do to stay engaged with students online, the institution supports the student in use of technology and in design of the online course, this gap should become lessened over time (Meyer, 2014).
Student’s perspective with online education centers around the flexibility and convenience the educational medium affords. Additionally though, students are enrolling at high levels in online coursework with the business curriculum being one of the more popular online degree programs (Meyer, 2014). Students report increased satisfaction and learning online when they participate actively with other students as well as the instructor which increases individual engagement and motivation. Interestingly, social interaction is less important to students in the online medium which is explained by the students’ busy life and family obligations that do not allow for time other than what is required for school assignments. The less interest in social interaction is also explained in part due to the lack of face-to-face contact and can lead to an understanding gap that is created while learning at a distance due to the reliance on technology (Butz et al., 2014).

With a review of this critical literature complete, a discussion of the implications for research and practice under adult education is now appropriate.

**Implications for Research and Practice**

This critical literature review of educators in technology does highlight the need for institutions of higher learning to address the concern of faculty resistance to online education and the negative view of the quality of the educational format. The studies reviewed clearly indicated there is increasing demand for online education from the students perspective but what is missing are studies addressing the factors that led faculty to a change in perspective with teaching online and how have they altered their face-to-face teaching practices. Many of the studies included both undergraduate and graduate surveys and how faculty have altered their approach online after they have started teaching in this educational format. There is a lack of critical analysis of what factors led
faculty to engage in online instruction after having experienced the several resistance factors outlined in this review or altered their face-to-face teaching practices. A review of graduate level faculty, specifically tenured business faculty is the focus of this research. Tenured business faculty is the focus because they are the most resistant group to online education. Because of their status, they are not “forced” to teach online in many instances, so if they choose to teach online, what led to this change in perspective?

Because of the high demand for the “low hanging fruit” from student enrollment in business courses online, institutions of higher learning are developing online coursework to realize their business goals including the need for increased revenue. This raises the question of whose needs are the institutions serving? The students, who should be the primary focus, or their own? The commodification of education is in full force with online education. When studies ask if online education is strategic for institutions, they readily confirm that they are and it has to do with the increased revenue (capitalism) and low overhead associated with offering online course work. Is this in the best interest of students? What learning is actually occurring? Study after study reviewed indicates there are no significant differences in learning outcomes between online and face-to-face educational environments. “The mistake that a number of prior research studies have made is to declare that online education and classroom instruction are equal without examining the variability surrounding their differences” (Bernard, Abrami, Lou, Borokhovski, Wade, Wozney, Wallet, Fiset & Huang, 2004, p. 406). Chief Academic Officers at institutions without distance education courses, for example, are more than twice as likely as institutions with distance education courses to indicate online learning outcomes are inferior or somewhat inferior to comparable face-to-face courses (Allen &
Seaman, 2015; Tanner, Noser & Totaro, 2009). This does not necessarily mean that online education should not continue. As with anything worthwhile it requires hard work to overcome obstacles and achieve lasting success. Even with these varying perceptions from academic leaders regarding learning outcomes and the difficulty in truly measuring learning outcomes, it is very important that institutions and adult education also comprehend that faculty perceptions of online education significantly impact the viability of coursework offered by these institutions of higher learning. The more an understanding of what causes the most experienced group of faculty to overcome their closely held assumptions and beliefs about teaching and learning, the more students and adult education can benefit to improve quality and perceptions of a degree earned online.

**Summary**

Many institutions are adopting online education, however, the most experienced faculty group-tenured faculty, continue to be resistant. If the perception of quality with online education is to be raised amongst faculty, it has to start at the highest level. There is a lack of research on tenured business faculty and if they had a change of opinion regarding online education, what led to a perspective transformation and how have they altered their teaching practices in face-to-face learning environments. By gaining an understanding of what common factors lead individual tenured business faculty to a change in perspective with teaching online and ultimately accepting online education as an educational medium will benefit adult education and institutions of higher learning. The knowledge gained through this study can be communicated to faculty in an effort to alleviate their concerns which will ultimately serve students in their quest for quality higher education.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Given the lack of data-based research studies on faculty resistance to online education in general and business faculty more specifically and what may have led to a change in perspective regarding teaching online, the purpose of this mixed methods research study was two-fold. One, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change in mindset of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments.

This chapter will begin with a brief overview of mixed methods research including the controversy surrounding this approach to research, its philosophical foundations and core characteristics. The reason for utilizing a mixed method approach, the design employed to guide the research, the strengths and concerns with mixed methods research in the study of tenured business faculty and the process of change in mindset will be discussed. This chapter will also provide an overview of the participants, data collection, analysis, data integration and verification strategies. Lastly, an overview of the researchers’ background and a chapter summary will be provided.

Mixed Methods Research

Mixed methods research is not a new research methodology. It has been described as the “third methodological movement” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p.4) because it has emerged as an alternative to qualitative and quantitative research since the late 1980’s. The reason mixed methods research continues to gain acceptance is due to the increasing belief that by combining qualitative and quantitative research, this would lead
to enhanced sophistication in evidence and a combination of both forms of data provides the most complete analysis of a research topic (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Mixed methods research is a research design in which the researcher collects, analyzes and mixes both qualitative and quantitative data into a single study (Johnson, Onwuebuzie & Turner, 2007). In the past, debates have been undertaken in the social and behavioral sciences about the superiority of qualitative (constructivist, which is meaning of phenomena formed through participants and their multiple subjective views) and quantitative (positivist, which is a single reality, knowledge based on observable fact) research paradigms (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Debates by scholars also centered on whether or not qualitative or quantitative data could be combined because they are linked with certain philosophical assumptions and largely believe that these viewpoints cannot be mixed (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). These debates, also called “paradigm wars,” have largely ended due to “paradigm relativism” which describes the viewpoint of using whatever methodological approach that works for the research problem under analysis (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). A “truce” was called for in the 1980’s and 1990’s as many major authors felt both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies were compatible (Terrel, 2012). Similarly, it seems as time goes by and problems become more complex, researchers are more open minded and look to find answers with methods that attempt to answer research questions as opposed to determining which viewpoint is right. This philosophical viewpoint is considered a pragmatic view and will be described next.
Philosophical Foundations

From a philosophical standpoint, the basic set of beliefs and assumptions that inform mixed methods research are pragmatism, postpositivism and constructivism. Pragmatism is an approach to knowledge that considers multiple viewpoints, perspectives, and positions. Pragmatism (“what works”) focuses on the consequences of research, the importance of the question asked rather than the methods used (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Pragmatism is also embraced by many researchers because a practical and applied research philosophy should guide methodological choices (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Other world views differ in the nature of reality, what reality is (ontology) and what knowledge is (epistemology) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). For example, dissatisfaction with the positivist viewpoint gave rise to postpositivism which is characterized by cause and effect thinking, narrowing and focusing on select variables to interrelate and detailed observations and measures of variables. Postpositivism views reality as singular. Singular, in that the researcher will draw one conclusion, either to reject or fail to reject a hypothesis, for example. The researcher is essentially working from the top to the bottom, from a theory to hypothesis, characterized as a theory that floats above the research study and helps to explain the findings of a study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Another viewpoint, constructivism views reality as multiple and looks for multiple perspectives from participants (such as using multiple interviews). The researcher works from the bottom up taking multiple perspectives to then build a theory (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

In addition to the philosophical viewpoints that inform mixed methods research, several core characteristics of mixed method research apply and will be described next.
Core Characteristics

The key components that go into designing and conducting a mixed methods research study require that the researcher collect and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data that is based on research questions. After collection and analysis, the researcher mixes the two forms of data concurrently by combining them sequentially and having one build upon the other or embedding one within the other. Depending on what the researcher wishes to emphasize, priority will be given to one or to both forms of data, the research is conducted in a single study or multiple phases of a program of study and then outline the study within the various philosophical viewpoints. Lastly, the researcher will select a specific research design that directs a plan of study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). As qualitative and quantitative studies are the key component in a mixed methods study, further explanation of these approaches to research is necessary.

Qualitative research purpose is not to generalize data to a population but to explore individuals’ experiences. Qualitative research does not test something or prove a theory is right or wrong. Qualitative research is inductive. The researcher, who is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, gathers data to build a theory rather than to deductively test a hypothesis. Its goal is to gather rich, thick data in words and pictures rather than numbers to determine how individuals make meaning while interacting within their social world and can be gathered through interviews, field notes, and documents. Sample selection in qualitative research is considered non-random or purposeful as opposed to larger random samplings of quantitative research (Merriam, 2002, 2009).
Quantitative research purpose is to test objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. The researcher is to remain objective. Variables can be measured and analyzed by utilizing statistical tools to determine if data is significant or not. Data collection methods can include surveys, questionnaires, and experiments (Creswell, 2009). The sample size in a quantitative study is also of importance. As the sample size gets larger, the significance of the study will be strengthened (Field, 2013).

Building on the core characteristics of a mixed methods research study and the components of qualitative and quantitative studies, the research approach and the specific research design that directs the plan of study will be discussed.

When looking at the research approach to study the change in mindset of tenured business faculty to teach online, a mixed methods approach was selected. The reason for this is this method of combining both qualitative and quantitative data will overcome the weaknesses with doing a qualitative only or quantitative only study. More specifically, a mixed methods approach will allow for triangulation of data by directly comparing and contrasting quantitative statistical results with qualitative findings to achieve validity and reliability (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). By collecting data from both approaches, the intent is that it will lead to a better understanding of the research problem than only one data type alone could produce. As a mixed method approach is not accepted universally, the design will have to be detailed and rigorous to be accepted (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).
Mixed Methods Research Design

When a research problem has been identified for a mixed methods approach, it is necessary to choose a research design that best fits the problem, the purpose, and the research questions of the study. These designs are necessary to guide the researcher during their study and set the logic for which the researcher makes interpretations at the conclusion of their study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Research designs can be considered as procedures for collecting, analyzing, interpreting and reporting data in research studies (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Before describing the approach (design) utilized for this mixed methods study, a review of the categories of mixed methods research designs and its strengths and weaknesses are necessary.

Mixed methods designs can be classified as either as a fixed method or emergent method design. A fixed method design is characterized as a mixed method study in which the use of quantitative and qualitative methods is planned from the beginning of the research process and procedures are implemented as planned. An emergent mixed method design is characterized as a mixed method study that arises due to issues that occurred during the research process (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). For example, a researcher may decide that after conducting qualitative research, they have concerns over the trustworthiness of interpretations that were made (Ryan, Coughlin & Cronin, 2007) and want to add a quantitative component to enhance validity and reliability from a quantitative perspective (Coughlin, Cronin, & Ryan, 2007). Many times, however, mixed method designs actually fall in between both fixed and emergent designs where the plan may be to conduct a research study in two phases, qualitative first and quantitative second. Details of one phase may emerge for the design of second
quantitative phase based on interpretations made from the results of the initial qualitative phase (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

There are inherent strengths and concerns with conducting a mixed methods study. Mixed methods research allows for a more comprehensive analysis of the research problem by offsetting some of the weakness of doing just a qualitative or quantitative study. Qualitative research weaknesses are with personal interpretations made by the researcher, ensuing bias created, and difficulty in generalizing findings to a group because of the limited amount of participants in some cases. Quantitative is weak in understanding the context or setting, voices are not heard and personal biases not discussed. Mixed methods research helps to overcome some of these concerns by answering the questions qualitative or quantitative research alone does not address (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

Other concerns with incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods into a research study are that it takes a certain amount of skill with both qualitative and quantitative research, as well as time and resources of a researcher to conduct a mixed methods study. Extensive data collection and analysis and the need to convince others of the need to do a mixed methods study so it will be accepted by the scholarly community are also necessary (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Some scholars may still object to mixed methods studies due to their philosophical concern over mixing two methods or are just not open to considering such a study. Those that are open to a mixed methods approach and adequately describe their position as to why the approach is acceptable will be in a better position to have their work gain acceptance and provide meaning to those who choose to acknowledge the methodology.
By utilizing a mixed methods research design for this research, the benefits of having a more complete understanding of the findings to support the purpose and research questions were realized.

With a review of the categories of mixed methods research designs and its strengths and weaknesses complete, attention can now be turned to an analysis of the research design that is most appropriate for this research study. The four designs from which to choose include the convergent parallel design, the explanatory sequential design, the exploratory sequential design and the embedded design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). For this research study, the exploratory sequential design is the most suited for this study.

**The Exploratory Sequential Design**

In an exploratory sequential mixed methods design, a qualitative phase is used as the initial starting point and a quantitative second phase is utilized to explore the purpose of the study among a wider pool of participants. This design is based on the premise that a qualitative first phase is needed because there are unknown variables and assumptions about a change in mindset tenured business faculty may or may not undergo that warrant further exploration and understanding before a quantitative survey can be constructed (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The research study began by identifying and interviewing tenured business faculty that had a change in mindset regarding teaching online and its viability as an educational format. By gaining the rich, thick data from the qualitative interviews, it was then possible to design a survey with questions that built upon the knowledge gained from the insights of the tenured business faculty and how they may have altered or not altered their teaching practices in the face-to-face classroom.
environment. The purpose of including quantitative data was to allow the researcher to assess trends and relationships amongst many variables based on what was learned from the qualitative interviews. Because of the focus on the qualitative phase, the philosophical viewpoint with this design is framed from a constructivist lens. Thereby, recognizing multiple perspectives and in-depth description and then shifting to a quantitative postpositivism philosophy including measuring variables and assessing statistical results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

The strength of the exploratory sequential research design is its straightforward nature, because the researcher conducts the two methods in separate phases and can describe and report results effectively. The main challenge associated with the design is the length of time involved to collect data under two separate phases (Creswell, 2009).

As stated previously, the purpose of this mixed methods research study was two-fold: one, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments.

Based upon the purpose of this study, this research was guided by the following questions:

1. For tenured business faculty, who initially resisted online education but later reconsidered and now teach online:
   a) What were the resistance factors to teaching in an online environment?
   b) What factors contributed to a change in perspective and what was the learning process associated with this change?
2. How has teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment?

3. How does transformative learning bring understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses?

Through the use of an exploratory sequential design, the information and data collected allowed for a foundation to conduct meaningful research to address the purpose of understanding perspective change of tenured business faculty with online education and teaching online.

In the next section, a discussion of the implementation of the mixed methods design, including the qualitative and quantitative participants, data collection and data analysis methods is analyzed.

**Implementation of the Mixed Methods Design**

Both qualitative and quantitative data were drawn in two separate phases to address the research purpose and then the two sets of results were merged into an overall interpretation that was intended to best understand the issue of perspective change for tenured business faculty (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

For institutional review board purposes, approval of this research study included both qualitative and quantitative phases of the study.

**Qualitative Methods**

In this section, a description of the procedures to identify participants, collect and analyze data from a qualitative methods standpoint is provided. The qualitative research phase was conducted first to gain a thorough understanding of what led to a change in
perspective with online education as well as how teaching online impacted the participants approach to teaching in the traditional classroom environment. The first step was to identify the criteria for participant selection

**Qualitative participants.**

The goal of this study, from a qualitative standpoint was to identify a purposeful sample of tenured business faculty who had a change in mindset regarding teaching online. “Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 2009, p. 77). The criteria considered for selection of participants to conduct a semi-structured interview included:

1) The educator previously was against online education as a viable educational medium but now finds teaching in this context enjoyable and productive.

2) Tenured business faculty.

3) Previously taught in a face- to- face format and now teaches online courses.

The criteria outlined above provided a framework to properly address the purpose and research questions of the study. With these criteria, purposeful samples of 14 tenured business faculty were identified (Six identified from participation in the quantitative survey). The qualitative results from the semi-structured interviews lead to rich, thick data to understand how people make sense of their world (Merriam, 2009). Participants for the qualitative interviews were identified by conducting an internet search of associate professors of business for the top online and graduate business programs in the United States. These schools included: Arizona State University (Carey), Carnegie Mellon University, Indiana University (Kelley), James Madison University, Lehigh University,
Pennsylvania State University-World Campus, North Carolina State University (Jenkins), Temple University (Fox), University of Connecticut, University of Florida (Hough), University of Nebraska (Lincoln), University of North Carolina (Kenan-Flagler), University of Texas (Dallas), and the University of Wisconsin (Eau Claire) (U.S. News & World Report, 2015). Additional participants were also identified through the quantitative survey. These institutions included: Florida State University, Pepperdine, SUNY-Oswego, Rider University and Wichita State University. Overall, 79 individuals were contacted for the qualitative research and while several indicated they would be agreeable to participate in the research, fourteen individuals met the research criteria of tenured business faculty, who have taught face-to-face coursework, resisted teaching online initially but now are accepting of the educational medium. Candidates were also identified by asking interview participants for individuals (snowballing) they may know who met the research criteria and were willing to share their story.

**Qualitative data collection.**

Qualitative semi-structured interviews (45-60 minutes) were conducted with the purposeful sample of tenured business faculty. The primary purpose of the semi-structured interview was to get rich, thick descriptions of what led to an individuals’ change in perspective and how their teaching practices have been altered in their face-to-face course. A semi-structured interview is a “fixed set of sequential questions but additional questions can be introduced to facilitate further explanation. The interview can be described as a managed conversation” (Cachia & Millward, 2011). The main benefit to the semi-structured interview is it will allow for a more thorough understanding of the participants viewpoints. Follow-up questions can be made to expand on a topic if greater
clarity is needed for a given response. Gaining a thorough understanding of the individuals’ perspective was crucial for this research. A fluid questioning process was necessary in order to collect the appropriate level of detail. The participants were geographically located in regions that did not allow for a face-to-face conversation, therefore telephone interviews were conducted. Telephone interviews are not better or worse than those conducted face-to-face (Creswell, 2009). The strengths of telephone interviews are that they provide access to participants who otherwise are hard to make contact with due to work commitments, offer greater flexibility than face-to-face interviews in setting up an appointment, offer a more private setting, reduces cost, data can be collected faster and potentially gain access to a larger population. The limitation to telephone interviews was that you cannot see the participant face-to-face to pick up on visual cues. For this research study, frequent follow-up with the participants to acknowledge what they said to gain clarification and understanding helped to offset any potential visual cues that could not be seen by doing a telephone interview (Cachia & Millward, 2011).

Interview questions focused on gaining an understanding of individual’s perspective with teaching online including: their perceived level of work required for an online education course versus face-to-face; their perception of the quality of online education versus face-to-face; if they would recommend online courses for students; if they have taught online previously; their satisfaction level with their institutions’ level of training and support with online education, and questions to gain an understanding if a perspective change occurred with their willingness to teach online were also be included. For example, Have you taught online? If so, why did you initially resist teaching online?
If you resisted teaching online but later changed your viewpoint did you critically reflect on your beliefs and reconsider previously held positions with online education? Were you required to teach online and that is the main reason you now do so? Did speaking with colleagues who successfully taught online contribute to a change of view? Did you ever assist in the development of an online course and would incentives to teach online increase motivation to adopt the educational format? A listing of the individual interview questions are provided in the appendix of this study (See Appendix B).

**Qualitative data analysis.**

The goal of qualitative data analysis in the process of making meaning is to answer the research questions posed by this study. Data analysis in an exploratory sequential design occurs by first collecting the data to be analyzed, transcribing the data and then coding the data into themes or categories (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Open coding of data was utilized in this study. Open coding consists of making notations next to the data collected that is interesting or relevant to the study of tenured business faculty (Merriam, 2009). NVivo Pro 11 (QSR International, Cambridge, MA) software was utilized to aid in the coding of data as well as ensuring the categories developed accurately reflected the nature of the data collected. This study also utilized a constant comparative method of data analysis. This data analysis method begins with a review of initial observations, undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process and then leads to the stage of the development of individual themes or categories (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Interview transcripts, field notes and other documents were reviewed and then the data was compared. These comparisons lead to other categories which were compared with each other (Merriam, 2009). As the data from
the individual semi-structured interviews can become voluminous, the data analysis process was conducted after each interview while the information was still fresh. The goal of data analysis was to make sense out of the data, or determine how well the data answered the research questions. It is very important that the coding of the data into themes or categories occurred while the information is current so interpreting what has been said and what the researcher heard and read is congruent (Merriam, 2009).

**Quantitative Methods**

As this study is a mixed methods research design, the second phase of this exploratory sequential design was quantitative analysis. In this section, a description of the procedures to identify participants, collect and analyze data from a quantitative methods standpoint is provided. The first step is to identify participant selection for the quantitative phase of the study.

**Quantitative participants.**

Participants for this study were identified through internet based list serves from the Academy of Management of tenured and non-tenured business college faculty throughout the world in order to gain a representative sample size. Additionally, business faculty (including tenured) from several of the previously identified top online and graduate business programs in the United States were contacted (excluding the existing qualitative participants) for consideration for participation in the research study. The criteria for selection were business faculty (including tenured) who taught both face-to-face and online. The business faculty must be employed by colleges and universities which offer online course work in business, either for-profit or not-for-profit and preferably have an online MBA program. As previously mentioned in Chapter 1 and
Chapter 2, the online MBA is one of the more popular postgraduate online business degree offerings. By selecting participants from institutions that offer this degree program will allow more opportunity for tenured business faculty who have a robust background with the educational format to participate in the study. Also of importance is to gain perspective from tenured business faculty who did not originally teach online but now do so as to gain an understanding of what led to a change in perspective.

Quantitative data collection.

For this study, web-based research was conducted. Specifically an online survey was utilized as the primary data collection method (See appendix C). The survey was utilized to gain an understanding of tenured and non-tenured business faculty including gathering demographic data such as nominal (categorical data) and interval data (specific number) which included data such as sex, race, location (nominal) and age, years teaching(interval). The questions were developed after gaining information from the qualitative interviews and focused on the individuals concerns and beliefs, factors considered to learn to teach online, the impact of teaching online and factors that changed perspective to teach online. The primary advantage to this method of data collection was the reduced response time and ease of data entry. Web-based surveys average two to three day turnaround compared to traditional mail surveys which can take up to four to six weeks to receive (Granello & Wheaton, 2004). Once the data was received, it was transferred to a database for analysis using IBM SPSS Version 24 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY) software (Field, 2013). A closed-ended questionnaire was considered for a majority of the survey questions because closed-ended responses are more efficient to collect and analyze (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). More specifically, the questions were a single
Likert type in which a statement was made and the respondent was asked to rate a series of questions on a rating scale or yes or no format (Gliner, Morgan & Leech, 2009).

Some of the limitations of conducting web-based research included, representativeness of the sample and a lower response rate. As the researcher for this study, it was my responsibility to ensure all members of the participant pool have equal access to technology necessary to complete the survey. To the extent that a portion of the participants may not have accessibility to technology to complete the survey and are eliminated from the sample, could result in the generalizability of the survey and the results being compromised (Granello & Wheaton, 2004). As the survey was distributed through list serves and individual business faculty e-mail addresses, this assured all participants had access to the survey equally if they chose to participate. The other concern with web-based surveys is the response rate is not as high as a traditional mailed survey (Granello & Wheaton, 2004). This limitation was addressed by advising the participants how long the survey would take to complete upfront (10-15 minutes) and frequent follow-ups were made to request a response if delays occurred from a specific population of the requested survey group.

The construction of the survey questions was predicated on the responses to the qualitative interviews. The rich, thick data collected from the interview process aided in the development of the survey questions to pose to a wider audience on perspective change to teach online and how teaching practices may be altered in the traditional classroom environment.
Quantitative data analysis.

In analyzing perspective transformation, from a quantitative perspective, descriptive and inferential statistical analysis was conducted. To measure frequency of response percentages, descriptive statistics was performed. Measures of central tendency (mean, median and mode), standard deviation, were also analyzed. To measure significance and relevance, inferential statistics, either for data with normal distributions (parametric tests) or without normal distributions (non-parametric tests) was considered. Two-Way Chi-Square analysis was utilized to test if differences existed between cells in a crosstabulations table with nominal variables. Independent $t$-tests (parametric) and Mann Whitney U (non-parametric) were utilized to analyze a nominal variable with two independent levels and an interval variable to compare if mean differences exist between two groups. Mann Whitney U is utilized when normal distribution assumptions are not met. Pearson Correlation (parametric) and Spearman’s rho correlation were conducted to determine if a linear relationship (correlation) exists between two interval variables. Spearman’s rho is utilized when normal distribution assumptions are not met. Lastly, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was utilized to determine which variables were more predictive in impacting the dependent variable (Field, 2013).

Verification Strategies

When conducting research it is important to be able to ensure the findings of the study are trustworthy (Merriam, 2009). In this mixed methods study, validity and reliability play different roles but both serve to verify the trustworthiness of the findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). From a qualitative standpoint, trustworthiness of data has been described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as credibility, dependability,
transferability and confirmability. From a quantitative standpoint trustworthiness is described as quantitative validity or reliability. As this study will employ an exploratory sequential design, the verification strategies for qualitative data will be described first followed by quantitative verification strategies.

**Qualitative Verification Strategies**

As discussed previously, qualitative verification strategies involve evaluation of the trustworthiness of the data. Data is trustworthy when there has been some rigor in carrying out a study. The primary methods of determining trustworthiness from a qualitative standpoint include: credibility (validity), dependability (reliability), transferability and confirmability (Merriam, 2009). Lincoln and Guba (1985) replaced validity and reliability with the terms mentioned above and will be described in further detail next.

**Credibility.**

Internal validity or credibility is looking at the findings of a study and determining if they are consistent with reality. With qualitative research “the understanding of reality is really the researcher’s interpretation of participants’ interpretations or understandings of the phenomenon of interest” (Merriam, 2002, p. 25). The strategies to assist in establishing credibility of a qualitative study include triangulation and member checks. Triangulation involves utilizing multiple methods of data collection. For example, in this study, semi-structured interview transcripts, observations (field notes from NVivo) and document review (journal entry) were compared and cross-checked when confirming findings (Merriam, 2009). With member checks, feedback is requested on tentative findings from the people who participated in
the study to see if it “rings true” (Merriam, 2002, p. 26). Member checks are one of the better methods of clearing up any misunderstandings or even identifying your own bias about what was observed (Merriam, 2009). For example, from the qualitative interviews of tenured business faculty, further clarification was requested for any answer that was not entirely clear or if the process that led to a change in perspective was not thoroughly discussed during the interview.

**Dependability.**

In a qualitative research study, dependability is the equivalent to reliability (Mertens & McLaughlin, 2004). Reliability or dependability refers to the extent that research findings can be replicated if the study was repeated. The key question for a researcher though is not if the results can be replicated but rather are the results consistent with the data collected and therefore considered dependable (Merriam, 2002).

Strategies to ensure reliability or dependability, include, triangulation, which was previously described and an audit trail. “An audit trail in a qualitative study describes in detail how data was collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout” (Merriam, 2009, p.223). Detailed records of transcription coding notes and coding nodes created through NVivo Pro 11 software were completed and retained throughout the data collection process.

**Transferability.**

Transferability is parallel to external validity in quantitative research and means the degree to which the findings can be generalized to other situations (Mertens & McLaughlin, 2004). Since small, purposeful samples are selected in qualitative research, statistically it is not possible to generalize findings. Therefore, to enhance the possibility
of findings from a qualitative study transferring to another study, the goal is to provide a rich, thick description to ensure external validity or transferability (Merriam, 2002). Rich, thick description is a detailed account of your findings, the setting and participants of the study. This rich, thick description can also be provided in the form of quotes from individual participant interviews, and detailed account of field notes and documents utilized in a study (Merriam, 2009). Many quotes were included in the qualitative analysis discussion chapter describing individual perspectives relevant to the topics presented in the research study.

**Confirmability.**

In qualitative research confirmability is parallel to objectivity which means the data and interpretations are factual and the researchers’ judgments are diminished (Mertens & McLaughlin, 2004). Confirmability is defined as “the extent to which data and interpretations of the study are grounded in the events rather than the inquirers’ personal constructions” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p.290). The primary method to ensure confirmability is through an audit trail. As previously discussed, an audit trail in a qualitative study describes in detail how data, categories, and decisions were made (Merriam, 2009). By keeping detailed notes on each phase of the study and data collected as they occur rather than going back to the data later, led to a factual research study.

**Quantitative Verification Strategies**

The primary verification strategies with quantitative research methods are validity and reliability. With quantitative validity the data received from participants of the study are meaningful indicators of the topic being investigated (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).
One of the key aspects a researcher should consider with quantitative validity is a researcher needs to be able to draw correct cause and effect inferences from the variables of the study. The design of the study needs to account for threats to internal and external validity. Internal validity is defined as “the extent to which variations in an outcome (dependent variable-perspective transformation/no perspective transformation) can be attributed to controlled variation in an independent variable” (demographic variables) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For internal validity, the research design needs to account for such things as participant attrition and selection bias to ensure that correct conclusions are drawn from the data. For this study, a random selection of tenured and non-tenured business faculty was obtained on a worldwide basis to avoid attrition and selection bias within the study and ensure internal validity. For external validity, it is defined as “the approximate validity with which we infer that the presumed causal relationship can be generalized to and across alternate measures of the cause and effect and across different types of persons, settings, and times” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher needs to ensure the results are drawn from a population that is large enough to allow for the data to be considered significant. This is usually the highest concern in survey design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). As 206 individuals participated in the survey worldwide, this allowed for a significant data sampling of the population.

Quantitative reliability means the results received from participants are consistent and stable over time (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Reliability of results needs to be established before an assessment of their validity can occur (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Reliability can be threatened through a careless act in the assessment or measurement of data or through ambiguities in the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
Careful attention to detail was taken in all aspects of the study to ensure that reliable results were achieved.

**Research Limitations**

After completion of the data gathering process with both qualitative and quantitative participants, it became evident that the concern with resistance to teaching online was an area that required further clarification from the participants of the study. While the goal was to locate individuals who were against online education and resistant to teaching online as a qualification to participate in the study, clarifying that the participants were resistant to teaching online was still necessary. During the interview process this issue was raised to determine what factors contributed to tenured business faculty’s resistance and to ensure that the reason for resistance was due to a concern related to the educational medium. If an individual agreed to participate but indicated they had not initially been resistant to teaching online, then they were excluded from the study. From a quantitative standpoint, the survey’s purpose was clearly stated at the beginning and pertinent questions applied throughout the survey on this topic to ensure a proper participant selection and response were recorded to address this limitation.

An additional limitation occurred with the survey. As the participants were required to have taught online and face-to-face, the survey concluded immediately if this requirement was not met. While the survey introductory email alluded to this requirement, it was not explicitly stated and resulted in a number of responses that were not considered for the research study.
Background of the Researcher

This research study emanated from an experience I had as a student pursuing a goal of higher education through an online educational format. After careful consideration and self-reflection, I decided to go back to school part-time to pursue a Ph.D. to allow myself opportunities later in life to teach full-time. After completing two online courses successfully, I became concerned about the perception of an online degree within institutions of higher education and their view of the qualifications of a candidate with an online degree. It became apparent, after discussing the university I was enrolled with and the degree I was pursuing with college faculty at traditional campuses, that major university research institutions would be unlikely to consider hiring a candidate to teach full-time with a Ph.D. earned online. With this perspective in mind, I remind myself to be open to the various viewpoints of the participants of the study. Also, as an online educator, I see my role as a facilitator of learning and both the student and teacher share responsibility for learning and achieving desired educational outcomes. While this is my personal view, other educators do not share the same philosophy and find that teaching online may be as successful utilizing different approaches. Being transparent about my personal views was necessary when gaining the perspectives of participants through semi-structured interviews and to avoid leading questions designed for survey responses. Also, my view of education has largely been shaped in the face-to-face environment as a teacher and learner. I recognize my view of teaching online is impacted by this background. However, I also have the unique perspective as an online educator and learner and can empathize with both faculty and students. I can understand the struggles of teaching online and the frustration that occurs with being available for students all
hours of the day and night. As a student though, I understand the frustration of attempting to complete an assignment on “off hours” due to work commitments and needing answers to questions from the instructor to complete the assignment on time. With my positionality as an instructor of both face-to-face courses as well as online courses, the qualitative participants may have had varied levels of comfort discussing their stories about a change in perspective to teaching in an online environment. As a result, I have reminded myself of these assumptions and being transparent throughout the course of this research study with the interview participants and survey construction.

**Summary**

In this chapter an analysis of a mixed methods approach to the study of the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and how teaching online impacted faculty’s approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments was offered. Mixed methods research is not a new research methodology. The methodology has gained acceptance because it allows for the most complete analysis of a research topic and overcomes the weaknesses of a qualitative or quantitative study only. The philosophical foundations and core characteristics of the mixed methods approach were provided along with a description of the exploratory sequential research design and the strengths and concerns of mixed methods research. A mixed methods research approach was appropriate in the study of tenured business faculty perspective change because it allowed for a more comprehensive analysis of the research problem by offsetting some of the weakness of doing a just a qualitative or quantitative study. Mixed methods research helps to overcome some of these concerns by answering the questions qualitative research or quantitative research alone does not address.
CHAPTER FOUR
QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

The purpose of this mixed methods research study was two-fold: one, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments. To support this purpose, this research study utilized an exploratory sequential mixed methods research design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). In an exploratory sequential mixed methods design, a qualitative phase is used as the initial starting point and a quantitative second phase is utilized to explore the purpose of the study among a wider pool of participants. Consequently, qualitative interviews of fourteen tenured business professors were conducted from various educational institutions across the United States. The findings from these interviews informed the design of the quantitative survey.

Based upon the purpose of this study, this research was guided by the following questions:

1. For tenured business faculty, who initially resisted online education but later reconsidered and now teach online:
   a) What were the resistance factors to teaching in an online environment?
   b) What factors contributed to a change in perspective and what was the learning process associated with this change?

2. How has teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment?
3. How does transformative learning bring understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses?

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the findings of these research questions through a data display (See also Figure 2, Appendix A). The data display provides further details on the components of the findings from the qualitative research of tenured business faculty and is described in further detail next.

The data display on the following page outlines the findings in four major sections of this chapter. NVivo Pro 11 was utilized to assist in organizing the data and the development of the major themes. The first section describes what led tenured business faculty to a change in perspective and the learning process of this change. The themes that emerged from this topic include faculty resistance, their identity changing as an educator and learning to teach online. The second section addresses the impact teaching online has for tenured business faculty and their face-to-face classroom. The themes that emerged from this topic include what is described as a “flipping” experience and the view of the participants’ impact on their practice. The third section discusses tenure opportunity if an individual teaches online and if it is a detriment to achieving tenure status in the view of tenured business faculty. The fourth section suggests how transformative learning brings understanding to tenured business faculty that initially resisted teaching online and now do so without hesitation. The theme for this section suggested that a key aspect of a change in perspective was the educator’s reflection on their individual identity as an educator and a sense of responsibility to their employer, ownership of their curriculum, being part of something new and relevant, helping to meet
needs of students, improved technological capabilities, and lastly, proper incentives afforded by tenured business faculty’s employer in providing motivation to consider teaching online. A final section of this chapter summarizes the qualitative findings, and how these findings informed the quantitative portion of this study, which are presented in Chapter Five.

DATA DISPLAY

I. Tenured Business Faculty Change in Perspective and Their Learning Process (“Behaving Like a Dinosaur”)
   A. Initial Resistance Factors
      1. Much Time and Effort
      2. Gaining Experience
      3. Quality of Education
   B. Identity as an Educator
      1. Responsibility to the Employer
      2. Ownership of Curriculum
      3. Avoiding Obsolescence and Learning New Tasks
   C. Learning to Teach Online
      1. Instrumental Knowledge
      2. Emotions
      3. Dialogue

II. The Impact Teaching Online has for Tenured Business Faculty and their Face-to-Face Classroom (“A Flipping Experience”)
    A. Flipping the Classroom
    B. Impact on Practice

III. Tenure Opportunity if Teach Online (“Taking Your Lumps”)

IV. Transformative Learning and Tenured Business Faculty (“The Big Transformation”)
    A. New Perspectives
    B. Incentives

   **A Change in Perspective: “Behaving Like a Dinosaur”**

   The first research question this study addressed was tenured business faculty’s change in perspective with teaching online after initially being resistant and what their learning process was in gaining a new perspective. The findings suggest that there are a
number of factors that occurred among tenured business faculty that lead to a change in perspective and guide them through a learning process of change. These factors included an initial resistance, identity as educators, and learning to teach online. Each of these themes that emerged are discussed in detail throughout this section.

**Initial Resistance Factors**

Resistance is defined as “behavior which is intended to protect an individual from the effects of real or imagined change” (Dent & Goldberg, 1999, p. 34). It is also seen as behavior indicative of “active non-acceptance and objection” (Illeris, 2004, p.87). Prior to considering teaching online, the tenured business faculty interviewed expressed concerns or resistance initially to teaching online after several successful years in a face-to-face environment. Additionally, after having taught an initial online course, faculty expressed concern with their experience and if they can be as effective as an instructor.

The initial resistance factors described by tenured business faculty include much time and effort, gaining experience to teach online, and if the quality of education is as rich as the face-to-face classroom. Each of these factors are discussed in greater detail.

**Much time and effort.**

One of the major themes that emerged from tenured business faculty’s initial resistance to teaching online was the amount of time and effort it takes to prepare and initiate a course online. Tenured faculty indicated they heard from other faculty members or after they actually had taken the step to teach online that extensive time and effort was required to teach online. For example, the time to learn to use technology or understanding how much explanation is needed to make assignments clear to students. Working with instructional design experts to craft an online course that is dynamic and
engaging to students who may not ever speak directly with the professor or fellow classmates was also a challenge. Specific examples cited from the faculty interviewed included, the amount of time and effort to grade, monitor emails, preparation of video, and the syllabus for the entire course well in advance were common sentiments expressed. As stated by Billy (See Figure 3, Appendix A for a listing of pseudonyms of the participants) who teaches negotiation skills at both the undergraduate and graduate MBA level “the entire course has to be prepared before you meet for the first time. All the videos, all the assessments, exams, rubrics, everything has to be done beforehand, well before the course begins.” Similarly Stanley, who teaches quantitative marketing courses at the undergraduate and graduate level when discussing the amount of time to keep material up to date indicated, “it’s about four times as much work to change a slide with an online course. You change the slide and the voice over which takes three to five tries before I think it’s adequate for the students.” Additionally, Kurt who is a Professor of Management and Business Administration (Emeritus) at the undergraduate and graduate level noted the amount and time and effort to learn the technology associated with his online simulation capstone course. He replied:

    Once I learned the system, now that took effort because I had been teaching so long, I pretty much had all my courses down pat. I could walk into the classroom with a bit of review. When I started online, yes, that took a lot of time to learn the simulation, learn Blackboard, and to learn how to interact with students outside of class.

    Chris, who teaches undergraduate courses in employment law and union management relations as well as a graduate level human resource management course,
described his concern with time and effort to teach online due to a unique challenge he faces. He stated:

I definitely thought it would be a lot more work. An interesting challenge that wouldn’t apply to most people, I have only one hand. So typing is not exactly the easiest thing for me. I use voice recognition software to help me with responding to student’s questions.

Similar sentiments about the time and effort to teach online were expressed regarding being explicit with instructions to students in an online course which takes an inordinate amount of time and effort to complete. For example, Fred, who teaches MBA managerial accounting, in speaking of the challenges about teaching online stated, “You need to be extremely explicit in your instructions for online assignments. If there’s a way to misinterpret what you say, someone will figure out how to do that.” The time and work effort to have the entire course prepared before the first class, and have explicit instructions are common sentiments expressed as to what caused initial resistance to the educational medium.

One of the other major concerns noted by the tenured business faculty with time and effort was the need to stay engaged with students 24/7. Even though the faculty were not required to teach a class at a specific time and place, the nature of online students according to the faculty interviewed was that when they are working on their assignments they expect to be able to reach their professor and get answers to their questions. For example, Neil, who teaches strategic management at the undergraduate and graduate MBA level stated:
You don’t have to be at a certain place at a certain time, but you’re still driven by the clock. If a student submits something to me, the expectation is you’ll always get back in 24 hours. To me, I get back a lot faster than that. I don’t think anybody ever waits 24 hours for a reply from me. Number one, they deserve a response I think as quickly as possible but two, if I respond to them, that’s off my plate, what’s next?

Neil reiterated his commitment to being highly responsive and available for his students when he expressed concern regarding his colleague’s sentiments about working on weekends, “I think some professors are very naïve about not working on Saturday or Sundays. I go, hey if you’re working with adult students, when do you think they’re doing the work?”

Another common theme that emerged is tenured business faculty’s viewpoint on the logistics, procedural and administrative aspects of teaching online as it relates to the amount of time and effort to prepare a course online. As stated by Wayne who teaches both undergraduate and graduate business and economics/statistics coursework:

Online the biggest challenge is pretty much administrative. It’s not so much curricular or preparation of materials or organization of materials or access by the student. It’s administrative. Things like, how do you administer tests? Do you make the student get a proctor or not? What kind of time limit do you put on a test? It’s those administrative, procedural, logistic issues that to me are the main headaches.

Many of the factors or themes that emerged regarding time and effort to teach online arose from what tenured business faculty heard from colleagues or experienced for
themselves after having taught online for the first time. The concerns that faculty expressed regarding what inhibited them from even considering taking the initial step of gaining experience to teach online or to continue to teach online after an initial experience is appropriate at this point. The main inhibitors expressed by faculty centered on restructuring relationships with students and the inflexibility with teaching an online course.

**Gaining experience.**

Being willing to take the first step to gain experience to teach online or continuing to teach after an initial online course and experiencing the amount of time and effort required to be successful online is another resistance factor expressed by faculty interviewed. Included under this theme of gaining experience teaching online includes faculty’s concerns over how relationships with students are restructured and also the lack of flexibility with online coursework as compared to face-to-face. Each of these inhibitors is discussed in greater detail.

Tenured business faculty who were considering whether to accept the challenge of teaching online expressed that they had an initial concern with teaching online because of *restructured relationships* with their students. A restructured relationship with students means the usual way of interacting with students is now altered when teaching online. The concern expressed is they could not see or interact with the students as they had grown accustomed to in their previous face-to-face classroom experiences or “were not there to explain things” (Fred). For example, as Bobby, who teaches both undergraduate and graduate Human Resource Management and Leadership in Organization coursework stated, “because you don’t see the nonverbal really as much in the online class.” Billy
also related how he felt his face-to-face class is a much more engaging experience. He stated:

You get the full flavor of interaction (in face-to-face). You see people. You see all of their nonverbal communication and, you know, as a teacher, it’s easier because I can just scan the classroom and see what people’s reactions are.

Similarly, Dan, who teaches both undergraduate and graduate MBA-Marketing coursework, expressed his concern with teaching online with “faculty to student and student to student engagement, just to replicate what happens in a typical face-to-face class. I’m coming from a case teaching type environment where there’s a lot of really rich student interaction.” Chris, expressed similar sentiments when he stated “I can’t call on a specific student to respond which is something that I might like to do in the actual classroom.”

Another example of restructured relationships was expressed by Billy in terms of his resistance to teaching online due to the nature of his course with teaching negotiation skills and providing feedback to students online. He stated:

Initially when the idea of online came up, it was many years ago and there were faculty teaching online and doing it in a synchronous way. I just said I don’t see how I could do my course that way. I don’t know how you could train people in this interactive skill and do it entirely online. It just wasn’t something I could do for the course. So I just said no, I’m not going to do it.

Billy could not initially see how he could teach his negotiations class without being physically in front of the students. Billy went on to explain how his class worked well now due to enhancements with interactive technology such as Web Ex conferencing with
students, but the other concern he noted with online teaching and the change with relationships with students is “with all the compressed classes, you have to work so hard to get feedback to students. You can’t wait a week in between grading. You have to do it in a couple of days.” For Billy the reduced timeframe to provide feedback with grades represented a restructured relationship with students because in order to have an appropriate level of feedback online requires more timely responses than what he was accustomed to providing in his face-to-face course. From my own journal notes from my online teaching experience, this sentiment tracks with what Billy is expressing. Because of the asynchronous nature of class, students expect to receive almost immediate feedback from the instructor in order to know if they are on track and understanding the assignments before they can feel comfortable with moving to the next assignment.

Another factor expressed by faculty pertaining to inhibitors to gaining experience or continuing to teach online was the lack of flexibility with online courses to be in a position to make modifications as the class progressed.

The inability to make adjustments or changes in structure with an online course was a common concern expressed by faculty. For instance, Bobby talked about his initial experience with teaching online courses, “It’s a lot more structured and yeah, I don’t have quite as much autonomy.” As Neil describes “I don’t make a lot of adjustments on the fly.” Similarly, Charles, who is a finance professor, an Academic Director, and founder of his university’s executive MBA program, also expressed his point of view, “well man, this is taking away the flexibility that I thought online offered.” The main concern expressed by faculty was that they enjoy the face-to-face classroom experience because they can make adjustments as the course progresses as they see fit. With an
online course because so much has to be completed and recorded prior to the start of the initial course, it is very difficult to make changes midstream. Billy shared this viewpoint:

When you want to make a modification because you learned from a previous experience that something worked well and you need more of it or something didn’t work well and you need to change it, you can’t do it on the fly. You have to do it in advance. With a face-to-face class you can say, you know, even in the middle of a class you can change gears. But you can’t do that so easily with an online class.

Related to the concern expressed about the inability to be autonomous with the classroom structure, a similar concern with flexibility was expressed with regard to the use of technology in the classroom. For example, Wayne expressed his anxiety to teaching online due to use of technology when instructing his class because it reduces his flexibility if problems occur with technology and he cannot deliver his material as planned:

I mean there are still a lot of glitches, especially with communication. Not a week would go by and there’d be some kind of major technological glitch. The system would go down. There’d be a bug in a program. That was an environment that was not very conducive to getting someone new interested in online education.

Many of the faculty interviewed had courses that required extensive engagement from students. Being able to replicate the face-to-face interaction that does not occur online was viewed as a major concern with teaching online. The need to utilize technology to replicate the experience of the traditional classroom was described by one of Stanley’s staff as a “soulless” way to teach. The concerns raised about the reliability of technology
to replicate the face-to-face experience though was relieved somewhat if the institution had a high level of technical support for the faculty in the event of a technological malfunction. As stated by Wayne with regard to the technological support team provided by his college, “they’ll come and rescue you. If you didn’t have people like that, it’d be really tough and you could get discouraged real quick.”

The concerns raised regarding time and effort and the inhibitors to gaining experience to teach or continue to teach online are important considerations raised by tenured business faculty as to why they were resistant to teaching online. Of equal importance with resistance to teaching online is if the quality of education was as rich as the face-to-face classroom experience.

**Quality of education.**

The quality of education received online versus the face-to-face environment was a consistent theme raised by the tenured business faculty interviewed. Quality, is defined as the rigor to which learning outcomes for a course are satisfied (Seaman, 2009). Specific concerns raised surrounded the issue of overall rich course content, socialization bias of the educator toward face-to-face coursework, economic pressure to implement online curriculum and the reliance on technology to participate in an online class.

*Rich course content* and engagement in an online course are considered important characteristics when assessing the quality of online education courses (Chapman & Henderson, 2010). These same characteristics were described as what was missing from the online experience compared to face-to-face and contributed to initial resistance among the tenured business faculty interviewed. This outlook was described by Billy,
“Face-to-face is a much richer experience. It’s just not as rich as it is when you can see people.” Tenured faculty also expressed a need to replicate the engagement of the face-to-face experience online for themselves. Charles described this when speaking about his online hybrid MBA course. “For me I’m trying to get contact and engagement. I like being in a live class.” Charles is the Academic Director of his institution’s executive MBA programs. While he prefers the experience of the live class and interaction it brings, he also understands the demand for students to offer online education and it is his job to replicate the quality coursework online as compared to what is offered face-to-face. Charles describes the biggest challenge to “get something comparable online” is to get people “to react as if we were together physically.” Similarly, Dan expressed his concern with rich course content and student interaction online as:

I guess I’m not even sure that can be overcomable to have that kind of rich student to student interaction and rich faculty to student interaction in the way I’m used to in face-to-face teaching in an asynchronous online course.

Similarly, Marv, who pioneered an early BASIC program language project and is a retired professor from a private western United States university described his sentiments with the challenges of the online experience as “the lack of face-to-face discussion, clearly that’s a huge factor, particularly with decision making, strategy (courses).” He felt as though certain courses do not lend themselves to online coursework. “It’s not the same as the classroom experience with an aggressive discussion about a topic. That to me would be one of the things they miss in comparing experiences.” Similar sentiments regarding student interaction were stated by other tenured business faculty interviewed. For example, Billy stated, “I think the challenge for students is that they’re not
developing their face-to-face relationships with other students.” Dan expressed similar sentiments regarding his concern with his students’ experiences when learning online when he said:

I guess my hope is that it doesn’t take away from how much they learn. My hope is that they’re learning in different ways. It’s not a negative, it’s not a reduction, it’s just a shift to other learning methods.

Wendy, who teaches business management courses both at the undergraduate and graduate level indicated, “The students are shortchanged. I think they’re shortchanged in terms of critical thinking, the application, just on a number of dimensions.” Similarly, Adam who teaches finance courses at the graduate level at his institution indicated, “The human interaction piece is missing. I think that it’s important for team building or just working in groups. It seems like that that’s something that is really hard to develop online.”

Another factor concerning the quality of education expressed by several of the tenured faculty interviewed regarding the difference in quality learning outcomes with online education compared with face-to-face was that online education was not up to par with face-to-face coursework. For example, Chris stated that, “I’m still resistant to teaching online to some extent because honestly there’s a lot of things I think you can’t get in an online course that you can get in a face-to-face course.” His concern overall is “am I able to have my students get as much out of this online course as they would if I did the course in a face-to-face format.” Billy also expressed similar sentiments about online teaching:
I wouldn’t want to do only online teaching. I think there is a difference between online and face-to-face and I’ve tried my best to make the online as equivalent in quality, as I can, to the face-to-face, but there’s something different there. I certainly wouldn’t reject online teaching. It’s just not my preference.”

Additionally, both Charles and Fred expressed similar sentiments about their perceptions of online education and having hesitation to teach online. Fred indicated, “My initial thoughts of online were that it’s inferior to resident.” Charles noted, “I came in with some hesitation. I thought it was honestly not as effective.”

Adam also expressed hesitation about quality of online education when he discussed his concern about cheating. He stated:

When you teach online there is no way to absolutely prevent cheating. I found very quickly that the students when they’re taking quizzes they were doing screen captures of every one of the questions and even though my weekly quizzes were 10-question quizzes that come from pools of 20 or 25, you know in just one class if you’ve got two or three students doing screen capture together, they’re going to get the whole quiz and pass it down. The only way to stop this is by giving new quizzes and new questions every semester and you kind of run out of questions doing that. This is one of the things I don’t have to worry about when I’m doing the face-to-face classes.

Kurt expressed his concern about cheating online when he indicated, “We set up mechanisms to deal with this (cheating). You could have somebody take the course for you and you get into all those issues of making sure that you don’t have surrogates taking the whole course.”
Another source of concern noted with quality of online education and faculty perception noted by Marv was institutions’ initial lack of commitment in the early days to online education as a viable educational medium. Marv noted:

It was lackluster or no leadership saying “hey fellows, this is going to be important to us someday, I want you all to do something.” It was very hard for faculty who absolutely refused to do anything (teach online) to be encouraged by the department chairs because there was no culture of we ought to get out front with all this and get going. Online education wasn’t worth it and it’s only run by bad guys. So there’s a culture that is almost defiant (against online education). A lot really has to do with I think the University of Phoenix culture. It really set other schools back along the way in terms of recognizing the opportunity. They were scared stiff of people seeing them as a University of Phoenix.

Marv also provided an additional view on why online education has a negative perception in education when he stated:

So the distance learning term has kind of drifted off, but don’t dismiss those old correspondence courses. And that, of course, is one of the first places they’d convert to online and that tarnished the image again. When I grew up they used to call it night school. It was a term of derision when I was a kid. But distance learning has been with this country a long time and you see where it’s headed is really interesting.

Tenured business faculty interviewed all discussed their beliefs about which medium, face-to-face or online was better for student learning outcomes. Based on their comments there is a degree of bias for face-to-face not only for the quality of education
concerns raised previously but also because the participants were all raised in education with this approach and this is how they gained success in higher education. Socialization of individuals and its role with resistance to educational practices (Storrs & Inderbitzin, 2006) helps to explain tenured business faculty’s individual’s identity as teachers as face-to-face instructors. This identity of teaching in the face-to-face classroom as the only mechanism for student learning is rooted in societal definitions promulgated over many years in higher education. The question asked of tenured business faculty was to provide their opinion as to the effectiveness of online education versus face-to-face in terms of the quality of education and learning outcomes for students. The opinions varied amongst the faculty interviewed but some of the most common sentiments were face-to-face is more effective in achieving learning outcomes than online. The issue is how does the dimension of social learning contribute to this viewpoint of preference for quality learning outcomes in a face-to-face environment over online education? Additionally, how does this view impact tenured business faculty’s eventual willingness to learn to teach online? The findings from the interviews of tenured business faculty do indicate a preference for face-to-face coursework amongst several of the participants as a preferred means of education. They are also socialized to believe the one approach (face-to-face) is the best since this is how they gained success in higher education.

For example, when discussing the question of the participants’ perception of the quality of education and achieving learning outcomes received online versus face-to-face, Fred stated:

I much prefer teaching face-to-face and I think face-to-face is better in general. I don’t see how you can make the learning outcomes the same. It doesn’t mean I
want them to be different, but they’re going to be and that’s life. Nobody’s guaranteed equal outcomes.

Bobby shared similar thoughts when he indicated:

I feel that there’s a higher quality of learning in the face-to-face because, I am able to give an exam prior to finals week so that during finals week for my face-to-face in 15 minute intervals, I get to meet with each group and go over their group assignment. I’ve always associated more face-to-face contact with higher learning.

Wayne, when discussing his initial perception of online advised, “to me online was just something that other folks did in their basement.” Dan expressed his preference for face-to-face for student learning outcomes when he stated:

I think a student would be getting more out of my face-to-face session and I think they’re getting deeper interactions in relationships with their peers. I think a big value of what an MBA leaves the program with, is their network of peers, which I think is better developed in a face-to-face setting. I’m kind of feeling like a dinosaur after telling you this.

Stanley expressed similar sentiments about teaching undergraduate and Ph.D. level students. He noted “teaching at the undergraduate and Ph.D. level really needs to be face-to-face in my opinion. I have found that undergraduate students, at least in my discipline, need the discipline of showing up to class.” Lastly, Charles explained his view when he indicated: “I now think it’s (online) maybe 90% as effective on knowledge transfer, knowledge transmission, discussion, but its more effective in the sense of being able to get people you otherwise wouldn’t get.”
While the tenured business faculty expressed their sentiments about why they viewed face-to-face learning environments as beneficial over online environments, it should be highlighted that they all agreed to teach their courses in an online environment. If the tenured business faculty believe face-to-face is the better environment for learning in most instances, why did they agree to teach online? Socialization in some respects can explain the current belief that the traditional avenue to learn is still the best because this is what they know and teaching online is the new unproven method. Still, for the participants, that unconscious nagging of whether their viewpoints will become outdated prevails and could explain why they chose to explore learning to teach in an online environment. Behaving like a dinosaur?

An additional concern raised by tenured business faculty regarding quality of online education pertained to their institutions implementation of online programs due to a need to reduce costs. Faculty interviewed understood the current economic pressures to offer online degree programs as a way to reduce costs but they also question the quality of learning outcomes as a result. Chris, for example, when speaking about students learning outcomes being at a disadvantage online versus from face-to-face because of the asynchronous nature of learning stated “just the whole idea that online learning is asynchronous I think in many courses is an impediment to the quality of the educational experience.” Marv also relayed his thoughts regarding the online education and rich course content:

There is enormous pressure to reduce faculty costs so online is seen as more economical. The AACSB has been very aggressive on encouraging schools to teach online, I think largely because the economics are getting so rough. I was
shocked at how fast the accreditation boys approved the degree programs. One of
the schools to look at that’s probably more aggressive than anybody is Arizona
State University. Arizona State is going to have more graduates I think than we
have people one of these days. You’ve got some guys teaching online at Arizona
State that I don’t think ever went to college. You will see that creep in at some
point if the accreditation boys do their job and say these people are not qualified.
Course quality is a soft area but the resume of the faculty member is a start in
order to make sure he has the credentials to teach the course.

Another factor affecting quality of education taught online as seen by faculty is the
reliance on technology to interact with students rather than in person. Faculty concerns
surround not only their interaction with students but also their own learning curve.

Faculty discussed how they were not technology savvy and this presented them
additional difficulties. Neil, for example, stated “I’m not particularly tech-savvy, even
though I teach a course on innovation. I thought the technology, the learning curve on the
technology would be pretty steep.” Concern with learning technology to conduct an
online course was not the only issue raised with quality of online coursework. For
example, Billy stated his with Web Ex technology:

I have to rely on students raising their hands electronically and participating. I
can’t see all their faces at a given time. It’s mostly just seeing those who are
speaking, because it’s voice activated. Students disappear from the class in the
middle of a Web Ex session because the power went out and it gets a little
ghostly, I got to say, dealing with people’s presence in the class.
As discussed in Bates & Sangra (2011), institutions are too cautious in their goals with technology. Technology is to be used to enhance traditional classroom teaching rather than transforming the way teaching is designed and delivered. Giving as much attention to faculty members teaching performance as to their research record for promotion and tenure requires a transformation in organizational culture and behavior.

While the tenured business faculty interviewed expressed concerns with utilizing technology online they eventually gained a comfort level and some actually began to prefer the use of technology in their online class versus the traditional classroom. In speaking about how technology has enhanced the learning experience, Billy, for example, described his online class experience with his negotiations class:

I’ve also taken advantage of the ability of students to have Web Ex accounts and I’ve had them conduct negotiations that they set up themselves and they record themselves and then submit and I review them. So, I’ve been increasingly using that, and that allows them to see each other in a much better way than breakout sessions. So it’s more like a teleconference, video conferencing than a telephone conversation. It approximates face-to-face meeting, but you’re still not watching somebody’s knee twitch or you don’t see their hands drumming on the table that you would see in the face-to-face interaction in the classroom.

While the educators expressed their concerns about the quality of education with online learning, the overriding interest they are serving with students who choose to gain their education online is not lost on them. As business schools continue to evolve and conclude that using the classroom model is not always appropriate for students who may be distributed worldwide, have changing professional or life obligations (Zucca, 2014),
so too must faculty evolve in the educational landscape in order to maintain relevancy and enhance their identity as an educator.

Having discussed the initial resistance factors that tenured business faculty expressed as concerns with teaching online, attention can now be focused on what contributed to and what the learning process was that contributed to the change in perspective to begin teaching online. The common theme that arose after speaking with the interview participants was how the institutions need for experienced faculty to teach online brought about reflection with the participants’ identity as an educator, their coursework, and learning new skills which ultimately led to a perspective change with teaching online.

Identity as an Educator

Three factors contributed to tenured faculty considering teaching online. These included, teaching online because tenured business faculty felt a responsibility or had a strong identity with their employer and had a desire to be a model employee, a viewpoint of identity with their coursework and having ownership of the curriculum and wanting to make sure it had their own stamp of approval, and a sentiment of avoiding obsolescence and learning new tasks and teaching skills could only be of benefit to them as individuals. Each of these topics will be described in further detail.

Responsibility to the employer.

One of the key findings from the interviews conducted with the tenured faculty group was the significance of individual identity and pride that contributed to a willingness of faculty to teach in an online environment. All 14 of the faculty indicated that they either had a higher ranking colleague request that they teach their course online,
develop coursework for an online program at the university or run a program for online education because of their rank and influence at the institution. All 14 of the faculty when requested to participate agreed to do so. Many of the faculty indicated that they thought they would try teaching online because they felt a responsibility or had a strong identity with their employer and had a desire to be a model employee. For example, in terms of feeling a responsibility to their employer, Chris stated, “I did it more to help out. I went to the MBA Director at the time and said I was willing to help out. Our job is to be a good team player and assist.” Billy also had similar sentiments, “I’ll do it because they asked me to do it and because I like to be a good organizational citizen.” Kurt described his experience when he stated:

My department chair was the one who asked me directly. I think there are probably two reasons, one sounds self-serving but I’m one of the better teachers in the finance area, but the second reason is I don’t think they could get anybody else to step up. We’re a revenue based school, we’re private and so in the downturn in 2008-2009 we saw our student population cut by a lot. This online approach was a way to reach more students. I kind of felt that it was my responsibility, my duty, to kind of explore that for the school.

Kurt recalled his experience as taking responsibility with getting an online program developed at his institution based on his strong reputation and expertise. He stated:

The Dean charged me with getting the online program going. I am not a computer whiz or anything like that, but I had been there at the time for 37-38 years, a full professor and I had a lot of respect in the college. I had been a Department Chair for three terms. I had been Associate Dean. I had been program director for
several programs. I started a research center. I think the Dean thought you have a lot of credibility if you get into this. I think that’s important to start with, you pick faculty who have a lot of credibility with other faculty.

Ownership of curriculum.

Other tenured business faculty expressed a viewpoint of identity with their coursework and having ownership of the curriculum and wanting to make sure it had their own stamp of approval. When the institutions came to the tenured business faculty because they needed their expertise and their course to develop an online educational program, the faculty interviewed were very willing to assist. For example, Wayne described his experience when he stated:

Somebody actually came and asked me. They were kind of ramping up to develop the online offerings, just as a college and university wide effort. They had one group in mind and they needed my course to help this group out. They came knocking on my door and they said we have some people to help.

Fred described his experience as “I was asked to create the online course by the Director of the School of Business so I did it.” Chris indicated “someone came to me, they had a need for this course and I was willing to fulfill it.” Bobby replied, “The Assistant Dean came to me and said what do you think about collaborating and putting a course (online) together.” It is apparent that the institutions did not force the tenured faculty to develop online courses or an educational program. For example, Billy stated:

Nobody pushed me to do it, so it wasn’t any big deal. But then, the online undergraduate program wanted a degree completion program. It’s for business students who have completed their first couple of years and want to finish their
degree. Maybe they’re older students and they need the convenience of an online program. So they decided they were going to put on a full menu of upper level courses and they wanted my course.

Luke, who teaches a capstone strategic management course at his institution, described his experience as the only faculty member who teaches the course online. He noted, “I teach strategic management, which is the capstone course for all business majors. I’m the only one who teaches it online and online is very valuable for us to have.”

**Avoiding obsolescence and learning new tasks.**

Other tenured business faculty also expressed a sentiment of not becoming obsolete and learning new tasks and teaching skills could only be of benefit to them as individuals. Chris described this sentiment when he stated:

If I had not been teaching this online course for the past three to four years I might say to myself, you know this world is progressing and it might not be a bad idea for me to experiment with some online education just because I don’t want to make myself so totally obsolete.

Additionally, faculty created online coursework and recruited their own staff to develop their skills in some instances. For example, Stanley replied, “I designed the class to be online. I basically pulled together three other faculty from two other departments and we created a certificate in Business Analytics.” Marv also had a similar experience when he described his experience with the launch of an Information Systems curriculum:

My university hired me to be part of their launch of an aggressive Information Systems (IS) curriculum, not necessarily teaching online, but IS was a blatant hole
in their delivery. When I ended up at my university, I slowly but surely weaned them into some pilot studies.

From the interviews conducted it is apparent the majority of the participants agreed to teach online because of an individual identification with the institution they are employed by and they had a strong desire to assist the institution in achieving their goals. Additionally, tenured business faculty wanted to maintain their excellent reputation as an educator with their coursework and enhance their skill level to avoid obsolescence.

Every one of the tenured business faculty shared their concerns with teaching online. Should they change their approach after being successful in a face-to-face environment? Would they be as effective for their students? Would their identity as an educator change when teaching online? Would they be viewed as lesser by others because they are not as accepting of technology? Even with these concerns, as a group, they tackled the challenge to teach online and while some still prefer to teach in a face-to-face format, overall the overriding concern of fear to attempt something new was not an obstacle that prevented the group from taking that first step. As Bobby stated initially when approached with the need for him to teach online, “I was very fearful in a sense, unsure. My God online?” However, as Billy stated, “I’m not afraid of trying something new.” This can be said is the same viewpoint of the entire group. They were willing to try something new in an effort to not only help their institution, their students, but also to grow in their own capabilities and skills.

Even though the tenured faculty group interviewed were not dissuaded from accepting the challenge of teaching online due to the factors discussed thus far, a learning curve existed and challenges ensued from instrumental and emotional learning
dimensions. In this regard, tenured faculty discussed how these factors as well as dialogue with colleagues played a role in the learning process to begin teaching in an online environment.

**Learning to Teach Online**

The process of learning and understanding can be thought to involve not only instrumental processes of knowledge acquisition but also emotional dimensions of feelings and motivation (Illeris, 2004). For example, tenured business faculty can be so engrained in their own context of the traditional classroom style of teaching, that they are resistant to put forth the effort into another style of teaching. Emotionally, faculty may have a fear of failure to begin to teach online due to the unknown that this educational medium entails. Dialogue with colleagues is also a helpful way to gauge understanding as well as to gain valuable insights to enhance confidence and to accept new challenges. The learning process tenured faculty described that they went through to overcome initial resistance and begin to teach online varied amongst these dimensions of learning and through dialogue.

**Instrumental knowledge.**

From an instrumental standpoint, learning occurred for tenured business faculty through traditional knowledge acquisition through informal training provided by their institution. The majority of the tenured business faculty interviewed indicated that while they did not receive formal training to teach online, they gained invaluable knowledge from instructional design specialists that their institution offered or through equivalent online support. For example, Neil described his training experience to teach online as:
Yea, not much. There were some introductory online course experiences, probably a series of four or five, and I did two. Not really much formal training at all. My instructional design assistance was exceptional. I had a course designer assigned to me and that individual was just tremendous. It was invaluable.

Billy also had a similar experience with the instructional designer from his institution. He stated:

My institution provided a great deal of help. They paired me with an instructional designer and we worked together to prepare the course and to figure out exactly how to deliver it online. That was a great experience and I had to record a lot of my lectures online, figure out how to deliver quizzes and tests online as well as to conduct class using Web Ex. The instructional designers keep me on top of what I needed to complete and we worked really closely on a syllabus, videos, power points, and assessments to fit things together.

Wayne described how he received training a bit differently from the others, “I received training in the form of just asking questions of the various consultants that they have. I guess, I actually might be on the other end. I’ve probably given training.” Wayne went on to describe how things have changed at his institution with additional support and attention provided to online education for faculty which supported his efforts to learn to teach online when he stated:

But now things have changed and the University now has an entire office or program on instructional design and all of these new types of approaches and initiatives. They do a really good job with the resources they have. It is an official University wide effort. Our college hired a person full-time to be an in-house
technology instructional guru. That was great because then we had a point person that we could go to quickly to get help. The technical support level started to mushroom. That is really important to have in-house technical support behind you. An infrastructure of support that you could say, okay, even if I do have a glitch I can quickly get help.

Only one of the tenured faculty interviewed felt as though they did not receive much support from their institution to teach online. Charles described his experience as “sink or swim.” He explained the support from his institution was limited “to making films of myself.” While Charles felt his experience with learning to teach online was limited from a teaching practice standpoint, his experience was similar to what the other tenured faculty described about the technical support received when he stated: “there is always a lot of help around in terms of electronic delivery.”

The closest the tenured faculty group came to formal training to teach online occurred for Dan but again its focus was more on the use of technology as opposed to training on formal techniques to teach online. He explained his experience with learning to teach online when he stated:

I first took a workshop in the spring of 2015. It covered a number of different online teaching technologies we have available. You did things in a really basic way; take power points and show different options, video yourself or audio. So it’s probably good to get that in the back of my mind a while before I really needed to before there was any time crunch.
In addition to gaining new knowledge through training provided by the faculty members’ institution, learning to teach online also occurred for the tenured group through emotional dimensions of feelings and motivation which are described in further detail.

**Emotions.**

The learning process to teach online also involved dimensions of emotions and feelings that the educators had to recognize and overcome in order to be as successful teaching online as they were in their face-to-face courses. The emotion of fear was a common theme shared by the tenured group with teaching online and how this impacted their confidence in their own abilities. For example, Bobby spoke about how teaching online tested his confidence due to the difference in age in students online than what he was used to in face-to-face coursework. He stated:

> It’s more of a mix with the online. We tend to have some older students. Actually, students who have an intimidating amount of manager experience. I mean, I just have a little bit. It’s strictly university. I mean, as a Department Chair and I was an Assistant Dean, but some of these students, it’s like wow. They’re like COO’s or they’re getting their degree I guess as a credential. I’m just trying to get them to talk sometimes and share with students. They have a lot more work experience than I do. And you don’t get that in my face-to-face class.

Neil also expressed his concern with his own level of confidence in terms of learning to teach in a new environment and if he would be as effective as in his face-to-face course. Neil stated:

> I think the number one word is confidence. You know, you have to be confident in your own abilities. I am. I try not to be arrogant about it, but I’ve done very
well in the classroom. The online environment is certainly different. But you know, learning is pretty much learning, so you need to be confident in your own abilities and know that you have something to offer to students. That is really important.

Bobby also expressed his concern with teaching online “I still kind of get a little nervous if I don’t have that structure.” Billy shared similar sentiments about his first teaching experience online. He stated:

I was very nervous for my first meeting. I think, when I first met the students on the first day, I think I was about as nervous as I had been when I first started teaching my first class. By then I’d had 35 years of experience teaching.

Dan similarly expressed his level of stress with building an online course was lessened due to having the coursework built well in advance and understanding how to use the technology when he stated:

I would’ve hated to have your course start in a week and you don’t completely understand these things. That would’ve been highly, highly stressful. I am glad I gave myself time to build the thing before there was any time crunch.

Kurt discussed how a fear of failure may be an inhibitor for faculty considering learning to teach online. He indicated:

For a lot of faculty it’s an unknown and what happens if I,-- it’s a fear of failure, you know, what happens if I don’t do this right. Faculty members say I might be trying to do my best job on this and I still could get a lot of student complaints and since it’s an unknown and since I do a good job face-to-face. I don’t even want to try it. It is extremely important to have people in-house who can sit down
with you and help you through the course when you are starting out and learning it. That’s critical.

Wendy described her experience with learning to teach online as feeling pressured because there were not courses she thought were appropriate to be taught online. She indicated, “When they were pushing people to try to develop online versions of the class I felt pressured.” Wendy went on to say that the approval process for online education limited the class size and that gave her a higher comfort level with learning to teach online courses. She stated, “It made me feel better that at least we were going to do this the right way.”

In addition to instrumental knowledge and dimensions of emotions and feelings that the educators had to recognize and overcome in order to be as successful teaching online, dialogue and interaction with colleagues was an equally important factor in the learning process to begin teaching online for the tenured business faculty interviewed.

**Dialogue.**

For the tenured business faculty interviewed they shared a mixed response with their sentiments regarding asking for help or engaging with others to learn to teach online. Some indicated that there was not really much of a learning curve or they were left to their own devices, “sink or swim” while others did reach out to colleagues to gain an understanding of what was involved in beginning to teach online. For example, Dan explained that seeing how other colleagues designed online courses made the experience (to teach online) less intimidating in his mind when he expressed, “so when you start seeing it (online course), I think it becomes less daunting once you see how others have done it.”
Stanley had a slightly different perspective change due to his experience teaching online and then making changes with his face-to-face course when he stated:

I tried doing it kind of flipped classroom this time, where I gave them the slides with voice overs that I would normally have lectured on in class. They were supposed to go over that before class, and then we had a discussion. I really liked that, because it wasn’t just me repeating stuff that was on slides, which is boring for me and boring for the students. It was a discussion about the methods and ideas presented and we could spend the time solving problems using those ideas or discussing the meaning of it all. And so it just, it was a really nice change.

Stanley went on to say that he made these changes after discussion with colleagues when he noted:

I just wanted to experiment. I wanted to see if I could make things better. Some of my colleagues have had good luck with flipped classrooms, so I thought I would give it a try.

In terms of Stanley’s viewpoint on teaching online he also indicated that speaking with colleagues did factor into his decision when considering teaching online. He stated:

I was open to it. I had heard from my colleagues that it did require a far higher level of preparation than another class that you might teach. That made me a little worried about the amount of time I would have, but I didn’t even ask for a grant from the Dean’s office to develop the class. I just did it. I did talk with them (colleagues) about the pros and cons and generally they said exactly what I expected, there’s a lot of extra preparation time to get class ready. You do have to worry a bit with an online class about cheating if the students are in the same
place, same physical location. But I have students that are spread out all over the world, so they’re not going to be passing each other notes. I think I’m probably going to stick with online. Our in-class Master’s program is in decline and has been for quite a few years. Whereas our online classes keep growing.

Stanley later noted that his colleagues are also open to teaching online because of flexibility with their schedule. He indicated, “They like the flexibility that it gives them. You know, the freedom to not be chained to their offices.”

Billy also described his interaction with colleagues when considering teaching online for the first time. He noted:

I talked with my colleagues, none of whom either had the time or inclination to put together the online course. I said, well I’ll try. I realized that I couldn’t adapt their syllabi, I couldn’t combine their syllabi with my syllabus so I figured I’d just take it on all by myself so that we can do it. Figured maybe an old dog could learn some new tricks. It required a big transformation, or a lot of thinking about how to do it online. If I hate this, this will be the last time I do it. I didn’t hate it, it was just a hell of a lot of work, so I continued to do it. Which, the second, third time, it does become easier, much easier.

Luke shared how he started a regular meeting with colleagues to support their online learning initiatives. He indicated:

Every other week we have a brown bag discussion on online learning and we do show and tell. Show me your Blackboard or we’ll talk about Blackboard tracking or we’ll talk about different features. Next semester we’re going to have students
who graduated and took a lot of online classes come in and tell us what they liked and didn’t like.

Lastly, Neil described his experience with colleagues when learning to teach online when he stated, “What I really did was talk to a lot of faculty who are very experienced in online education, so I didn’t go into it with my eyes shut. I pretty much knew what I was getting into.”

Along with the change in perspective that led to a willingness to teach online and the associated learning processes of this change for tenured business faculty, the teaching practices they may have or have not adopted in their face-to-face class due to their experience teaching online is relevant for review. This topic is discussed in greater detail in the following section.

Teaching Online: “A Flipping Experience”

According to the 14 participants of this research study when asked what changes they made to their face-to-face course after having taught online, four indicated they did not make any changes while 10 mentioned that their online teaching experience did impact their face-to-face course.

Flipping the Classroom

For the group that did make changes, they described how the concepts for change with their face-to-face course originated from instructional design staff and how it impacted students. For example, Wayne described his early experience with the idea of “flipping a classroom” when he stated:

Let’s see, there were a couple of folks in our instructional design office and they started to tell me that they heard about people flipping their classroom. They were
doing a lot of stuff online and having a lot of content posted online and then using their class periods for things other than face-to-face lecture. So the idea really came from the instructional design type people. I was intrigued by that. I’m not going to give a face-to-face lecture. They’re all online. I’ve got all my lectures online so students 24/7, they can listen, get the lecture anytime they want to. So in class, that begs the question of what do we do? Well we do cases, we do demonstrations, we solve problems, we answer questions, we do some group activities. Some people call this flipping. I call it flipped and flexible. Flipped because you better read and listen to things before you come to class otherwise you’re not going to get anything out of the class. Flexible, because I don’t make you come to class. You can turn my class into an online class if you like.

Stanley discussed similar sentiments with a flipped classroom and how it impacted his face-to-face classroom when he stated:

You know, the discussion board is not the same as a class, but the advantage of the discussion board is everybody has to say something, something that contributes. Whereas in a classroom it’s always the same five people. I tried doing a flipped classroom where I gave the students the slides with voice overs that I would normally have lectured on in class. So they already had the concepts. They were supposed to go over that before class, and then we had a discussion.

The results were favorable for Stanley’s flipped classroom when asked if he received more interaction in his face-to-face course with the changes. He indicated, “Actually I did. I got a lot more response from the class. We have some good discussions.” Stanley also shared similar sentiments as Wayne about the value of slide presentations being
recorded and available on demand when he mentioned, “That’s one wonderful part about it is, the slides are there for the students to go over as much as they want.”

Other benefits tenured business faculty mentioned about flipped classroom included, “it gave more time for speakers for my face-to-face class or group time” (Bobby). Billy described intently how his use of technology has made his job much easier when he stated:

I have students use Google Drive and I’m going to have them post results of their negotiations in Google Sheet and also take a survey using Google Forms. So I’m willing to expand into these different types of apps, both online and in face-to-face classes because it’s better than counting, like with taking a poll. It’s better than having to raise their right hands and then me going around the room counting how many answered this way or that. I’m not a big fan of the clickers that some people use in the classroom. I have gotten into, not only delivering quizzes and tests online, but also grading them there too. I had some long experience with materials and writing on it and handwriting and all that. Then it just became a whole lot easier to do it on the screen and online.

Billy also described his experience with recorded lectures when he indicated:

I’ve also relied heavily on the recorded lectures in my face-to-face classes so there is even more interactivity in the face-to-face classes than there used to be. I’m not standing up there delivering a lecture for part of the time. I’m telling my students watch the videos at your leisure.

One other benefit noted by Billy regarding the use of recorded lectures is that his university provides a transcript for all lectures. For international students who have
trouble with English being able to spend time listening and then reading a transcript of a lecture is invaluable. Billy noted “I think it helps those students who have some difficulty with English. I think it has improved the student satisfaction with the class. It has made the classroom experience a bit different. I think its improved things.”

Other tenured business faculty interviewed found that online resources were so impactful that they incorporated use of reading material more easily retrieved online as required background reading as preparation for their face-to-face class. For example Marv stated:

I think I probably skewed the syllabus more and more, maybe not consciously, to more background reading. Obviously, the incredible resource of being able to go online on demand and look at an article. For example, I made sure in the strategy course they read the Wall Street Journal. I was hesitant before but online has certain resources, so I was more willing to expect them to use online resources for anything that was timely.

Marv also experienced favorable feedback from student evaluations in his face-to-face course because he would attempt to understand the industry the student was employed by (through online research) and work that into the classroom conversations. Marv noted:

I had a heavy executive program enrollment and I made sure I knew what industry they’re in (students). I would go out of my way to say, hey, what do you think of Hewlett Packard buying……. They did, I think, reflect the fact (in evaluations) that they thought the course was perhaps better because there were references to real-time situations. They look smart at work. You know one guy would come up
and say I was a hit at a Monday morning meeting because I brought that Journal article with me.

In addition to the specific teaching practice changes made by the tenured business faculty in their face-to-face course due to having taught online, there were also other changes made to individual’s practice that will be described in further detail.

**Impact on Practice**

For some of the tenured business faculty, while they did not make specific teaching practice changes in their face-to-face class due to their experience teaching online, there was an impact on their practice that occurred. For example, while Dan did not mention any specific changes to his face-to-face course due to online teaching experience, he did mention he was “learning a little bit about how to manage the online discussion forum in his face-to-face course.” Similarly Charles expressed sentiments about his face-to-face course that he is “trying to be a bit more direct with questions and make sure the questions are understood.” Billy, also expressed how his online teaching experience made him more explicit with his face-to-face course when he stated:

> Trying to adapt a course to online made me make explicit a lot of the things I was doing. So I had to articulate them explicitly so that I knew, the instructional designer knew what all the elements are and what all the goals are and how I was going to assess students. It has made me use rubrics a lot more; rubrics for judging writing, for participation and so on. I have extended those into my face-to-face classes.
Adam, when discussing how he utilized recorded lectures in his face-to-face course, expressed how it has benefitted his practice and learning outcomes for his students. He stated:

It probably has given me a little more time; I wouldn’t say a lot of time because I still mostly deliver the lecture scheduled in the face-to-face. It does free up a little bit of time. I’ve noticed in the last two years that my average grades on testing and quizzes are going up.

Luke also discussed how his face-to-face grading practices were altered due to the use of rubrics from his online course. He noted:

I was somewhat lenient, subjective, in grading in my (face-to-face classes). When I went online I created rubrics for grading and I tried to create objective rubrics and then I carried them over to my face-to-face classes. In my main class there are 31 scoring opportunities or assessments. A higher percentage of failures for sure. It’s students who aren’t doing the work.

Wendy, when describing her experience with changes made in her face-to-face course due to her experience teaching online stated:

I utilized assignment delivery and submission more through our learning platform. It seems like it’s better in the sense that I don’t have to worry about students having not been in class that day. Everyone gets the assignments. It keeps track of submissions for me so I’m not having to deal with paper in the same way and copying. I think it just makes it very clean. Teaching online really forces you to codify your class in terms of what it is you teach and how you teach it. It forces you to look at the whole course and what you want to cover. I think it
made my teaching face-to-face somewhat better because I got a better overall handle on my teaching.

It is evident from the findings provided by the tenured business faculty that teaching online has some positive spillover effects with their face-to-face course. Wayne described his sales pitch for any colleague considering teaching online when he stated:

My sales pitch would extend beyond just an online course in question. It would be that what you do in the online course is going to then transmit out into other ways that you teach. It’s just going to increase your technological IQ. It’s going to get you more current with what your students want to do.

With these findings regarding the benefits of teaching online and how it impacted favorably the tenured business faculty’s face-to-face course in some instances, a follow up to this was the participant’s view of teaching online and its impact on achieving promotions including tenure status.

Tenure Opportunity if Teach Online: “Taking Your Lumps”

Tenure status and teaching online is another area of concern addressed in the qualitative interviews of the tenured business faculty. Specifically, the participants were asked if they would have considered teaching online if they were not already tenured or if teaching online in their view would inhibit them from gaining promotional opportunities. The overall response was that teaching online would not be an inhibitor to promotions or achieving tenure status but with some individual reservations. For example, Chris noted:

If anything I think it would have increased it (tenure status) because I would have realized, hey, the school is going to this online education model. They need
people to teach online. Ultimately it’s the board of trustees; it’s the Dean that makes the ultimate tenure decision.

Similarly, Marv felt that teaching online “would be a plus. We finally got a guy down at that damn business school who is using technology.” Bobby expressed his view that teaching online may give an individual an advantage towards achieving tenure status when he stated:

I think it might even potentially give someone a leg up. If you were untenured and many of the faculty said, “no no no, I don’t want to teach online,” I’m used to face-to-face and you were willing to stick your nose in there and maybe take a few lumps at first just while you got used to it, you could actually make yourself more indispensable, at least within the department in terms of teaching, which could very well help you. The whole tenure process is very much bottom up. There’s a committee at the department and the Department Chair goes with the business school committee and the Dean. If you have a central role in terms of online teaching, that could really help you.

Kurt stated a different opinion in that he believed a candidate would need to have face-to-face instruction experience for tenure consideration. He noted:

A traditional school like a state university, I would say no, you would have to have some face-to-face classroom instruction experience. If they (promotion and tenure committee) looked at somebody’s teaching record and everything was online, I think they would be very, very suspicious about that person and their ability to teach face-to-face.
Wayne expressed his view regarding an untenured person seeking tenure, is that it is the entire portfolio of an individual’s background that makes a difference over a certain period of time. He noted:

Projecting myself back in the role as a Department Chair, whether a person who is coming up for tenure, had an extensive online teaching experience probably as well as some face-to-face, I don’t think that would make any difference to me as I sat down to give my opinion of what their teaching experience had been or their performance had been. I think the concern about the person, an untenured person, comes on the part of that instructor themselves; how have they allocated their time in the best way so that at the end of the six or the seven years their ready to present a good portfolio that will get them tenure. That gets us back to has the development phase of the online classes, has that sapped too much of their time. Wayne had a very different response as to whether he individually would teach online if he had not already achieved tenure status when he noted:

No. Emphatically, no. But that may depend upon the school that you’re talking to. Getting deeply involved in instructional innovations possibly at the expense of continuing to put out research projects would not be a good idea here, for anybody below a full professor.

Neil also shared similar sentiments as Wayne when he indicated:

I wouldn’t have done it. Because not being tenured, it’s really about your research. The nice thing about teaching a class is you know exactly when it is. And if you don’t have office hours on a certain day, you can close your door and pretty much be a research day on Tuesdays, Thursdays, whatever. Another thing,
too, is risk. If you’re a non-tenured faculty and you’re on tenure track, you tend to be very risk averse. I mean, here’s a different format and a lot of people tend not to get the evaluation you would teaching in class. That’s a statistical fact. You want to get good teaching evaluations. I think for those years you want to teach something you are very comfortable with and works for you. You want to have a model and not make a lot of changes to it. That’s a very pragmatic approach.

In terms of research and the amount of time faculty spend teaching online, for example, versus time to research for publication, Stanley protects his tenure track faculty. He stated:

I try to protect them from anything that would take away from research. So I’ve given them all a course release every year. They teach three sections instead of four. I try to give them as much as possible the same section to teach every time.

At Stanley’s university, which is more of a research institution, he noted “publication is how you get tenure. Your teaching evaluations have virtually no impact on tenure unless they’re really, really bad.”

Marv reiterated the viewpoint of publication is how you get tenure from his experience when he stated:

The pressure, the publish or perish pressure, which I first got exposed to at the University of California, I was shocked, is still there. The accrediting boys still have it on their checklist. It’s fascinating. I don’t think any business schools would substitute, well, that’s ok, he doesn’t do any publishing but he teaches all his courses online. I don’t think that will happen. The publish or perish stuff is with us to stay I think.
Some of the participants had a different response regarding the time and effort to teach online taking away from research responsibilities which demonstrates this concern depends on the University’s orientation toward research or teaching. For example, Chris affirmed this viewpoint when he indicated:

That’s a function of the school that we are teaching for. My institution is a very teaching oriented school. We do have our research obligations but they are pretty minimal. We only have to have three intellectual contributions in a five-year period. Two of them need to be refereed journal articles. I don’t think learning to teach online would in any way interfere with getting that amount of research done.

The tenured business faculty viewpoint on teaching online and gaining tenure or promotions is interesting. While they do not see that teaching online should be an inhibitor to gaining promotion and tenure and some expressed it should be a plus, several note individual concerns about how teaching online would have possibly inhibited their own career potential. While some of the tenured business faculty would not have taught online had they not already been tenured, they did ultimately agree to teach online after reconsidering prior viewpoints and had their perceptions of the educational medium altered to some degree.

In the last section, the final research question of how transformative learning brings understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses is addressed.
Tenured Business Faculty: “The Big Transformation”

The final research question for this study was to understand what led tenured business faculty to a perspective change and a potential perspective transformation with teaching in an online environment. A perspective transformation is the change that occurs within our core to make sense of our experience, due to a disorienting dilemma that causes a person to question their long standing beliefs and assumptions (Taylor, 2008). For the tenured business faculty who participated in this research, their perspective change to teach online occurred due to reflection on various factors which provided the opportunity for a perspective transformation. These factors included, new perspectives due to reflection on their individual identity as an educator and a sense of responsibility to their employer, ownership of their curriculum, avoiding obsolescence and being a part of something new and remaining relevant. Additionally, reflection about helping to meet needs for students, and improved technological capabilities also contributed to a change in viewpoint. Lastly, a perspective change also occurred through receipt of incentives offered by the institution to develop online courses.

New Perspectives

For tenured business faculty, reflection did occur when considering teaching in an online environment. For example, reflection occurred over several years for Neil before he started teaching online. He noted:

I’ve been thinking about it for years and years, so start kind of formulating your thoughts and kind of wrapping my head around the whole idea of online. I’ve probably been doing that for three or four years before I started teaching online. Now one day, actually my thinking started to change. I wasn’t getting any
younger, I saw the way that education seemed to be going. I’m not gonna do a
University of Phoenix type model. Forget that. It has to be something good.

Neil then went on to describe his thoughts after the Director approached him to see if he
would consider teaching online, when he stated:

That got me thinking because I did respect him very much. I didn’t think he was
trying to sell me a bill of goods. I respected him a lot, so that got me thinking, and
then also, it’s flattering to be approached, it really is.

Neil further elaborated about why he decided to take on the challenge of teaching online.
He noted:

I really wanted the challenge. I wanted to challenge myself to do it. You don’t
want to stagnate. You want to do something different and remain relevant and
vibrant as an instructor. I’ve been teaching undergraduate strategy for like 20
years. I enjoy doing it, but after a while it’s like, let’s try something else, just to
keep it fresh. But I was looking around at the instructors who were doing it and I
had a lot of respect for them. They were good instructors, but none of them were
better than me. They were just teaching differently. And I go, well, if they can
succeed on this, geez, I can do it too. I wanted the flexibility. Everybody talks
flexibility, flexibility, flexibility. I can continue to teach this residential class here
in Erie, Pennsylvania in the spring semester which is cruel because it’s the middle
of winter or if this is really flexible, I can grab the laptop, get in the car and go to
some warmer place and teach. I can kind of be a transportable teacher. That was
very appealing to me, so that was part of the motivation, too.
Chris provided similar sentiments regarding flexibility with teaching online due to commuting concerns. He indicated “A lot of faculty have to commute a pretty good distance to get here. So for some of them teaching online gives them the huge advantage of not having to come to campus.” Chris also indicated a willingness to be open, try new things in order to improve or enhance his individual skills which led to overcoming initial resistance to the educational medium. Chris shared this sentiment when he stated:

If I thought I would be given instruction on how to use the technology and if I thought I would be given appropriate assistance I would not be resistant. I don’t know, you know, the world progresses. I’m always willing to try to learn new things.

Wayne, expressed concerns rising from his face-to-face experience as to why he considered teaching online after approximately “a year’s incubation” and why now he enjoys teaching in an online environment. He stated:

Well you know, it’s kind of a confluence of several things. I would have to say it was born out of frustration of the face-to-face environment. The face-to-face environment, particularly in the subject I teach, Business and Economic Statistics, can be very frustrating. I just kind of got frustrated with playing the role of the town crier so to speak. You just can’t do enough applications, practice and demos with them so that had been frustrating for a number of years. Once I saw what the online world could do I went in. I just went all in. I pushed all my chips in and said ok, I’m taking that online stuff and I’m changing forever the face-to-face.

Wendy expressed her thoughts about teaching online and how it offered a new challenge and something new to learn. She indicated, “An online course is something different,
something challenging, something new to do, something new to learn. I’m very interested in technology. I thought, okay, this will be very cool.”

Fred expressed his viewpoint regarding teaching online having relevance for his career when he noted:

I thought it would grow in significance in the future and we were getting in early with this IMBA and it would grow in significance in the future and therefore wouldn’t be bad to have that skill set in case I needed it later.

Bobby shared similar sentiments with teaching online and giving it a try to not only help his career but also his institution when he noted:

I said ok, I’ll give it a shot. I guess I always in the back of my mind thought that well if it’s a real disaster, I’ll just bale out. But you know, I’ll do my sixth one in a row starting this spring. What’s interesting is once in a while I say who is going to take my place and can I get anybody else involved. I am 60 and not going anywhere. So I think I’ll be teaching it for a while longer. But I figured it’s like a coach. It’s always good to have a backup and we don’t really have one.

Luke also expressed his sentiments regarding beginning an online curriculum due to declining funding from the state in order to assist his institution. He indicated:

I’m probably the biggest proponent of online education. When I started thinking about it, I got into online in order to drive enrollment at the university. Four years ago a new president came to the university. The university is about 15,000 students, and he noticed that we were getting less funding from the state. As a result, he said we need to grow online. I proposed two online degrees and we’ve been working toward that ever since.
Dan, expressed his viewpoint about how his Dean was speaking about online learning and how his comments caused him to reflect. He noted:

One of our Dean’s was talking about the landscape change that came along with online learning and how perhaps, he was an older faculty member and he could sleep through this whole online thing and retire and everything would be fine, but not everyone can or should be doing that and that resonated with me a little bit. I said, you know I think I’d like to try online teaching and maybe a one credit course that really meshes with my research interest might be a good entry point.

Billy also described his opinion regarding tenured faculty engaging in online education. He indicated:

I think that there’s a lot to be said for being taught by a tenured faculty member, someone with a lot of experience in doing research and involved in the life of the university as well. That doesn’t take anything away from those other instructors who do a great job, but I do think that tenured faculty should engage in this kind of education, know what it’s about. Part of the reason I did it was because I wanted to be able to critique it from a knowledgeable point of view. Now I can talk about the pros and cons.

Wendy shared similar sentiments regarding tenured faculty teaching online. She stated:

“My view is I think it’s important that tenured faculty teach online. It’s a different course when I’m teaching those two intro courses one online and one face-to-face. It’s two totally different preparations in so many ways. I think it’s important that tenured faculty have that experience.”
Reflection leading to a new perspective to teach online also was stated to occur for the tenured business faculty due to a desire to help to meet needs for students to reach their academic goals. This view was especially evident when Bobby stated, “It’s just online education’s really here to stay. I mean, it does really meet a need for students in terms of graduation, remote sites, that kind of stuff.” Similarly, Billy shared his thoughts about helping students. He reflected:

You would be helping students who may need this because they’re stay at home moms who have to finish their degree, or they’re people with full-time jobs who can’t commute to the campus. You know, a whole variety of situations. Not to mention people who have physical handicaps. So there are some rewards and, I just feel like, at my age, I’m glad to be learning new stuff. It keeps my mind active.

Neil shared similar comments when he discussed trying something new would benefit himself and students. He stated:

I could do the same old thing for the next 15 years until they kick me out because I was senile, right? Or, I could try something new that would kind of reinvigorate me and teach me a number of things and be good for students, too.

The tenured business faculty stated how online education benefits students however, as noted in the above examples, it has also benefitted faculty by learning new technological skills that enhanced the student learning experience in the online courses they taught.

One of the resistance factors expressed by the participants to teaching online initially was that the course would not translate online or that the interview participants did not feel like they could replicate the face-to-face experience. However, as they began to
participate and teach online, learn the technology and understand what the capabilities were from a technological standpoint, a new perspective developed. Billy described his experience:

The big difference was Web Ex. I wasn’t aware of this technology or the possibilities of it (initially). Maybe there are other platforms that are just as good, this just happens to be the one my university pushes. But, I realized after a discussion with the head of the program and the instructional designer, that there were real possibilities to make it interactive, as opposed to something where you’re really remote from the students and only interacting with them through email. So as the technology has advanced and has made it much more possible to teach my course.

Wayne shared similar thoughts about how advances in technology allowed him to consider teaching online. He noted:

So finally the technology got there, my interest got there, and now we can create lectures, put them out online and now we can spend class periods doing, in the long run, I think is the better thing to do. That’s the applications, the cases and the group work. It was kind of a confluence of frustration and the availability of these new technological tools that kind of pushed me over the edge. The beauty of the technology is we have the tools to make the transition.

Wayne further elaborated on his institutions use of technology and the assistance they provide in support of faculty also playing a significant role in his change in perspective to teach online when he mentioned, “That is the one thing they got right at the offset. They had people that would do that (administrative work) for us.”
Providing the tenured business faculty with the necessary technical support and training, taking care of certifying proctors for example, “Nitty gritty administrative work” (Wayne) was what allowed Wayne, for example, to realize teaching online could work. Wayne stated:

They (instructional designers) showed me how you could use Adobe technology to create lectures and embed videos. They came to my office and showed how to record over stuff and edit and it was great. I mean I had just a great time. OK, now I get it. This is where were going. I did have to be led by the hand, but not very far and then I could see that this was a big deal.

Lastly, Adam relayed his thoughts regarding use of Adobe Connect and how that influenced him to continue to teach online. He noted:

The very first time I taught a class I had to use Voice Thread, but as soon as I saw Adobe Connect that was the reason I was willing to do a second class and to revise my first class. I got to the point where I said okay this technology will allow me to deliver the class not exactly like I do face-to-face, but it will help me get the most of the way there.

In addition to technological enhancements contributing to a change in perspective for the participants, incentives offered by the various employers also played a role in a change in perspective to teach online.

**Incentives**

Of the 14 tenured business faculty interviewed, 11 indicated they received an incentive to participate in an online course in some manner. For example, Fred advised, “they paid us 11 percent of salary to create the course. If it’s on load it’s just part of your
regular load but if its overload it’s 11 percent of salary.” Similarly, Adam stated, “the first class I designed and delivered online I did get an incentive to do that, but they don’t offer that now. It’s just part of our assignment.” Luke also indicated at his institution, “You get paid $3,000 if you design your course using Quality Matters and therefore that requires some learner to learner interaction, some clarity, and some structure. We would not have been as successful without the incentive.” Chris also provided perspective about incentives applying at his institution only when developing a course online for the first time. He indicated:

The only thing that there’s incentive for is if you are developing a course to be taught online for the first time you get a couple of thousand dollars. It’s not a whole lot. For example, I got an additional $2,500 or something like that to put my course online. I think they could provide more financial incentives.

Stanley advised at his institution tenured faculty willing to teach online are provided incentives to initiate online classes. He stated:

The Dean would give $5,000 salary supplement in the summer for somebody to create an online class. That got a lot of people creating, to get over the hump. Most business faculty I know are pretty flexible. They’re really happy to teach something online if that’s what’s needed and they get the proper incentives doing it.

Kurt described a similar scenario regarding how his institution provided incentives for the various disciplines to develop online courses. He stated:

The University decided that if a school developed an online course it would get an allocation out of the tuition payment for that course. It was significant. That got
the Dean’s attention because now you have some money above and beyond a normal budget that you could use to fund research, summer teaching, summer research grants. I found out we could make it good quality. You put a financial incentive out there, that helps.

Wayne advised that his institution provided an incentive to teach online by providing a flat rate per student, however he realized the financial reward was not the incentive, it was how he could improve his craft that was the enticement to teach online. He indicated:

They pay by the head. It was piece rate work. I think I got maybe $150 a student, something like that. And that’s fine. It’s not like the online classes were huge. I suppose the most I ever had at any one time in the online classes may be 20. But I quickly realized that it’s not the money that’s going to keep me in this game. It’s how I can transform in general the way I teach. You know there are other things to do with our time, pursue research grants and things like that, which would pay a heck of a lot more for the time spent on the effort than getting $150 a head for teaching an online class. It’s more that you see it as an opportunity to expand your own skill set and maybe adapt what you’re learning in that space, the online space into your traditional classroom space. I could see that right away and that’s why I say once I got a taste of it I just went all in.

While the institutions utilized incentives to assist in the development of online coursework at the various institutions, the tenured group did not universally view the incentive as a reward but as in Wayne’s case, as a means to improve or enhance individual skillset, and also the learning experience for their students.
Summary

In summary, this chapter provided a synopsis of the qualitative findings of this study. Upon completion of the qualitative interviews the findings suggest that tenured business faculty resisted teaching online initially due to, the time and effort to design and implement an online course, not being able to replicate the face-to-face experience online, the inflexibility of online coursework and not being able to deviate from the course syllabus, and negative faculty perceptions over the quality of education not being as rich an experience as face-to-face. Additionally, a degree of social bias was noted with the participants who expressed their preference for face-to-face coursework as the better educational method for students, however, they all agreed to teach their courses online to benefit their institution and their students. Also, the economic pressure to implement online curriculum in their view led to questionable learning outcomes. Reliance on technology to interact with students was also noted as a potential detriment with quality of the educational experience online. Tenured business faculty began to reconsider teaching online when the institution they were employed by requested they teach their course online. This was a source of flattery for some of the tenured business faculty and enhanced their identity as an educator. However, it was also a seen as a responsibility to serve their institution and assist them in implementing a strategic business goal to aid the institutions revenue base. There was also a sense of ownership tied to their individual course and wanting it to be a success online. There was a desire amongst the participants to not become obsolete or irrelevant as online education and teaching online continues to evolve in higher education across the country. Learning to teach online involved instrumental knowledge as the various institutions provided tenured business faculty with
training initiatives to teach online. Emotional learning occurred when learning to teach online in the sense of addressing the fear of doing something new and gaining confidence to take the first step to teach in an online environment. Learning also occurred through dialogue with colleagues which increased the educator’s confidence level. The second and third sections addressed the impact teaching online had for tenured business faculty and their face-to-face classroom as well as tenure opportunity. The themes that emerged from these sections included what is described as a “flipping experience.” The educator’s utilized new techniques learned from their online course to offer more time for in-class activities in their face-to-face course for students and impacted their teaching practice which overall made the experience much more robust both for student and teacher. The view of the participants if teaching online would have impacted their ability to achieve tenure status was mixed but the prevailing finding was that teaching online would not impact a person’s chances of gaining tenure status and in fact may enhance their opportunities. The fourth section suggests how transformative learning brings understanding to tenured business faculty that initially resisted teaching online and now do so without hesitation. The themes suggest that a key aspect of a change in perspective and a potential perspective transformation was the educator’s reflection on their individual identity as an educator and a sense of responsibility to their employer, ownership of their curriculum, participating in online education in order to be part of something new and relevant, helping to meet needs of students, improved technological capabilities, and lastly proper incentives afforded by tenured business faculty’s employer in providing motivation to consider teaching online.
These findings provided a foundation for the development of the quantitative portion of this study, which involved distribution of a survey. The ways in which these findings informed the development of the survey as well as the findings of the survey research are presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

The purpose of this mixed methods research study was two-fold: one, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments. To support this purpose, the following research questions framed this study, including:

1. For tenured business faculty, who initially resisted online education but later reconsidered and now teach online:
   a) What were the resistance factors to teaching in an online environment?
   b) What factors contributed to a change in perspective and what was the learning process associated with this change?

2. How has teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment?

3. How does transformative learning bring understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses?

For this research study, the exploratory sequential design was the most appropriate. In an exploratory sequential mixed methods design, a qualitative phase was used as the initial starting point and a quantitative second phase was utilized to explore the purpose of the study among a wider pool of participants. This design is based on the premise that a qualitative first phase is needed because there are unknown variables and
assumptions about a change in mindset tenured business faculty may or may not undergo that warrant further exploration and understanding before a quantitative survey can be constructed (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The qualitative findings from the interviews of tenured business faculty were presented in Chapter 4. The quantitative section of this study sought to indicate significance with each of the research questions of a wider range of participants as well as verify the findings from the qualitative interviews of tenured business faculty. The method in which this study achieved these results is discussed in the following section.

Collecting and Analyzing Quantitative Data

As this study utilized an exploratory sequential design, it is appropriate to discuss how the qualitative portion of this study informed the design of the quantitative survey. This section will also describe how this data was analyzed and the tests utilized in the analysis process. This section will also include an outline for the remaining sections of this chapter.

The quantitative survey developed for this study was constructed based on the findings from the qualitative interviews conducted of tenured business faculty and research questions of this study. To summarize, tenured business faculty resisted teaching online initially due to the time and effort to design and implement an online course, not being able to replicate the face-to-face experience online, the inflexibility of online coursework, namely not being able to deviate from the course syllabus, and negative faculty perceptions over the quality of education not being as rich an experience as face-to-face coursework. A degree of social bias was noted with the participants who expressed their preference for face-to-face coursework as the better educational method.
for students; however, they all agreed to teach their courses online to benefit their institution and their students. Also, the economic pressure to implement online curriculum in their view led to questionable learning outcomes. Reliance on technology to interact with students was also noted as a potential detriment with quality of the educational experience online. The survey was developed to address these initial resistance factors with questions regarding concerns and beliefs with teaching online.

From the qualitative interviews it was determined that tenured business faculty began to reconsider to learn how to teach online when the institution they were employed by requested they teach their courses online. Tenured business faculty learned to teach online by various means. These means included instrumental learning, emotional learning and through dialogue with colleagues. One such method of instrumental learning occurred through training initiatives provided by the faculty’s institution. Emotional learning occurred when learning how to teach online in the sense of addressing the fear of doing something new and gaining confidence to take the first step to teach in an online environment. Learning how to teach online also occurred through dialogue with colleagues which increased the educator’s confidence level. The survey was developed to address these findings with questions focusing on factors considered to learn to teach online.

Additionally, the qualitative interviews explored the impact teaching online had for tenured business faculty and their face-to-face classroom and how transformative learning brings understanding to tenured business faculty that initially resisted teaching online and now do so without hesitation. The theme that emerged for the impact of teaching online were the educator’s utilized new techniques learned from their online
course to offer more time for in-class activities in their face-to-face course. A key aspect along with a change in perspective about teaching online was the educator’s reflection on their identity as an educator. The survey addressed these findings through questions pertaining to the impact of teaching online and factors that changed perspective to teach online/transformation. Once the survey was constructed, a pilot group of local college professors, dissertation committee members as well as a statistician reviewed the survey for accuracy and flow. The major sections of the survey are summarized below in Table 1 A and Table 1 B respectively.

Table 1A.

Survey Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns With Teaching Online</th>
<th>Career Concerns With Teaching Online</th>
<th>Beliefs About Teaching Online</th>
<th>Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Work</td>
<td>Place at a Disadvantage</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes More Time</td>
<td>Inhibits Tenure</td>
<td>Preference-Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Support/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Experience</td>
<td>Teach if not Tenured</td>
<td>or Online</td>
<td>Web/Video Conf. Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure Teach Online</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flexible Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Promotional Opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online is as effective as</td>
<td>Dept. Needs Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Enhance Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously Taken Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested to Teach Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1B.  
Survey Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Impact of Teaching Online</th>
<th>Factors That Changed Perspective (To Teach Online)</th>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Demographics-Personal/Job Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online teaching impact on Face-to-Face (F2F)</td>
<td>Changed View of Effectiveness</td>
<td>Time to Reflect</td>
<td>Personal: Race, Gender, Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record lectures</td>
<td>Maintain Control of Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Related: Tenure Status, Rank, Years teaching online and F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web/Video Conf. Tools</td>
<td>Dialogue with Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location, Level of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>Concern (Less Relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Discipline, Type of Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Interactive Group Activities</td>
<td>Growing Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Detailed Syllabus</td>
<td>Inst. Requirement to Teach Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Exams</td>
<td>Positive Feedback Improved Technology Capabilities Promote Student Learning Tenured – reasons for successful online experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey questions (see Appendix C) were constructed around the themes mentioned above. The number of questions per theme were: Concerns-Teaching Online and Career Concerns with Teaching Online (4), Beliefs About Teaching Online (4), Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online (4), The Impact of Teaching Online (2), Changed Perspective to Teach Online/Transformation (4), and Demographics, personal and job related questions were also asked to gain necessary background on the participants (12).

The research questions of this study sought to understand tenured business faculty resistance to teaching in an online environment, the factors that contributed to a change in
perspective and the learning process associated with this change. Additionally, how teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment. Lastly, how transformative learning brings understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses. With these research questions, exploratory hypotheses were created. The exploratory hypotheses guiding the quantitative portion of this study and corresponding statistical tests include:

**Research Question 1.a.** For tenured business faculty, who initially resisted online education but later reconsidered and now teach online: What were the resistance factors to teaching in an online environment?

*Concerns and Beliefs:*

_Hypothesis 1:_ A difference will exist with concerns to teaching online between tenured and all other business faculty.

_Hypothesis 2:_ A difference will exist between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty with their preference for face-to-face coursework over online coursework.

_Hypothesis 3:_ A difference will exist between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty that believe it important that tenured business faculty teach online to benefit higher education.

_Hypothesis 4:_ A difference will exist between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty who believe online education is as effective in providing quality learning outcomes as traditional face-to-face coursework.
Research Question 1.b. For tenured business faculty, who initially resisted online education but later reconsidered and now teach online: What factors contributed to a change in perspective and what was the learning process associated with this change?

Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online:

Hypothesis 5: A difference will exist between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty for the specific factors considered in the learning process to teach online.

Research Question 2. How has teaching online impacted tenured business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment?

The Impact of Teaching Online:

Hypothesis 6: Teaching online classes will predict altered teaching practices utilized in a face-to-face course by tenured business faculty.

Research Question 3. How does transformative learning bring understanding to tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses?

Factors that Changed Perspective to Teach Online:

Hypothesis 7: Time taken to reflect by tenured business faculty will predict a change in perspective to teach online.

The data analysis and statistical tests utilized to analyze the hypotheses will be described in further detail in the following section.

Data Analysis and Statistical Tests

A number of statistical tests were conducted to analyze and report the data gathered through IBM SPSS Version 24 software. Univariate descriptive tests were
conducted on all 32 questions. The majority (10) used a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A five point Likert scale ranging from extremely important to no opinion or not applicable was used on three questions and a Likert range of always to never was utilized for one question. Additional questions included, (4) open-ended, (2) yes or no, (4) check all that apply and (8) choose one answer applied. Inferential statistics were also conducted. Two-Way Chi-Square was utilized to test if differences exist between cells in a crosstabulations table with nominal variables. Independent *t*-tests (parametric) and Mann Whitney U (non-parametric) were utilized to analyze a nominal variable with two independent levels and an interval variable to compare if mean differences exist between two groups. Mann Whitney U is utilized when normal distribution assumptions are not met. Pearson Correlation (parametric) and Spearman’s rho correlation were conducted to determine if a linear relationship (correlation) exists between two interval variables. Spearman’s rho is utilized when normal distribution assumptions are not met. Lastly, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was utilized to determine which variables were more predictive in impacting the dependent variable (Field, 2013). Significance levels were adjusted for tests including all business faculty to reduce the probability of a Type I error from $p \leq .05$ to $p \leq .001$ due to the number of respondents in the survey ($N=206$). For tests conducted of tenured business faculty only, alpha remained at $p \leq .05$ ($n=92$).

**Presentation of the Findings**

The quantitative results discussed in this chapter will be presented in two sections. The first section will demonstrate the descriptive statistics for the major categories outlined in the survey followed by the inferential statistical analysis of the applicable
hypotheses statements which apply to each research question. The inferential analysis included the statistical tests mentioned above. The final section will provide a summary of the findings.

**Descriptive/Inferential Statistics**

In order to gain an understanding of the background of the participants with this quantitative study, demographic information will be presented first. Upon completion of the demographic analysis, descriptive statistics for the remainder of the major components of the survey will be offered to provide a context for the inferential statistical analysis. From a demographic standpoint, the survey participant’s mean age was 51 years (range 25 to 80). The majority of respondents (77.2%) were White/Caucasian almost equally split between male and female. Of the respondents who responded as tenured professors, 93.5% had an academic rank of Full or Associate Professor. Slightly more than 74% of the respondents worked within the Management academic discipline and the remainder from a mixture of Economics, Finance, and Marketing. The participants have taught both at the undergraduate and graduate level (76.2%), primarily at public not-for-profit institutions (57.6%). The survey was distributed world-wide. Within the United States the mid-west had the highest response rate of 19.1%. Second highest was the southwestern portion of the United States at 14.7%. Over 17 countries outside the United States participated in the survey. These countries included: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, England, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Trinidad & Tobago. The most responses received from these 17 countries were from Australia (12). In terms of the number of years teaching online the median years taught was four for the respondents with a mode
of one year (range six months to 20 years). In terms of the number of years teaching face-to-face courses the average (mean) years taught was almost 16 for the respondents (range 1 to 45 years) and a mode of 20 years. See Table 2 for a summary of years teaching for the respondents.

Table 2.

*Teaching Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean/Median/Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching Online</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>Median=4; Mode=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching Face-to-Face</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>Mean =16; Mode=20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A crosstabulation Two-Way Chi-Square analysis between tenure and all other business faculty was conducted on the demographic categories of race, gender, level of education taught, academic discipline, academic rank, type of institution and location to determine if any differences existed with the various categories. No significant differences were indicated to exist between the two faculty groups and the demographic variables listed above with the exception of the level of education taught and academic rank. For level of education taught a significant difference existed with a larger percentage of tenured business faculty teaching at the graduate level than all other business faculty. For academic rank a significant difference existed for the tenured group achieving Full Professor or Associate Professor rank at a higher percentage than the all other business faculty group. This result appears to be appropriate given the tenured rank of the faculty surveyed. Table 3 summarizes the results.
Table 3.

**Demographic Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Discipline</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*results significant for p<.001

For the other major sections of the survey, concerns, beliefs, factors considered to learn to teach online, the impact of teaching online, and changed perspective/transformation to teach online, the descriptive statistics for each topic will be offered first followed by the inferential analysis to test the associated hypothesis. The concerns and various resistance factors with teaching online will be described first.

**Concerns with Teaching Online**

Within the qualitative findings several of the tenured business faculty described the concerns that they had initially to begin to teach in an online environment. As a result of these concerns, the survey included one question pertaining to this topic. The question was stated as: (a) If you have concerns with teaching online courses, check all the concerns that apply.
Table 4.

*Concerns with Teaching Online*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes More Time</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Work</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flexible Syllabus</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Course Format</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 4 the findings suggest that the highest level of concern regarding teaching online with business faculty stems from quality of education. Quality of education (65.5%) included concerns regarding a lack of face-to-face contact with students online, emulating the classroom experience, and concerns with cheating including overall academic honesty with students in an online environment. Lack of support in terms of training and set up from the university also are included under quality of education from comments offered in the survey. The amount of time (39.8%) and work (30.1%) associated with teaching online and working with technology (25.2%) were the next highest categories of concern noted. Less flexible syllabus (18%) referred to the need to have an online class constructed well in advance of the start of the course and little flexibility to make changes as the course progressed throughout the semester. Accelerated course format (17%), grading (17%), and lack of experience (12.1%)
rounded out the remainder of the responses. To analyze authenticity of business faculty and their concerns with teaching online, Hypothesis 1 was tested.

To test this hypothesis, a Two-Way Chi-Square test was utilized to analyze if differences exist in resistance to teaching online between tenure and all other business faculty groups and the various nominal variables listed in Table 4. This is of interest for this research study because it will assist in understanding the experiences of all business faculty surveyed and if the tenured group showed different patterns of resistance or concern to teaching online. Based on the findings from the Two-Way Chi-Square analysis, a significant difference was not indicated between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty for the various categories of concern with teaching online. Thus, H1 cannot be confirmed. It is clear that the majority of business faculty (tenured and all other) do have concerns with teaching online as only 12.6% of the faculty surveyed indicated they did not have at least one concern. Below is the crosstabulation analysis by category and faculty group including the related Two-Way Chi-Square significance level as indicated in Table 5.
Table 5.

**Concerns with Teaching Online**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes More Time</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Work</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Technology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Flexible Syllabus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Course Format</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Experience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific career concerns with teaching online were also noted by the survey participants. These career concerns are analyzed next amongst all business faculty surveyed.

**Career Concerns with Teaching Online**

The survey participants were also asked to answer three questions pertaining to individual career and promotional status in relation to teaching online. The questions were stated as: (a) Teaching online courses places me at a disadvantage later in my career. (b) Teaching online courses will inhibit my ability to achieve tenure status. (c) If you are a tenured faculty member would you be likely to teach online if you were not tenured.
The descriptive statistical results for the questions are described below in Table 6 and Table 7 respectively.

Table 6.

*Career Concerns with Teaching Online*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Concerns</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SoA</th>
<th>NAD</th>
<th>SoD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Places me at a Disadvantage</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5 (2.4)</td>
<td>18 (8.7)</td>
<td>44 (21.4)</td>
<td>40 (19.4)</td>
<td>99 (48.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibit Ability to Achieve Tenure</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6 (2.9)</td>
<td>13 (6.3)</td>
<td>32 (15.5)</td>
<td>19 (9.2)</td>
<td>59 (28.6)</td>
<td>77 (37.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are percentages. SA=Strongly Agree, SoA= Somewhat Agree, NAD=Neither Agree nor Disagree, SoD=Somewhat Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree, NA=Not Applicable.

As presented in Table 6 for Places me at a Disadvantage, the majority of business faculty either strongly (48.1%) or somewhat disagreed (19.4%) representing a total of 67.5% that teaching online courses would place them at a disadvantage later in their career. Only a total of 11.1% of the respondents either strongly (2.4%) or somewhat agreed (8.7%) and slightly more than 20% did not agree or disagree.

For Inhibit Ability to Achieve Tenure, Table 6 demonstrates that for the business faculty surveyed, the majority (37.8%) either strongly (28.6%) or somewhat disagreed (9.2%) that teaching online inhibited their ability to achieve tenure status while 37.4% did not find the question as applicable to their ability to achieve tenure status. Only 9.2% of business faculty strongly (2.9%) or somewhat agreed (6.3%) while 15.5% were indifferent.
Table 7.

Career Concerns with Teaching Online- Likely to Teach Online if not Tenured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Likely nor Unlikely</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unlikely</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unlikely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For career concerns with teaching online and if business faculty were likely to teach online if not tenured, in Table 7 the indication is that a majority of the business faculty (63.1%) did not believe that this question was either applicable (45.1%) or neither likely nor unlikely (18%). Business faculty did believe (27.7%) that it was extremely (14.1%) to somewhat likely (13.6%) that they would still teach online if not tenured. Only 9.2% indicated that it was extremely (2.9%) to somewhat unlikely (6.3%) that they would teach online if not tenured.

In summary, for career concerns with teaching online, business faculty did not report that teaching online would place them at a disadvantage later in their career or inhibit their ability to achieve tenure status. Those who believed the question was applicable or were not indifferent and achieved tenure status would still choose to teach online if not tenured.
In order to gain a more in depth understanding of the business faculty’s beliefs regarding teaching online, four questions were asked addressing their preference for teaching courses face-to-face, online, their view regarding if tenured business faculty should teach online and if they believe online education provides equivalent learning outcomes as compared with face-to-face coursework. The descriptive statistical and inferential analysis for these questions are analyzed further.

**Beliefs About Teaching Online**

The business faculty surveyed were asked to address four questions to gain an understanding of their view of their preference for teaching courses in a traditional environment versus online as well as their concerns regarding the quality of education for teaching and learning online. These questions were stated as: (a) I prefer to teach in a face-to-face environment rather than online. (b) I prefer to teach in an online environment rather than face-to-face. (c) It is important that tenured faculty teach online courses to benefit higher education. (d) I believe online education is as effective in providing students with quality learning outcomes as traditional face-to-face coursework.

For business faculty surveyed, a large majority of the respondents indicated that they either strongly or somewhat agree (64.6%) that they would prefer to teach in a face-to-face environment rather than online. Only 11.2% of the participants strongly or somewhat disagreed that they preferred to teach face-to-face rather than online while 24.3% neither agreed nor disagreed. The counterpart to this question to prefer to teach in an online environment rather than face-to face revealed reciprocal results. The majority (57.8%) indicated they either strongly or somewhat disagreed with the statement while only 13.6% indicated they strongly or somewhat agreed with the statement. A larger
portion neither agreed nor disagreed with this question (28.6%). For the question that it is important that tenured faculty teach online courses to benefit higher education, 51.7% of the business faculty either strongly or somewhat agreed while only 15.6% strongly or somewhat disagreed. The remainder neither agreed nor disagreed. Lastly, business faculty were asked if they believe online education is as effective in providing students with quality learning outcomes as traditional face-to-face coursework. The results were business faculty by a slight margin (50%) strongly to somewhat agreed to 39.2% strongly to somewhat disagreed. The remainder neither agreed nor disagreed. Thus, the majority of the business faculty surveyed indicated they prefer to teach face-to-face over online courses and they believe the most experienced faculty (tenured) should teach online to benefit higher education. In keeping with this sentiment of benefitting higher education by having tenured faculty teach online, only a slight majority do believe that online education is as effective in providing students with quality learning outcomes. To analyze authenticity of business faculty between tenured and all other faculty groups regarding their beliefs with teaching online Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 were tested.

To test these hypotheses a Two-Way Chi-Square analysis was completed to determine if a difference exists between tenured and non-tenured business faculty in terms of their view with a preference for teaching face-to-face, if tenured business faculty should teach online and if online education offers equivalent learning outcomes as face-to-face. These tests were conducted to determine if differences exist within the two categories of business faculty to clarify if beliefs regarding resistance to online education vary amongst the categories of business faculty. Based on the findings from the Two-Way Chi-Square analysis, a significant difference was not indicated between tenured
business faculty and all other business faculty thus, maintaining a consistent pattern of belief amongst the different faculty groups for the various hypotheses. Below is the crosstabulation by category including the frequency number by faculty group type and the related Two-Way Chi-Square significance level as indicated in Table 8. As a significant difference did not exist between tenured and all other business faculty, hypothesis 2, 3 and 4 cannot be confirmed.

Table 8.

Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Face-to Face Over Online</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Teach Online</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online as Effective</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While both tenured and all other business faculty had concerns with teaching online, preferred teaching in a face-to-face environment, and believe that tenured business faculty should teach online to benefit higher education, the participants did indicate they believed online education offers equivalent learning outcomes as face-to-face. Thus, while many resistance factors applied with teaching online, the participants of the survey all eventually taught online coursework. With this, an analysis of what factors business faculty considered when learning to teach online is appropriate.

Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online

The survey participants were asked to answer four questions pertaining to the factors considered to learn to teach online. The questions were stated as: (a) How
important were the following factors when you considered teaching online classes?

(Institutional Support, Use of Web/Video Conferencing Tools, Incentives, Promotional Opportunities, Department Needs Your Class, Enhance Your Skills, Previously Taken Online Course as a Student, Requested by Dean or Academic Director to Teach Online, Flexible Schedule) (b) My institution has a formal strategy to develop and make online education a viable educational medium for students. (c) My institution provides an appropriate level of training and support for me to teach effectively online. (d) Does your institution provide incentives to teach online coursework? If so what type?

For question (a) when considering learning to teach online, the business faculty results by category are displayed in Table 9 below.

Table 9.

Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support/Training</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>95(46.1)</td>
<td>60(29.1)</td>
<td>38(18.4)</td>
<td>9(4.4)</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web/Video Conferencing</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>68(33)</td>
<td>56(27.2)</td>
<td>42(20.4)</td>
<td>35(17)</td>
<td>5(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>25(12.1)</td>
<td>43(20.9)</td>
<td>45(21.8)</td>
<td>80(38.8)</td>
<td>13(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Opportunities</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>7(3.4)</td>
<td>25(12.1)</td>
<td>27(13.1)</td>
<td>119(57.8)</td>
<td>28(13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Needs Class</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>46(22.3)</td>
<td>64(31.1)</td>
<td>52(25.2)</td>
<td>26(12.6)</td>
<td>18(18.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Skills</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>37(18)</td>
<td>63(30.6)</td>
<td>61(29.6)</td>
<td>40(19.4)</td>
<td>5(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Taken Online Course</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>14(6.8)</td>
<td>21(10.2)</td>
<td>115(55.8)</td>
<td>52(25.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested to Teach Online</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>42(20.4)</td>
<td>53(25.7)</td>
<td>49(23.8)</td>
<td>47(22.8)</td>
<td>15(7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>64(31.1)</td>
<td>57(27.7)</td>
<td>38(18.4)</td>
<td>38(18.4)</td>
<td>9(4.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are percentages. EI=Extremely Important, VI=Very Important, MI=Moderately Important, NI=Not Important, NO=No Opinion.

For Institutional Support and training, slightly over 93% of the business faculty respondents indicated that institutional support and training were extremely (46.1%), very (29.1%) and moderately (18.4%) important factors when considering learning to teach
online classes. Slightly over 80% of the respondents felt that the use of Web/Video conferencing tools were extremely (33%), very (27.2%) and moderately (20.4%) important factors. Slightly less than 55% of business faculty felt incentives were extremely (12.1%), very (20.9%) and moderately (21.8%) important. However, a significant proportion (38.8%) also believed incentives were not an important factor. A majority of business faculty (57.8%) did not believe that promotional opportunities were an important factor and slightly less than 79% of the business faculty felt that the department needing your class was an extremely (22.3%), very (31.1%) and moderately (25.2%) important factor. Business faculty (78.2%) believed that enhancing their skills was extremely (18%), very (30.6%) and moderately important (29.6%) and the majority of business faculty (55.8%) did not believe having previously taken an online course as a student was an important factor. A majority of business faculty however, believe (69.9%) that it is extremely (20.4%), very (25.7%) and moderately important (23.8%) to be requested to teach online by the Dean or Academic Director when learning to teach online. It is also evident that the majority of business faculty (77.2%) believe a flexible schedule when considering learning to teach online is extremely (31.1%), very (27.7%) and moderately (18.4%) important.

In summary, from the descriptive statistics, the majority of business faculty believed that institutional support and training are the most important factor when considering learning to teach online followed by the use of web and video conferencing tools to replicate the face-to-face experience. The highest percentage frequency reported for the factor that was not important to the business faculty participants was promotional opportunities (57.8%) followed by previously taken an online course at 55.8% when
considering learning to teach online. To analyze authenticity for tenured business faculty and how important the various factors were for considering learning to teach online, hypothesis 5 was tested.

To test this hypothesis, a Two-Way Chi-Square test was utilized to analyze if differences exist between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty for the factors considered to learn to teach online. This analysis is of interest in order to understand if tenured business faculty show different patterns from the descriptive statistics with the factors considered to learn to teach online than all other business faculty. Based on the findings from the Two-Way Chi-Square analysis, a significant difference was approached \( p < .002 \) between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty only for the factor of promotional opportunities. Slightly more than 76% of tenured business faculty participating in the survey indicated that promotional opportunities was not an important factor when considering learning to teach online compared to 58% of all other business faculty who participated in the survey who indicated that this was not an important consideration. A significant difference was not noted between the two faculty groups for the remainder of the factors to consider learning to teach online. Since a significant difference did exist for the factor of promotional opportunities, H5 is confirmed. While a difference did exist for promotional opportunities, tenured business faculty’s view on the factors considered to learn to teach online did not differ with all other business faculty in terms of what leads to a change in perspective to consider to learn to teach online. Institutional support and training are the most important factors followed by the use of web and video conferencing tools to replicate the face-to-face experience. Below is the crosstabulation analysis by category
and faculty group including the related Two-Way Chi-Square significance level as indicated in Table 10.

Table 10.

_Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support/Training</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web/Video Conferencing</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Opportunities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Needs Class</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Skills</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Taken Online Course</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested to Teach Online</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the remainder of the questions under factors considered to learn to teach online (b, c & d), the descriptive statistics which applied for each question are provided below.

With regard to the statement (b) My institution has a formal strategy to develop and make online education a viable educational medium for students 75% of the business faculty either strongly or somewhat agreed while only 13.7% strongly or somewhat disagreed and 11.3% neither agreed nor disagreed. For the statement (c) My institution provides an appropriate level of training and support for me to teach effectively online, 60.4% strongly to somewhat agree while 25.3% strongly to somewhat disagreed. The
remainder of business faculty (14.4%) indicated they neither agreed nor disagreed with the question. Lastly, for question (d) Does your institution provide incentives to teach online coursework? If so what type? The majority of business faculty (60.3%) indicated that their institution does not provide incentives to teach online. Only 25.5% indicated that they did receive incentives. Financial incentives were reported at a higher frequency than reduced course load or another form of incentive.

In summary, business faculty reported that their institution has a formal strategy to develop and make online education viable for students and that an appropriate level of training is provided for business faculty to learn to teach online. This is consistent with the finding that a majority of the business faculty felt institutional support and training were important factors in the process to consider learning to teach online. Incentives, either in the form of financial compensation, a reduced course load or other alternatives are not offered by the majority of institutions to serve as motivation for business faculty to learn to teach in an online environment. As incentives were not a main consideration to consider learning to teach online this may be due to the finding that they are not offered by a majority of institutions according to the participants in the survey.

With an the analysis of resistance to online education and the factors considered in the process of learning to teach in an online environment complete, an analysis of how teaching online impacted business faculty’s approach to teaching in the face-to-face classroom environment is offered next.

**The Impact of Teaching Online**

The business faculty surveyed were asked to address two questions to gain an understanding of how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in the face-to-
face classroom environment. These questions were stated as: (a) Teaching online classes has impacted the teaching methods used in my face to face class. (b) Because you have taught online, to what extent have you used the following teaching methods/procedures for your face-to-face course (Record Lectures for Review by Students Outside of Class, Use of Web/Video Conferencing Tools, More Small Group Discussion, Highly Interactive Group Activities, More Detailed Syllabus and Use Online Exams).

The descriptive statistical results for question (a) teaching online classes has impacted the teaching methods in business faculty’s face to face class indicated the majority (68%) strongly to somewhat agree. Only 18.5% indicated they strongly to somewhat disagreed while 13.5% indicated they neither agreed nor disagreed. For question (b) the results for those business faculty that did make changes to their teaching methods in their face-to-face course due to having taught online are displayed in Table 11 below.

Table 11.

Teaching Practice Change for Face-to-Face

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Lectures for Review</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>38(18.8)</td>
<td>27(13.4)</td>
<td>49(24.3)</td>
<td>88(43.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Web/Video Conferencing Tools</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>33(16.3)</td>
<td>30(14.9)</td>
<td>74(36.6)</td>
<td>65(32.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>54(26.7)</td>
<td>48(23.8)</td>
<td>67(33.2)</td>
<td>33(16.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Interactive Group Activities</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>62(30.8)</td>
<td>48(23.9)</td>
<td>55(27.4)</td>
<td>36(17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Detailed Syllabus</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67(33.5)</td>
<td>53(26.5)</td>
<td>43(21.5)</td>
<td>37(18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Online Exams</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>47(23.4)</td>
<td>27(13.4)</td>
<td>41(20.4)</td>
<td>86(42.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are percentages. A=Always, MT=Most of the Time, ST=Sometimes, n=Never
From the descriptive statistics it is apparent that the majority of business faculty, due to having taught online, either always or most of the time changed their face-to-face course by using a more detailed syllabus (60%), highly interactive group activities (54.7%) and small group discussion (50.5%). The use of recorded lectures for review by students outside of the face-to-face class (43.6%) and online exams (42.8%) received the highest percentages of never being utilized by business faculty in their face-to-face course. The highest percentage of responses receiving a sometimes response was the use of web/video conferencing tools (36.6%) in the face-to-face course. To analyze authenticity of tenured business faculty and teaching practice change in their face-to-face course due to having taught online Hypothesis 6 was tested.

To test this hypothesis, the first step in determining how teaching online predicted altered teaching practices for tenured business faculty in their face-to-face course was to determine if mean differences occurred between the two faculty groups. A series of Independent *t*-tests (parametric) were conducted including Levene’s test for equality of variance to determine if these differences were significant. Additionally, since Skewness and Kurtosis level were < 1.00 in some instances, Mann-Whitney U (non-parametric) tests were run to compare if significance levels varied amongst the faculty groups. Table 12 below indicates the results from the Independent *t*- test and Mann-Whitney U tests.
Table 12.

Comparison of Teaching Practice Change Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practice</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>p (t-test)</th>
<th>p(MWU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Lectures for Review</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Web/Video Conferencing Tools</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Interactive Group Activities</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Detailed Syllabus</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Online Exams</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD=Mean Difference, MWU=Mann-Whitney U.

From the results of the Independent t-tests and Mann Whitney U tests, no significant mean differences existed between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty regarding altered teaching practices in their face-to-face course due to having taught online. To determine if teaching online predicted altered teaching practices for tenured business faculty in their face-to-face course, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was run including Pearson Correlation (parametric) as well as Spearman’s rho correlation (non-parametric) as Skewness and Kurtosis level were < 1.00 in some instances. Table 13 below describes the inferential correlation results from the analysis of tenured business faculty.
Table 13 shows the predictors of teaching online classes that impacted tenured business faculty face-to-face course. Highly interactive group activities was significantly correlated to altered teaching practices in face-to-face course work. More small group discussion is approaching significance and a more detailed syllabus is positively trending toward significance. Use of web/video conferencing tools and use online exams should be significant since the correlations are >.10, however, the significance level does not meet the alpha requirement of \( p \leq .05 \) and could indicate a Type II error with the small sample size \( (n \leq 90) \). Record lectures for review did not prove to be correlated from the data presented. To confirm these results, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was performed to determine what altered teaching practices in tenured business faculty face-to-face course were considered relevant. After completing the analysis, the predictor of highly interactive group activities proved to be relevant. \( R^2 = .058 \) and therefore accounts for 5.8% of the variance as a predictor for altered teaching practices for the tenured
business faculty surveyed who subtly introduced this practice into their face-to-face coursework. Thus, the findings support H6 in that teaching online classes will predict altered teaching practices utilized in a face-to-face course by tenured business faculty for the factor of highly interactive group activities.

In keeping with the purpose of this study to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education, it is important to analyze not only how tenured business faculty view their altered teaching practices in their face-to-face course but also what differences, if any, exist for all business faculty combined. This will also allow for a larger sample size when determining significance of the analysis. To explore these results, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was again run including a Pearson Correlation (parametric) as well as Spearman’s rho correlation (non-parametric) as Skewness and Kurtosis level were < 1.00 in some instances. Table 14 below will describe the inferential correlation results from the analysis of all business faculty.

Table 14.

**All Business Faculty Teaching Practice Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Lectures for Review</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Web/Video Conferencing Tools</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Interactive Group Activities</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Detailed Syllabus</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Online Exams</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r=Pearson Correlation, SR=Spearman’s rho.
Table 14 shows the predictors of teaching online classes that impacted business faculty’s face-to-face course. The use of web/video conferencing tools, highly interactive group activities, and more detailed syllabus approached significance with correlation to altered teaching practices in face-to-face course work. Small group discussion and use of online exams are positively trending toward significance. Record lectures for review was not significant. To confirm these results, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was performed to determine what altered teaching practices in all business faculty’s face-to-face courses were considered relevant. After completing the analysis, the predictor of highly interactive group activities and use of web/video conferencing tools proved to be relevant. For highly interactive groups $R^2 = .046$ and therefore accounts for 4.6% of the variance and use of web/video conferencing tools $R^2 = .028$ and therefore accounts for 2.8% of the variance. These two teaching practices signify as predictors with 7.4% of the variance for altered teaching practices for all business faculty who subtly introduced these teaching practices in their face-to-face coursework.

Thus, for tenured and all business faculty combined, teaching online classes does predict altered teaching practices on a subtle basis with highly interactive group activities and through the use of web/video conferencing tools. With teaching practice change complete, in the next section a review of how a perspective change occurred with teaching online for tenured business faculty. A descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of all business faculty with specific focus on tenured business faculty who initially resisted online education and now primarily teach online courses is offered.
Changed Perspective to Teach Online

The business faculty surveyed were asked to address four questions to gain an understanding of the factors that changed their perspective to teach online and also potentially transform their identity as an educator to teach online. These questions were stated as: (a) If you are a tenured faculty member, what led you to believe you could be successful teaching online after many years of teaching in a face-to-face environment? (b) Peer mentoring of other online instructors is an effective method to learn to teach online coursework. (c) If you initially resisted teaching online coursework but now do so, how important were the following factors in your change in perspective? (d) If you had a change in perspective regarding your willingness to teach online coursework, how much time did this change take to occur? For the business faculty surveyed the descriptive statistical results for the four questions are offered below.

For tenured faculty members, what led you to believe you could be successful teaching online after many years of teaching in a face-to-face environment? The results are presented in Table 15 below.

Table 15.

Tenured Business Faculty-Reasons for Success Online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Provided Training</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Provided Technical Support</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted with Colleagues</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Your Skills</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As presented in Table 15, the findings suggest that receiving technical support received the highest frequency of responses from tenured business faculty (33.3%). Receiving the necessary training from the institution and enhancing skills received the next highest frequency at an equal percentage of (23.3%) of responses followed by consulting with colleagues to gain a new perspective at 22.3%. The majority of “other” responses indicated a confidence in their ability to teach face-to-face would translate online and a desire to help students achieve their academic goals as a reason tenured business faculty believed they would be successful teaching online. In relation to consulting with colleagues to gain a new perspective as a reason to be successful teaching online, a follow-up question regarding the practice of peer mentoring of other online instructors is an effective method to learn to teach online coursework was asked. A majority of the respondents indicated they strongly to somewhat agreed (77.3%) while only 4% strongly to somewhat disagreed. The remainder neither agreed nor disagreed.

For the question of all business faculty, if you initially resisted teaching online coursework but now do so, how important were the following factors in your change in perspective? The results are presented in Table 16 below.
Table 16.

*All Business Faculty—Change in Perspective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed View</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>21(10.2)</td>
<td>30(14.6)</td>
<td>20(9.7)</td>
<td>12(5.8)</td>
<td>15(7.3)</td>
<td>108(52.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Control</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>23(11.2)</td>
<td>31(15)</td>
<td>18(8.7)</td>
<td>8(3.9)</td>
<td>16(17.8)</td>
<td>110(53.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with Colleagues</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>14(6.8)</td>
<td>39(18.9)</td>
<td>28(13.6)</td>
<td>9(4.4)</td>
<td>13(6.3)</td>
<td>103(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Relevant</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>9(4.4)</td>
<td>18(8.7)</td>
<td>13(6.3)</td>
<td>18(8.7)</td>
<td>40(19.4)</td>
<td>108(52.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Confidence</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>18(8.7)</td>
<td>35(17)</td>
<td>34(16.5)</td>
<td>14(6.8)</td>
<td>8(3.9)</td>
<td>97(47.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Requirement</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>22(10.7)</td>
<td>19(9.2)</td>
<td>17(8.3)</td>
<td>11(5.3)</td>
<td>21(10.2)</td>
<td>116(56.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>17(8.3)</td>
<td>41(19.9)</td>
<td>28(13.6)</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>12(5.8)</td>
<td>102(49.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Technology</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>20(9.7)</td>
<td>40(19.4)</td>
<td>24(11.7)</td>
<td>13(6.3)</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>103(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Student Learning</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>21(10.2)</td>
<td>32(15.5)</td>
<td>27(13.1)</td>
<td>14(6.8)</td>
<td>14(6.8)</td>
<td>98(47.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are percentages. EI=Extremely Important, VI=Very Important, MI=Moderately Important, SI=Slightly Important, NI=Not Important, NA=Not Applicable

As indicated in Table 16, the majority of the respondents indicated this question was not applicable to their individual perspective. For those that did offer an opinion growing confidence in teaching online had the highest percentage of all importance categories selected (49%) followed by improved technological capabilities of the institution (47.1%). Promote student learning in innovative ways (45.6%), received positive feedback as you began to teach online (44.7%), dialogue with colleagues who had a successful online experience (43.7%) and a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online (40.3%) round out the top six categories. The highest percentage categories considered not at all important included a concern for becoming less relevant as a faculty member (19.4%) and maintain control of course after moving online (17.8%). The next highest category considered not at all important was an institutional requirement
for faculty to teach online (10.2%). After responding to the factors that led to a change in perspective, business faculty were asked if they had a change in perspective regarding their willingness to teach online coursework, how much time did the change take to occur? For a majority of the respondents (21.8%) reflected for six months followed by 7-12 months (11.7%) and 13-24 months (7.8) as the highest selected time frames.

In summary, tenured business faculty believed they would be successful teaching online after many years teaching in a face-to-face environment if they were provided the necessary training and support with technology to enhance skills and by consulting with colleagues. In line with this result, the majority of business faculty surveyed believed mentoring peer instructors was an effective method to learn to teach online when considering what would make them successful teaching in an online environment. For all business faculty the two factors that were most important to a change in perspective with teaching online if they initially resisted were a growing confidence in teaching online (49%) followed by improved technological capabilities of the institution (47.1%). The majority of participants reflected for a period of six months to 2 years on these factors which led to a change in perspective.

To analyze authenticity of tenured business faculty and the factors that led to a change in perspective after reflecting about teaching online, Hypothesis 7 was tested. To test this hypothesis, the first step in determining the factors that led to a perspective change to teach online and potential transformation for tenured business faculty after time spent reflecting, was to determine if mean differences occurred between the tenured business faculty and all other business faculty. A series of Independent t-tests (parametric) were conducted including Levene’s test for equality of variance to determine
if these differences were significant. Additionally, since Skewness and Kurtosis level were < and > 1.00 in some instances, Mann-Whitney U (non-parametric) tests were run to compare if significance levels varied amongst the faculty groups. Table 17 below indicates the results from the Independent $t$-test and Mann-Whitney U tests.

Table 17.

*Comparison of Perspective Change Factor Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>$p$ ($t$-test)</th>
<th>$p$(MWU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed View</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Control</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with Colleagues</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Relevant</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Confidence</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Requirement</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Technology</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Student Learning</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD=Mean Difference, MWU=Mann-Whitney U.

From the results of the Independent $t$-tests and Mann Whitney U tests no significant mean differences existed between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty regarding time taken to reflect on the factors that led to a change in perspective. To determine if time spent reflecting by tenured business faculty predicts a change in perspective to teach online, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was run.
including a Pearson Correlation (parametric) as well as Spearman’s rho correlation (non-parametric) as Skewness and Kurtosis level were < and >1.00 in some instances. Table 18 below describes the inferential correlation results from the analysis of tenured business faculty.

Table 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p*</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed View</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.461</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Control</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.440</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.423</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with Colleagues</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.451</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Relevant</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Confidence</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.449</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Requirement</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.458</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Technology</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-.408</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.406</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Student Learning</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.390</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*pNote: results significant for p<.05. r=Pearson Correlation, SR=Spearman’s rho.

Table 18 shows the predictors of tenured business faculty who initially resisted teaching online but later had a change in perspective after time spent in reflection. It is apparent from the correlations listed that as the period of time to reflect is reduced the more important the factors are that tenured business faculty considered important in leading to a change in perspective and potential transformation in identity as an educator. To confirm these results, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was performed to
determine what factors were considered relevant to a change in perspective after taking time to reflect. Upon completion of the analysis, the predictor of growing confidence in teaching online proved to be moderately relevant. $R^2 = .234$ and therefore accounts for 23.4% of the variance as a predictor for a change in perspective after taking time to reflect about teaching online. Thus, the findings support H7 in that time taken to reflect by tenured business faculty will predict a change in perspective to teach online.

In keeping with the purpose of this study to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education, it is important to analyze not just how tenured business faculty view their change in perspective to teach online after spending time in reflection but also all business faculty to determine what differences, if any, exist. This will also allow for a larger sample size when determining significance of the analysis. To explore these results, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was again run including a Pearson Correlation (parametric) as well as Spearman’s rho correlation (non-parametric) as Skewness and Kurtosis level were < and >1.00 in some instances. Table 19 below will describe the inferential correlation results from the analysis of all business faculty.
Table 19 shows the predictors of all business faculty who initially resisted teaching online but later had a change in perspective after time spent in reflection. It is apparent again from the correlations listed that as the period of time to reflect is reduced the more important the factors are that business faculty considered important in leading to a change in perspective and potential transformation among the participants. To confirm these results, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was performed to determine what factors were considered relevant to a change in perspective after taking time to reflect. Upon completion of the analysis, the predictors of a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online and an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online proved to be moderately relevant. $R^2 = .270$ for a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online
and therefore accounts for 27% of the variance and \( R^2 = .019 \) for an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online and therefore accounts for 1.9% of the variance. The total variance between the two factors is 28.9% as a predictor for a change in perspective after taking time to reflect about teaching online.

Summary

In summary, this chapter presented the findings of the quantitative portion of this research study. The findings include a significant difference was not indicated between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty for the various categories of concerns analyzed with teaching online. The majority of business faculty (tenured and all other) do have concerns with teaching online with quality of education being the most prevalent concern. For career concerns with teaching online, business faculty did not report that teaching online would place them at a disadvantage later in their career or inhibit their ability to achieve tenure status. Those who achieved tenure status would still choose to teach online if not tenured. While both tenured and all other business faculty had concerns with teaching online and preferred teaching in a face-to-face environment, they believed tenured business faculty should teach online to benefit higher education. The participants did indicate they thought online education offers equivalent learning outcomes as face-to-face. The majority of business faculty (including tenured) believed that institutional support and training are the most important factor when considering learning to teach online followed by the use of web and video conferencing tools to replicate the face-to-face experience. A significant difference was approached between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty only for the factor of promotional opportunities indicating that promotional opportunities was not an important factor when
considering learning to teach online. Incentives, either in the form of financial compensation, a reduced course load or other alternatives are not offered by the majority of institutions to serve as motivation for business faculty to learn to teach in an online environment. For tenured business faculty, highly interactive group activities were significantly correlated to altered teaching practices in face-to-face course work. For all business faculty the predictor of highly interactive group activities and use of web/video conferencing tools proved to be relevant. Tenured business faculty believed they would be successful teaching online after many years teaching in a face-to-face environment if they were provided the necessary training and support with technology to enhance skills and by consulting with colleagues. In line with this result, the majority of business faculty surveyed believed mentoring peer instructors was an effective method to learn to teach online when considering what would make them successful teaching in an online environment. The majority of participants reflected for a period of six months to 2 years on those factors which led to a change in perspective. As the period of time to reflect is reduced the more important the factors are that tenured business faculty considered important in leading to a change in perspective and potential transformation to teach online. The predictor of growing confidence in teaching online proved to be moderately relevant for tenured business faculty. For all business faculty the predictors of a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online and an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online proved to be moderately relevant. Based upon these findings a number of research implications have been presented. Consequently, the following chapter, Chapter Six, serves to assimilate the qualitative and quantitative findings of this research study and discuss the implications of these findings.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this mixed methods research study was two-fold: one, to explore
the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and
two, to assess the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially
resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face
learning environments. In order to analyze the emergent themes of this study, this chapter
will begin by presenting an integration of the qualitative and quantitative findings. The
remaining sections of the chapter discuss how this study contributes to the current
literature on perspective change with teaching online, the impact of teaching online with
a face-to-face practice and the role of transformative learning with a perspective change
to teach online. Lastly, the implications for practice, future research topics and
concluding remarks are presented.

Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Findings

In this section an integration of the qualitative and quantitative findings of this
research study are offered for all business faculty, with a specific focus on the tenured
participants to address the study’s research questions (See Figure 4, Appendix A). The
topics addressed are (a) Initial Resistance Factors to Teaching Online; (b) Factors
Considered to Learn to Teach Online; (c) The Impact of Teaching Online on Face-to-
Face Coursework; (d) Perspective Change to Teach Online and the role reflection played
in a potential transformation among the participants. As this is a mixed-methods study the
discussions integrate and analyze both qualitative and quantitative findings.
Initial Resistance Factors to Teaching Online

The initial resistance factors to teaching online that emerged from both the qualitative interviews of tenured business faculty and the quantitative survey of business faculty (including tenured) were numerous. Both faculty groups described concerns regarding, the quality of education received by students, the amount of time and effort, a lack of flexibility with the coursework, and faculty career concerns and beliefs with teaching in an online environment. An overview of each of these concerns and beliefs will be offered first from the perspective of the tenured business faculty who participated in the qualitative interviews and then the business faculty (including tenured) who participated in the quantitative survey.

Quality of education.

Tenured business faculty who participated in the qualitative interviews described their initial resistance to teaching online due to perceived concerns with the quality of education received by students. Quality is defined as the rigor to which learning outcomes for a course are satisfied (Seaman, 2009). The concerns expressed regarding quality of online education pertained to a belief that online education is not as rich an experience as face-to-face and from economic pressure institutions of higher learning face to implement online curriculum. Regarding richness of experience, the common view expressed by tenured business faculty was face-to-face coursework is a much richer experience than coursework completed online. The view of the tenured faculty is that the experience is not the same when you cannot see your students, their non-verbal communications and answer questions in person. The usual way of interacting with students is altered which leads to discomfort on the part of faculty interviewed. This
view is even more pronounced by those tenured business faculty who taught decision making, negotiation, strategic, or case oriented coursework which require a great amount of student interaction. The qualitative participants described their challenge as getting something comparable online and to get people to react as if they are together physically. A further challenge that exacerbates the situation for tenured business faculty is with the reliance on technology to replicate the classroom experience, causes anxiety for faculty who are not tech savvy. Some faculty interviewed did comment that after using technology, they were able to gain a comfort level and actually believe it has enhanced the learning experience for students.

Another concern expressed regarding quality of education and richness of experience online pertained to students not developing their face-to-face relationship with other students. The concern is that human interaction is important for team building and students are short-changed in terms of critical thinking and application skills. This concern with a lack of human interaction with online education was supported in the analysis of Adams and DeFleur (2006) which indicated “students lose team experience and the ability to learn from each other” (p. 41). The hope is that a lack of face-to-face interaction does not take away how much a student can learn. Another tenured business faculty member (Bobby) indicated he associated more face-to-face contact with higher learning. A degree of social bias may be an explanation for some of these viewpoints with tenured business faculty who socially were raised and gained success learning and teaching in face-to-face environments. Just because the qualitative participants learned and taught coursework in the traditional classroom style, does not mean that other styles of teaching and learning cannot be adopted as technology improves and attitudes about
the use of technology in education changes. Resistance to new styles that are untested or unproven may not necessarily be wrong but it also does not mean it is never to be considered. It is important to stay open to differing viewpoints about what is considered quality education as learning can occur in many different ways for individuals. One teaching method whether on line or face-to-face does not have a more significant effect on student learning than the other. “The best approach is to guide students in a general direction and assist them to construct knowledge in new and useful ways” (Zucca, 2014, p.100).

The education received by students learning online was also perceived as lesser quality by some qualitative participants because of the fast pace with which higher education must develop and implement online curriculum due to increasing economic pressure. The growing economic pressure refers to institutions implementing an online curriculum in order to reduce costs, increase revenue and address declining enrollment and funding (Cavico & Majtaba, 2010). In some cases, tenured business faculty from the qualitative interviews believed implementing online curriculum led to questionable learning outcomes. This was due to a perceived lack of quality time and effort spent developing curriculum in order to meet institutional deadlines for an online educational initiative. Related to the concern with questionable learning outcomes was faculty’s concern with academic integrity and how cheating would be addressed if courses were taught online. A further concern noted about quality of education by the qualitative participants was undergraduate students benefit from having regular class times they must attend to maintain a sense of discipline and if this is no longer required due to taking courses online, their effort and performance may decline.
The qualitative participants all had various reasons for resisting teaching online initially due to concerns with quality of education however, it was indicated from one tenured faculty member that course quality is a soft area of analysis and the resume of the faculty member (being tenured) is a start to make sure they have the credentials to teach a course and to establish a level of academic integrity with online education.

From a quantitative perspective, the business faculty who participated in the survey ranked quality of education as their highest concern with teaching online. Quality of education concerns were similar to the qualitative participants as they related to limited face-to-face contact with students, emulating the classroom experience and academic integrity (cheating). An additional concern noted under quality of education included a lack of support in terms of training and course preparation from the university as potential detriments to teaching online and working with technology was the fourth highest concern rated by all business faculty including tenured who participated in the survey.

As can be seen from the results of the qualitative interviews with tenured business faculty and survey of business faculty (including tenured) quality of education is a large concern and a major reason why faculty are resistant to teaching in an online environment. With the analysis of quality of education completed, the amount of time and effort to begin teaching online is the next resistance factor discussed.

**Time and effort.**

Tenured business faculty who participated in the qualitative interviews also described their initial resistance to teaching online in terms of the extra amount of time and effort necessary to design and implement an online course. This is consistent with the
literature which indicated in some cases faculty are not willing to spend extra hours working in an online environment when there is not an expected reward (Lloyd, Byrne & McCoy, 2012). For example, the time and effort to learn to use technology including learning management systems, simulation exercises and how to interact with students outside of a traditional classroom were common sentiments expressed. Additionally, the amount of explanation necessary to make assignments clear to students online, working with instructional design experts to craft an online course and make it engaging to students, the time and effort to grade assignments and respond in an expedited manner, monitor email, preparation of videos for lectures, and completing the course syllabus well in advance of the course start date were also commonly described sentiments of extra time and effort by tenured business faculty. In terms of monitoring email, a feeling of the need to stay engaged 24/7 was also described as a concern by tenured business faculty. This sentiment was expressed as a concern due to the nature of students taking coursework online who expect to be able to reach their professor and get answers to questions on their schedule, not the professor’s. Another concern for time and effort related to the amount of administrative burdens that must be addressed when teaching online. For example, how are tests to be administered? Should proctors be utilized? What kind of time limit should be placed on a test taken online? A unique concern raised regarding time and effort was described by one tenured business faculty member who only has one hand which makes typing difficult. Special voice recognition software enables this individual to respond to student inquiries online.

For business faculty who participated in the quantitative survey, the amount of time and work (effort) to teach online were the second and third ranked concerns out of a
total of nine categories with teaching in an online environment. The expedited manner in which grading assignments must occur when teaching online was also noted as a concern. This factor ranked sixth out of the total nine categories analyzed overall.

Thus for the qualitative and quantitative participants, the amount of time and effort to devote to developing coursework and learning to teach online is a considerable obstacle to venturing into this educational medium. Learning new technologies, working with instructional design experts, staying engaged 24/7, dealing with new administrative concerns all contributed to faculty feeling somewhat overwhelmed with all the new tasks and requirements with the educational medium. This feeling of being overwhelmed by all the new tasks and requirements also gave rise to a concern expressed about a general lack of flexibility with the online course itself.

**Lack of flexibility.**

An additional issue with resistance expressed by tenured business faculty who participated in the qualitative interviews with teaching online was the requirement to have the course syllabus and all the details of the course completed prior to the start of the first class. The concern expressed was that in a traditional face-to-face classroom adjustments to the topics covered, approach to delivering a message or how much time was spent on a particular topic, could be considered at any time without much difficulty in implementation. Teaching online courses however, requires that the details of every assignment, recorded lectures for each topic, and time allocated for individual tasks be completed upfront (Herman, 2013). Once these tasks are completed, it is very difficult to make an adjustment. Nothing can be done on the “fly” as described by some of the participants. As a result, this could be one explanation for anxiety expressed on the part
of tenured business faculty to teach online. With so much of the coursework tied to
technology, this reliance on delivering coursework over the internet heightened the level
of resistance.

From a quantitative standpoint, business faculty (including tenured) surveyed, a
less flexible syllabus was noted as a concern with teaching online but was ranked fifth
out of the total nine categories analyzed. The remaining categories of concern noted in
the survey with teaching online included working in an accelerated course format which
ties back to the speed and lack of flexibility with which grading and providing feedback
to students must occur when teaching online. With the concerns noted regarding lack of
flexibility it is interesting that from the survey, the lack of experience was the lowest
rated concern regarding teaching in an online environment. This would indicate that the
business faculty (including tenured) surveyed did not have as high a concern to teach
online due to a lack of experience with the educational medium but had a higher level
concern with quality of education and the amount of time and work to teach online. This
result though compares to the findings provided by the qualitative participants who
expressed similar concerns with quality of education and the amount of time and effort to
teach online. Overall, from the quantitative analysis of resistance factors to teach online,
it can be stated that business faculty (including tenured) do have concerns with teaching
online as only 12.6% of the respondents indicated they did not have at least one concern
with teaching in an online environment.

From a quantitative standpoint, a significant statistical difference between tenured
business faculty and all other business faculty was not indicated for the major categories
of resistance with teaching in an online environment. Thus, tenured business faculty who
participated in the survey also agreed that the major categories of resistance with teaching online (quality of education, time and effort to teach online and lack of flexibility) contributed to resistance to teaching in an online environment.

Would increasing the amount of experience teaching online lead to efficiencies in teaching and therefore business faculty could benefit from a higher level of confidence as their experience level increased and reduce their level of resistance? This issue will be addressed in a later section, however, resistance to teaching online also involved specific career concerns and beliefs which required further analysis.

Career concerns and beliefs.

Resistance to teaching online also involved specific career concerns and beliefs. The tenured business faculty who participated in the qualitative interviews were asked if they would have considered teaching online if they were not already tenured or if teaching online in their view would inhibit them from gaining promotional opportunities. The main response was that teaching online would not be an inhibitor to promotions or in achieving tenure status, and the majority would teach online if not tenured; however, this response was made with several reservations. From a perspective of enhancing status, the comments offered included that higher education needs individuals to teach online and this may give a person an advantage if untenured and other faculty said they would not teach online. Several reservations were described by the participants, however. For example, one view offered was a candidate for tenure would need to have face-to-face experience in order to be considered. If their only experience was online, this could cause concern for a promotion and tenure committee. Another reservation mentioned was how has the individual allocated their time in order to present the best portfolio? Has
teaching online taken too much of their time and prevented them from considering research opportunities? One sentiment mentioned was that getting involved in instructional innovations at the expense of continuing to put out research projects is not a good idea for anyone below a Full Professor. It was noted that it depended on the type of institution an individual taught for as to whether it was more research or teaching oriented as a caveat to the impact teaching online may have for promotion and tenure opportunities. If the institution was more research oriented, the risk may be too great if seeking tenure status. A different teaching format may also lead to lower evaluations than what was afforded in a face-to-face class and be a detriment to achieving tenure status. Other participants mentioned that their institutions’ focus on tenure did not include teaching evaluations. While the tenured business faculty believed teaching online should not be an inhibitor to gaining promotion and tenure status, a few had individual concerns and would not have taught online had they not already achieved tenure status. This was due to the concern with teaching online potentially taking too much of their time and preventing potential research opportunities or lower evaluation scores. Thus, for institutions of higher learning, it is paramount that they consider providing enough time to allow faculty who teach online to conduct research in order to be considered for promotional opportunities. If evaluations for faculty who teach online are a focus of promotion and tenure committees, consideration should be made to the adjustment faculty must make to teach online and effectively refine their skills.

The quantitative business participants were asked similar questions regarding promotion and tenure and teaching online. The participants were asked if teaching online places them at a disadvantage later in their career and if teaching online inhibits their
ability to achieve tenure status. The business faculty surveyed disagreed with both these questions and confirmed the overall viewpoint of the qualitative participants. The follow-up question asked of the survey participants was if tenured, would you likely be teaching online if not tenured. A higher rate of participants (27.7%) would still teach online if not tenured than those that indicated they would not (9.2%). Again, this result mirrors the overall belief communicated from the qualitative participants that indicated they would still teach online if they were not tenured but with individual reservations noted.

Additionally, quantitative survey questions were posed in an attempt to gain an understanding of business faculty’s beliefs about teaching online. These questions included: their preference for teaching courses in a traditional environment versus online as well as their concerns regarding the quality of education for teaching and learning online. The resistance concerns listed previously for teaching online were supported as the business faculty (including tenured) participants preferred teaching in the traditional face-to-face classroom. However, business faculty did believe that it was important that tenured business faculty teach online to support achievement of obtaining equivalent learning outcomes as face-to-face coursework.

Interestingly, with the resistance factors described by both the qualitative and quantitative subjects to teaching online as well as potential career concerns and beliefs regarding this educational medium, all the subjects interviewed and surveyed eventually agreed to teach in an online environment. The logical question this point raises is, if the participants had several reservations about teaching online why did they agree to teach within this medium? It is now appropriate to gain an understanding of the factors faculty
considered to teach online and the associated learning process to teach within this medium.

Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online

In this section, a description of the factors the research participants described as to why they considered teaching online are provided. Qualitatively, tenured business faculty indicated that the following factors contributed to a change in perspective to consider teaching online. These factors included: Teaching online because tenured business faculty felt a responsibility or had a strong identity with their employer and had a desire to be a model employee, a viewpoint of identity with their coursework, having ownership of the curriculum and wanting to make sure it had their own stamp of approval, and a sentiment of avoiding obsolescence and learning new tasks and teaching skills could only be of benefit to them as individuals. In the next section, the three factors of identity as an educator with their employer, their coursework, and remaining relevant as an educator are discussed in further detail.

Identity as an educator.

The views expressed by qualitative participants as to the factors they considered to teach online centered on their individual identity as an educator with their employer, their coursework and maintaining a sense of relevance as an educator. These factors all played a role in their eventual acceptance of teaching or the development of online coursework. Identity is defined as, “our persona, the self we present to the world. It consists of the roles we play and is easy to change in a superficial way” (Cranton & Kasl, 2012, p. 394). Included with these factors to consider teaching online are both conscious thought and unconscious thought processes. The tenured business faculty described their
initial conscious resistance factors to teaching online but the unconscious concerns of relevance in the minds of the participants had to be acknowledged in order to be able to proceed and continue to maintain their duties and responsibilities as educators. This process can also be described as the ego consciously cooperating with the unconscious (Spear, 2014). While the participants did not actively acknowledge these thought patterns, it became apparent after interviewing all 14 participants that they were battling their long standing assumptions and beliefs about their identity as an educator and how teaching and learning effectively occurs. “The ego can be thought of as the center of consciousness responsible for identity and personal continuity in time and space. The ego may resist messages from the unconscious that are disturbing or disruptive, unconventional with the ego’s goals” (Spear, 2014, p.227). The tenured business faculty viewed their identity as a successful content expert and disseminator of knowledge for many years. They were in power and control of how and when learning occurred in the classroom. Now, alarmingly, they are being asked to do something new and different that is a foreign concept. No longer is their identity tied to a course as a disseminator of knowledge but as a facilitator of knowledge. The students no longer see faculty lecturing and offering philosophical concepts and beliefs but as a guide to learning and offering helpful advice when tackling assignments in an online environment. The common thread that runs through these three factors tenured business faculty considered to teach online are conscious thoughts by the participants of a sense of responsibility and maintaining a strong reputation with their employer, their identity as an educator with established coursework and pride with their institution from a lifetime of service with their craft. Faculty also provided side commentary regarding obsolescence that were unconscious in
nature to their main conscious beliefs and that they may need to learn new skills to remain relevant. For example, Fred indicated that he “was asked to create an online course by the Director of the School of Business.” Since he was new at the time he did so because his boss wanted him to do so. Consciously, Fred said “had I not been asked, I would not be teaching online.” But Fred later indicated “once I started it was sort of a done deal. I mean it is my course.” Fred consciously believes he would not have taught online had he not been asked but unconsciously in order to satisfy his boss and maintain his identity with his course he is willing to accept the challenge. Chris also previously described his conscious beliefs about teaching online:

If I had not been teaching this online course for the past three to four years I might say to myself, you know this world is progressing and it might not be a bad idea for me to experiment with some online education just because I don’t want to make myself so totally obsolete.

Chris later went on to say “Even though I don’t remember either way whether I had that mindset at any point in the past I do think that is appropriate now.” Consciously, Chris also felt an obligation to be a good employee and help his institution due to their lack of staff to teach online. Unconsciously, could the barriers that prevented Chris from teaching online initially have been reduced unconsciously due to a concern about becoming obsolete that he is just now recognizing? While Chris indicates he was trying to be a good employee to help out, when questioned about his role with development of online coursework he adamantly professed “I didn’t help develop it, I developed it. It’s 100 percent my course.” Chris was very proud of his development of the online MBA course for his institution. Not just helping out but developing it. Possibly, the concern
again with becoming obsolete unconsciously was a driving force behind his passionate
declaration of ownership of his online course.

Another concern regarding teaching online with tenured faculty was the
unconscious concern with status and how other colleagues may view those who are not
willing to consider teaching in an online environment. For example, Marv explained how
younger faculty should understand that the tenured group has a lot of influence over their
careers and should be more respectful:

If they (tenured faculty) find any wisecracks which I’ve heard tons of from some
new young dumb faculty members, calling the tenured guy who has got their life
in their hands some wise names about being Luddites or whatever they call them,
not a good idea.

While younger faculty according to Marv should understand how influential the tenured
group are to their careers, consciously the tenured group are prideful and want to
maintain the respect they have built over a very successful career and may unconsciously
not want to be considered as resisting progress or seen as not willing to be progressive in
education. Therefore, from an unconscious mindset, the tenured group may feel pressure
to pursue online education due to the criticisms they perceive being leveled at them from
other groups. Their identity as an educator is being challenged and do not want to be
thought of as lesser because of their initial lack of enthusiasm about teaching online. As
Dan stated, “Most of my research is on innovation and new product developments and it
kind of struck me that I was behaving as a bit of a dinosaur as I had avoided online
teaching thus far.” Bobby also shared related thoughts when he stated:
I’m pretty old fashioned. I’m right here in my office right now and I’m looking at my two monitors on my PC here in my office. I don’t even have an Android or a Smart Phone. I mean I can text. My kids think I’m retarded and I probably am you know.

Wayne shared similar conscious beliefs with his concerns about teaching online and if he would be able to change his identity and be as effective as in a face-to-face format:

I want to think of myself more as an enabler than a dispenser, I guess. That wasn’t the case 25 years ago. I was probably one of the biggest dispensers around. But you know, when you have been face-to-face for many years and your students think by way of evaluations that you’re pretty decent at it, why you get comfortable.

Neil further explained his conscious beliefs about his effectiveness as an educator when he stated:

“I’m a classroom guy. You know, I like to have an audience. I am very comfortable doing what I’m doing. I’m the guy. I think a lot of people are very ego-defensive, so maybe what they feel they lose face or something if they don’t do it right.

As all 14 participants had a high ranking colleague request they teach, develop or administer online coursework, the conscious beliefs they shared in terms of being responsible to their employer and their identity as an educator helped to shape their change in perspective to consider teaching online. Unconscious concerns possibly about
being less relevant as an individual and as an educator may have also been a driving force when reconsidering teaching in an online environment.

Quantitatively, business faculty were also asked to consider how important nine factors were when they considered learning to teach online. The top six ranked factors (from high to low) of all business faculty surveyed included, institutional support and training, use of web/video conferencing tools to replicate face-to-face interaction, department needs your class, enhancing your skills, flexible schedule, and requested to teach online by Dean or Academic Director. The top three ranked factors as not important (from high to low) included promotional opportunities, previously taken an online course as a student and incentives. A significant difference between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty applied only for the factor of promotional opportunities. More tenured business faculty than all other business faculty believed that promotional opportunities were not an important factor when they considered learning to teach online.

Qualitatively, the tenured business faculty expressed that having a high ranking colleague request they get involved in online education was a major factor in considering teaching online. Quantitatively, the participants felt that having the institutional support and training and replicating face-to-face coursework through use of web/video conferencing tools played a major role in their change in perspective.

After considering both sets of data it is clear the importance the role the institution has in influencing faculty to consider teaching in an online environment. Not only from the individual influence of colleagues requesting their expertise but also through technical support and training. All participants agreed to teach in an online environment,
try something new, enhance their skills with technology while also benefitting their employer and most importantly their students. It is understandable that the tenured group quantitatively, would not see promotional opportunities as an important factor as they have already gained tenure status. However, it is interesting the contrasting view the participants had with incentives. Quantitatively, incentives were not an important factor for both tenured and all other business faculty surveyed, simply because the majority of faculty indicated their institution did not offer an incentive to teach online. Qualitatively, however, 11 of 14 tenured business faculty indicated they did receive an incentive to teach online. While the institutions in these individual cases utilized incentives to assist in the development of online coursework at the various institutions, the tenured group, after reflection, did not universally view the incentive as a reward but as a means to improve or enhance their individual skillset, and also the learning experience for their students. Incentives clearly played a role for the tenured business faculty interviewed in considering learning to teach online and possibly for the survey participants, had their institutions provided a form of incentive. Had a form of incentive been offered in more cases this may have had a more significant impact on the survey participants to consider learning to teach in an online environment.

Thus far a discussion of the factors to consider teaching in an online environment has been discussed. It is now appropriate to discuss the learning process associated with tenured business faculty’s change in perspective to teach online.

Learning process.

The qualitative participants learned to teach online through the dimensions of instrumental learning, emotional learning (Illeris, 2004) and through dialogue with
colleagues by gaining insights which enhanced confidence and a new willingness to accept new challenges. Instrumental learning occurred through knowledge gained from instructional design specialists or through online support. In keeping with the quantitative participants view about the importance of institutional support and training when considering learning to teach online, qualitative participants also discussed how important it was to have in-house technical support behind them to ensure success. There was not much in terms of formal training initiatives offered by institutions or teaching practices online but technical support and assistance with course design through instructional design experts was described as extremely important in the process of learning to teach online and were widely utilized.

The learning process to teach online also involved dimensions of emotions and feelings the educators had to recognize and overcome in order to be as successful teaching online as they are in their face-to-face courses. The function of emotional learning is to secure a mental balance between feelings and emotions and to develop a sensitivity to the identified emotions (Illeris, 2004). For example, the emotion of fear was a common theme shared by tenured business faculty with teaching online. This was due to concern with a lack of confidence in their abilities to teach in this medium. Neil, stated it well when he said, “learning is pretty much learning, so you need to be confident in your own abilities and know that you have something to offer to students. That is really important.” The fear of failure to teach online for the first time and not have the familiar structure of the face-to-face course was something all the participants had to be sensitive about and learn to overcome in order to experience success teaching online. Kurt expressed his sentiments succinctly about how one learns to address the fear of
failure when he stated: “It is extremely important to have people in-house who can sit down with you and help you through the course when you are starting out and learning it. That’s critical.” Technical and emotional support provided by the institution again is indicated as critical components to a successful experience teaching online.

The third learning dimension which occurred for the qualitative participants was through dialogue with colleagues. Specifically, reaching out to colleagues who taught online to discuss what were the pros and cons, the level of preparation necessary, how to design a course, any special teaching practices recommended that made the experience less intimidating. As the tenured business faculty had a number of years of successful teaching experience face-to-face, a certain amount of humility was required on their part to ask for assistance. The participants recognized that if they were going to tackle the challenge of teaching online, one way they can be successful is to emulate and learn from colleagues whom they trust and respect.

For the quantitative business participants questions regarding the learning process to teach online included, the institution has a formal strategy to develop and make online education a viable educational medium for students and the institution provides an appropriate level of training and support for me to teach effectively online. Business faculty surveyed agreed that their institution had an effective strategy to make online education a viable educational medium for students. Additionally, the participants agreed that they did receive an appropriate level of training and support from their employer to teach online coursework. This result, in the process of learning to teach online, is consistent with the finding that a majority of the business faculty felt that having
institutional support and training were important factors when considering learning to teach online.

Thus through the dimensions of instrumental learning, emotional learning, and through dialogue with colleagues, business faculty (including tenured) were able to flow through a process of learning to effectively teach online after having a change in perspective with the educational medium. What impact teaching online had on the participant’s face-to-face course is also a topic addressed in this research study and the findings from qualitative and quantitative participants are discussed next.

**The Impact of Teaching Online on Face-to-Face Coursework**

When considering the impact teaching online had on the tenured business faculty who participated in qualitative interviews 10 of the 14 indicated they did alter their teaching practices for their face-to-face coursework. While the remaining four did not implement altered teaching approaches, they did describe the impact teaching online had on their practice. From the perspective of altered teaching practices, the qualitative participants indicated the concepts for change in their face-to-face course came from instructional design staff. The main idea that tenured business faculty described that they implemented in their face-to-face course was the concept of a flipped classroom. This concept entails posting a lecture online for students to review outside of the classroom and use the class period for activities that enhance the learning experience for students. For example, the class period is spent reviewing case studies, group activities, demonstrations, solving problems and answering questions. This can be considered a constructivist model of learning. A constructivist model is based on the concept that students construct their own meaning and knowledge from their experiences. Teaching is
viewed as a process that helps learners create knowledge through interactive and authentic learning experiences. The instructor acts more as a guide to facilitate learning rather than acting as a content expert. The constructivist model allows for active learning versus passive learning of the lecture style (Bangert, 2004). An example of a constructivist interactive learning process was indicated by Kurt when he described his view on active learning in the courses he taught when he stated:

> So many of our professors come in, put up slides and lecture for most of the period. I never taught that way, but many, many professors do. That’s passive learning. All the students have to do is sit there. A lot of students resist active learning; they are used to passive learning. They are used to being lectured to. I think it’s finally being overcome.

Tenured business faculty also described several benefits of conducting a flipped classroom style. For example, giving more time for speakers for the face-to-face class, additional interactivity in class due to not spending time lecturing, use of technology to improve teaching efficiencies such as delivering quizzes and tests online as well as grading online. The use of transcripts with recorded lectures was also seen as a benefit especially for foreign students who have difficulty with English. The student can spend time listening and reading as necessary to gain understanding of the topic presented. Lastly, the use of online reading topics was incorporated in face-to-face coursework as access to the references is easily obtainable for the most part by students.

In addition to altered teaching practices from utilizing a flipped classroom approach by tenured business faculty in their face-to-face coursework, four of the qualitative participants described the impact that teaching online had overall for their
face-to-face practice. For example, one tenured business faculty member described how he was more direct with questions, explicit in instructions for writing and participation through the use of rubrics due to his experience of teaching an online course. This practice, however, led to more stringent grading of student assignments in some cases. In other cases, however, a participant noted grades had improved because of the increased interactivity in class. Another participant spoke of how he learned to manage online discussion forums as part of his face-to-face course.

Overall, tenured business faculty felt there was a positive spillover effect in their face-to-face course due to having experienced teaching in an online environment. Having handled and designed all aspects of a course online in some cases gave tenured business faculty a greater understanding of how they would approach teaching their face-to-face course, increase their technological IQ and have a better appreciation of student’s perspective to learning and applying knowledge. The literature supports the finding of faculty increasing their technological knowledge due to having taught courses online through support offered by their institution (Glynn Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012).

For the quantitative participants, two questions were posed regarding altered teaching practices in business faculty’s face-to-face course due to having taught online. These included, teaching online classes has impacted teaching methods used in face-to-face classes and to what extent did teaching online alter teaching methods/procedures for face-to-face courses? The business faculty surveyed agreed that having taught online impacted the teaching methods and procedures used in their face to face class. For altered teaching practices business faculty surveyed indicated the top three teaching practices utilized in their face-to-face course were a more detailed syllabus, highly interactive
group activities and small group discussion. Occasional use of web/video conference tools was also noted. Interestingly, the use of recorded lectures for review by students outside the face-to-face class and use of online exams had the highest rated percentages reported as never being used by business faculty in their face-to-face course. This is in stark contrast to the tenured business qualitative participants who described their prevalent use of recorded lectures as well as occasional use of online exams in their face-to-face coursework. From a quantitative standpoint it was determined that no significant mean differences existed between tenured business faculty and all other business faculty regarding if they altered teaching practices in their face-to-face course due to having taught online. Tenured and all other business faculty agreed that teaching online impacted their approach to teaching face-to-face coursework.

For the tenured group surveyed, highly interactive group activities was significantly correlated to altered teaching practices in face-to-face coursework. More small group discussion approached significance and a more detailed syllabus positively trended toward significance. Use of web/video conferencing tools and use online exams, and record lectures for review did not prove to be correlated from the data presented. For tenured business faculty, the predictor of highly interactive group activities proved to be relevant and subtly introduced this practice into their face-to-face coursework. For all business faculty combined the use of web/video conferencing tools, highly interactive group activities, and more detailed syllabus approached significance with correlation to altered teaching practices in face-to-face coursework. Small group discussion and use of online exams positively trended toward significance. Record lectures for review was not significant. From these teaching practices the predictor of highly interactive group
activities and use of web/video conferencing tools proved to be relevant for all business faculty who subtly introduced these teaching practices in their face-to-face coursework. Thus for tenured and all business faculty surveyed, teaching online classes does predict altered teaching practices on a subtle basis with highly interactive group activities and through the use of web/video conferencing tools.

For both qualitative and quantitative tenured business faculty, having taught online led to more interactive group activities in their face to face course which further enhanced student engagement and learning outcomes. For tenured business faculty, the question was what led to a change assumptions and beliefs about teaching online and altering teaching practices in their face-to-face course? The impact transformative learning had on tenured business faculty who initially resisted teaching online but now do so was also a topic addressed in this research study and the findings from qualitative and quantitative participants are discussed.

**Perspective Change to Teach Online**

Various factors contributed to a change in perspective for the qualitative tenured business faculty who eventually taught online but what role did transformative learning play in bringing about this perspective change? As exemplified by the 14 participants in the qualitative portion of the study, a key to a change in perspective was tied to their identity as an educator with their institution and their coursework through conscious thought and unconscious mindset. “Trying on a new identity might be part of the process of working toward transformative learning, but it is not an outcome” (Cranton & Kasl, 2012, p. 397). Perspective change could be said to have occurred because of how tenured business faculty viewed themselves through their conscious thoughts (habit of mind).
about their change in role and responsibilities. This conscious process of a changed view of one’s identity is not necessarily a transformative experience (Cranton & Kasl, 2012). What is vital to understanding if transformative learning occurred is how the changed view or habit of mind has been altered due to the experience of considering teaching online after initially being resistant. A shift in identity of the educator is an outcome of this change in perspective. Central to transformation of an individual is how unconscious mindset leads to conscious thought (habit of mind) and then through critical reflection (Mezirow, 1994) an altered mindset and identity as an educator (transformation) has potentially occurred with a newfound willingness to teach online. This change in mindset is not only through a habit of mind but also through a revised point of view (meaning scheme) that led to a change in specific beliefs about teaching online that directed and shaped their interpretation of the benefits this educational medium offered (Mezirow, 1994). This is the process of transformative learning that may have occurred for tenured business faculty in this study. What is key to a potential transformation is critical reflection. Mezirow defines reflection as “the process of critically assessing the content, process and premise of our efforts to interpret and give meaning to an experience” (Taylor & Cranton, 2012, p. 105). Individuals must first be open to the idea of considering viewpoints that differ from their own and also take time to examine their well-established assumptions and beliefs in order for perspective transformation to occur (Mezirow, 1991).

For the qualitative tenured business faculty, critical reflection (or reflection) likely occurred due to several factors. These included, individual identity as an educator, a sense of responsibility to their employer and ownership of their coursework, avoiding
obsolescence, being part of something new and remaining relevant. Additionally, reflection occurred with considering teaching online to help meet the needs of students and due to improved technological capabilities. Tenured business faculty in some cases, reflected over a period of several years before deciding to accept the challenge of teaching online. The interview participants also believed it was important for tenured business faculty to engage in online education. A lot can be said for an institution’s students to be taught by their most experienced faculty members. Tenured business faculty can also gain an understanding of online education and offer an informed viewpoint to potentially improve the institutions’ online curriculum as necessary.

From a quantitative standpoint, four questions were posed to gain an understanding of the factors that led to a change in perspective to teach online and also potentially transform business faculty’s identity as an educator. These questions included: If you are a tenured faculty member, what led you to believe you could be successful teaching online after many years teaching in a face-to-face environment; Peer mentoring of other online instructors is an effective method to learn to teach online; If you initially resisted teaching online coursework but now do so, how important were several factors in your change in perspective; If you had a change in perspective regarding your willingness to teach online coursework, how much time did this change take to occur?

Similar to the results from the factors considered to learn to teach online by the quantitative participants, tenured business faculty indicated that they believed they would be successful teaching online if their institution provided the necessary technical support and training followed by a belief they would be successful because by teaching online they would enhance their individual skills. Also, to a lesser degree, was the importance of
dialogue and consulting with colleagues to gain a new perspective to be successful when teaching online. Similar to qualitative participants under the learning process to teach online, the business faculty surveyed did agree that peer mentoring was an effective method to learn to be successful teaching online.

For all business faculty surveyed, several factors were listed for consideration as to how important each were to a change in perspective after having taken the step to teach online. These factors listed (from highest-lowest) included, growing confidence in teaching online, improved technological capabilities of the institution, promote student learning in innovative ways, received positive feedback as you began to teach online, dialogue with colleagues who had a successful online experience, and a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online round out the top six categories. The highest percentage categories considered not at all important included a concern for becoming less relevant as a faculty member and maintain control of course after moving online. The next highest category considered not at all important was an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online. Business faculty were then asked if they had a change in perspective regarding their willingness to teach online coursework, how much time did the change take to occur? For a majority of the respondents they reflected between six months to two years. As the survey applied to all business faculty (including tenured) it was necessary to determine if mean differences existed between the two faculty groups with time taken to reflect on factors that led to a change in perspective. No differences were reported between the two groups regarding time taken to reflect on the factors that led to a change in perspective.
Does time spent reflecting by tenured business faculty predict a change in perspective to teach online? It became apparent from the correlations analyzed that as the period of time to reflect is reduced the more important the factors are that tenured business faculty considered significant in leading to a change in perspective and potential transformation in identity as an educator. The predictor of growing confidence in teaching online proved to be moderately relevant as a predictor for a change in perspective after taking time to reflect about teaching online.

For tenured business faculty who participated in the survey it is meaningful that they believe the major factor that contributed to a change in perspective is a growing confidence to teach online. Through reflection they reconsidered and began to teach online after receiving technical support and training. As they continued to evolve in their beliefs as an online educator, their confidence in their abilities grew and a realization occurred that they have something positive to offer students. A change in mindset or conscious thought (habit of mind) could be said to have occurred contributing to a transformative experience about teaching online.

For all business faculty a similar analysis was conducted to determine if time spent reflecting by all business faculty predicted a change in perspective to teach online. It is apparent again from the correlations listed that as the period of time to reflect is reduced the more important the factors are that business faculty considered important in leading to a change in perspective and potential transformation among the participants. The predictors of a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online and an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online proved to be moderately relevant as a predictor for a change in perspective after taking time to reflect about teaching online.
For all business faculty a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online pertains to the availability of technology that replicated the face-to-face experience. Initially, faculty possibly did not understand the capabilities of the technology or did not know of its existence. Either way, a changed view of the effectiveness to teach online occurred by faculty after having taken time to consider the use of technology to approximate the face-to-face experience online. Also of relevance is the predictor of an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online. As the survey included all business faculty (including tenured) some of the business faculty do not always have a choice whether to teach online. Thus, while an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online may not have been an important aspect statistically for a change in perspective for all business faculty, it was relevant as a predictor of change in perspective. This is because as more and more business faculty may be required to teach online there is less time spent in reflection on its importance as a predictor for a change in perspective to teach online. Also interestingly, the highest percentage categories considered not at all important included a concern for becoming less relevant as a faculty member and maintain control of course after moving online. This is in contrast to the qualitative findings of tenured only business faculty. As the quantitative participants included other than tenured faculty they may not have the same level of concern about relevancy and control of a course since they may be newer, less experienced faculty.

A perspective change to teach online included time spent in reflection on many factors. As a change in assumptions and beliefs to teaching online occurred for the participants of the study as they made meaning of their new experiences, this served as a
guide to direct future action. This process represents the definition of transformative learning.

With the analysis of the qualitative and quantitative findings complete, attention is now turned to how this research study contributes to the current literature on current resistance trends to teaching online, the impact of teaching online with a face-to-face practice and the role of transformative learning and teaching online.

**Perspective Change to Teaching Online: Contributing to the Literature**

This section of the study focuses on how this research study adds to the current literature on perspective change of tenured business faculty with resistance to teaching online. The section will be organized into three themes which include: Current resistance trends with teaching online, the impact of teaching online with a face-to-face practice (flipping the classroom), and transformative learning and teaching online.

**Current Resistance Trends**

From a 2014 survey done by the Babson Survey Research Group only, 28% of academic leaders say that their faculty accept the value and legitimacy of online education. This rate is substantially the same as what was recorded in 2003 and is down from an all-time high which was reported in 2007 of 33.5% (Allen & Seaman, 2015). According to the Babson Survey Research Group, no more than one-third of chief academic officers in the past 12 years reported their faculty accept the value and legitimacy of online education. Consistent with this result, according to the last survey conducted in 2015, only 29.1% of chief academic officers reported their faculty accepted the value and legitimacy of online education (Allen & Seaman, 2016). “In the past several years a continuing failure of online education has been the inability to convince
its most important audience, higher education, of its worth” (Allen & Seaman, 2016, p.26). In this research study, the purpose was to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments. This study informs the current literature in a number of ways. From the 14 tenured business faculty interviewed across the United States and the 206 business faculty surveyed (including tenured) and understanding of what they viewed as the major factors for resistance with teaching online was determined. Additionally, the study also informs the current literature on the factors and the learning processes business faculty (including tenured) adopted when considering teaching in an online environment.

While faculty may be more skeptical about online education and teaching within this medium, administrators hold a different outlook about the possibilities of online education. As reported by Nash (2015), the Babson Survey group found that the percentage of administrators that considered online education important to the future of their institution went from less than half in 2002 to almost 70% in a 2012 survey. The reason for the difference in administrator’s view of online education from that of faculty was due to the potential revenue opportunities that online education offers. The financial benefits offered by online education include, shorter courses, more cost efficient faculty which can lead to downsizing of tenured faculty and increased enrollment opportunities (Nash, 2015).

This study also informs current literature on the value of tenured faculty for an institution’s reputation in achieving quality learning outcomes for their students. The
finding from this research study was business faculty did believe that it was important that tenured business faculty teach online to support achievement of obtaining equivalent learning outcomes as face-to-face coursework. However, in a national survey of Chief Academic Officers in January, 2016, just 38% of respondents said that they strongly believed that tenure remained important and viable at their institution. This same survey reported 75% of Chief Academic Officers indicated they relied heavily on non-tenure track members for instruction (Shulman, Hopkins, Kelchen, Mastracci, & Yaya, 2016).

The success of an institution lies in its ability to attract and maintain high quality faculty. Long-term strategies that facilitate sustained academic excellence and improve student success includes a long-term commitment to full-time tenure, tenure- track faculty. Tenured faculty, full or associate professors, make up approximately 21% of the academic labor force while tenure-track faculty (assistant professors) make up just over 8%. Over the past 40 years, the amount of faculty holding full-time tenured positions has declined by 26% and full-time tenure track positions declined 50%. In contrast, a 62% increase in full-time non-tenure track faculty appointments and a 70% increase in part-time instructional faculty appointments has occurred (Shulman, et. al., 2016). Two-thirds of faculty still believe after 12 years of analysis that learning through online courses is inferior to face-to-face courses (Allen & Seaman, 2016). As evidenced above, administrators in higher education are supporting online courses and full-time non-tenure track positions at an increasing rate. From this research study, it has been demonstrated that a key aspect to business faculty change in perspective to teaching online is due to a change in their view of the effectiveness of teaching online. This change occurred because of the ability to replicate the face-to-face classroom environment through
improved technology. Tenured business faculty surveyed indicated a change in their perspective to teach online was due to reflection regarding helping to meet needs of students and a growing confidence in their ability to teach within this medium through effective institutional support and training. The decision by administrators to reduce the proportion of full-time tenured and tenure track faculty has had a deep impact on higher education. The increase in part-time faculty has created problems for higher education and diminished student learning. Research has found that the use of part-time instructors is associated with lower retention and graduation rates (Shulman, et. al., 2016).

Institutional support of business faculty (including tenured) as demonstrated from this analysis is a key aspect to faculty consideration to teach online. Through support and retention of the institution’s most experienced and qualified tenured staff, will help to drive successful learning outcomes for students who participate in online courses and also improve the perception of quality of online initiatives for an institution of higher learning.

The impact altered teaching practices business faculty utilized in their face-to-face course also was addressed in this research study. The current literature on flipped classrooms and how this study informs this research is the next area of discussion.

**Flipping the Classroom**

The concept of a flipped classroom was a central theme described by more of the qualitative than quantitative participants of this research study. Specifically in how they altered teaching practices in their face-to-face classroom due to having taught online coursework. The findings from this study for tenured business faculty and teaching practice changes with their face-to-face course after teaching online was significant because there was previously no identified research studies that analyzed this group.
Higher education and teacher education are entering a time of transformation. Shifting demographics, new technologies and a move from an industrial society to service mean that teacher educators need to examine their current approach and model new ways of addressing student learning (Marks, 2015). A flipped classroom concept means the “instructor acts as a facilitator to motivate, guide, and give feedback on student’s performance.” In a flipped classroom, students will not spend time in class “listening to long lectures and have more time in class to solve problems individually or collaboratively” (Zianuodin & Halili, 2016). From this research study of quantitative business faculty (including tenured) it was also determined that highly interactive group activities and use of web/video conferencing tools proved to be a relevant change in their face-to-face practice. This finding is significant as curriculum design is becoming more student centered, the changes made to the face-to-face coursework can now focus on specific practice implementation rather than centrally focused on use of technology in the classroom. As more and more instruction is geared toward student engagement and active learning, the flipped classroom model supports this initiative in higher education. Current studies on the flipped classroom model show the practice serves to keep students engaged in learning while classes utilizing the traditional (lecture) style tend to produce a disengaged learning environment. Students also expressed that they felt more confident learning in a flipped classroom style because they had already prepared the lesson (listen to lecture) prior to coming to class (Zianuodin & Halili, 2016). What makes the flipped classroom model successful is how the media (lecture videos) are integrated into the classroom. Because faculty produce videos of their lecture for a subject outside the classroom, students are required to use the knowledge gained from the video lecture in
class and gain immediate feedback from peers and the instructor. This type of learning accompanied by meaningful peer/instructor feedback is considered higher-level learning as opposed to learning individually outside of the classroom (Marks, 2015).

Thus, from the experience of having taught online, a more student centered approach to learning has been allocated to the face-to-face classroom and transformed the traditional style of learning and teaching. As the style of teaching in face-to-face courses has been altered, so too has the perspective of faculty who participated in this research study. How transformative learning and teaching online ads to the current literature on perspective change of tenured business faculty is discussed next.

**Transformative Learning and Teaching Online**

A perspective change to teach online occurred for various reasons as outlined in this research. What transformed individual mindsets to adopt the educational medium and consider it as effective as their face-to-face coursework was due to reflection. From the current literature reviewed on resistance to online education and teaching online, one perspective is offered through Dietrich’s, 2015 description of observations of a reluctant college instructor. The instructor, who taught counseling students, initially had concerns about teaching online and struggled to understand how technology could provide the same educational experience essentially as face-to-face coursework. The instructor considered, is this a legitimate degree? He also commented on how surprised he was on how much time it took to develop online courses. During the process the instructor began to reconsider after reflection about his own experiences in his face-to-face course. He indicated that there were many students who physically attended his course with whom he had very little interaction. A student could attend his class, sit quietly in the back,
participate minimally and then slip out the back door. After teaching online he concluded that students cannot hide and everyone must participate. There is no backdoor in an online course. After experiencing teaching online, he now has a change in thinking and prefers the use of email over talking on the phone or even in person with students. Email, he found, affords time to collect thoughts and have a record of a response. The instructor also likes the flexibility of not needing to be in class but did describe the time and effort to monitor email and grading with an online course as “always silently operating whether you are logged in or not.” He concludes his commentary as saying his identity has transformed now to “I am now an online professor!”

This research study of perspective change of tenured business faculty included many of the themes addressed by this reluctant professor (Dietrich, 2015). Initial resistance and concerns with quality of education, reconsidered, and after reflection believed that teaching online not only benefitted their career but also benefitted students in terms of an improved learning experience. By declaring “I am an online professor”, a change in identity occurred for this individual who had previously taught face-to-face coursework. But can a simple change in identity with one’s job translate to transformation? Transformation is defined as “To change the form of. To change into another shape or form, to change in character and condition, to alter in function or nature, to metamorphosis” (Newman, 2012). As seen from this research study of tenured business faculty, they had a strong motivation to serve their institution and be a model employee by assisting in the development of an online curriculum, to remain relevant and enhance their skills. Adults, however, do not transform elements of their identity without strong reasons or motivation to change (Illeris, 2014). The qualitative tenured business
faculty’s identity as an educator was tied to their successful experience as a face-to-face professor. Over the years of their career they had developed a solid reputation and had a strong identity to their employer and their coursework. When confronted with a request to take on the challenge of teaching online or assisting in the development of an online curriculum all the quantitative participants agreed to do so. As exemplified by the declining amount of tenured faculty holding full-time tenured positions an unconscious mindset may have played a role in the motivation of the participants to agree to teach online. Thus, through a potential unconscious concern with obsolescence leading to conscious thought (habit of mind) to serve their institution and students and then through critical reflection of these factors (Mezirow, 1994), an altered mindset and identity as an educator (transformation) has potentially occurred. An individual can change their identity depending on the circumstance, but a change of mindset with deeply rooted assumptions and beliefs such as becoming an online instructor who previously had deep reservations about its viability as an educational medium could be described as a metamorphosis. The process of transformative learning that may have occurred for the participants of this study has served to inform the current literature on transformative learning in the following way. One of the criticisms of transformative learning research is that it is overly qualitative in nature. The strength of this research study is that it is a mixed methods approach. The weaknesses inherent in doing a qualitative analysis or quantitative analysis only are addressed with this study. Qualitatively thick, rich data was collected from 14 tenured business faculty from across the United States. Quantitatively, 206 business faculty (including tenured) world-wide participated in this study and provided their perspective on teaching and learning online. Thus, the benefit of
having a large amount of quantitative responses coupled with the qualitative descriptive stories brings greater credibility to the overall research study. The focus of this research from a transformative learning standpoint was on reflection by the participants on factors considered relevant to a change in perspective with teaching online. Additionally the role of the unconscious mind in triggering a willingness to consider a change in a habit of mind, point of view (meaning scheme) and identity to teach online leading to a transformative learning experience was identified from qualitative analysis. From a quantitative standpoint for the tenured business faculty, time spent in reflection did predict a change in perspective to teach online. As the most relevant factor which led to a change in perspective after reflection was a growing confidence to teach online. This suggests that tenured business faculty in the study were open to a change of mindset if the right training and support were provided by their institution. Thus, not only did the qualitative stories support the role of reflection but so did the quantitative analysis which proved time in reflection as a significant predictor for a change in perspective.

**Implications for Practice and Future Research**

The implications for practice that this research study addressed included: The specific factors of resistance that were considered relevant for all business faculty (including tenured) regarding teaching online; what factors were considered by tenured business faculty to consider learning to teach online; the impact of teaching online on face-to-face coursework; and perspective change to teach online and the role resistance and reflection played in a potential transformation among the participants. This research study will assist institutions of higher learning by providing knowledge to train and reduce the impact these resistance factors have on tenured business faculty to teach in an
online environment. It will serve to encourage tenured business faculty to reflect on their assumptions, beliefs and identity as an educator for the benefit of their institution, their coursework, their students and their own relevance in a changing educational environment. This study also informs institutions of higher learning on specific teaching practice changes that were incorporated subtly within tenured business faculty face-to-face coursework after teaching online. This knowledge can be shared and training provided to other faculty on best practices for teaching face-to-face courses to encourage active learning from students rather than passive approaches which have been indicated to disengage students from impactful learning experiences.

As this research study centered on the online experiences of business faculty, including tenured business faculty, further research is needed to determine how other faculty groups view teaching online and the factors they consider to teach online if initially resistant. Online coursework through technological innovations can work for most types of curriculum, but as seen through this research study, replicating the face-to-face experience was a very important aspect to a change in perspective for the participants. How do other educational disciplines with more hands on activities such as medical, therapeutic activities, for example, view teaching and learning online? Additional research in technical practices that are useful for these learning environments is appropriate. Additional areas of future research also include active versus passive learning approaches and the impact on learning outcomes, promotion, tenure and salary considerations for faculty exclusively teaching online versus traditional coursework and the role the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation has for quality learning outcomes with online education. Lastly, what
teaching practices are considered to contribute to transformative learning in an online environment?

Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, this study explored the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education. Additionally, the study assessed the process of change of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant to teaching online and how teaching online impacted their approach in face-to-face learning environments. Based on the findings of this study, which have been presented throughout this chapter, a perspective change to teach online begins with reflection on several factors that proved to be important in the learning process to begin teaching within this educational medium.

In terms of resistance to teaching online, it is clear from the business faculty who participated in this research that there was a high level of reluctance to begin teaching online. Resistance to the educational medium centered on perceptions of the quality of education received by students, much time and effort to begin teaching online and concerns with a less flexible syllabus than what was previously encountered in face-to-face coursework. These resistance patterns were consistent with all business faculty participants, including tenured. With this resistance however, the participants did not see that teaching online as an inhibitor in promotion and tenure opportunities with certain reservations including having served time in a face-to-face course and affording time to conduct research. All business faculty believed that tenured business faculty should teach online to support achievement of obtaining equivalent learning outcomes as face-to-face. Additionally those tenured participants surveyed agreed that they would still teach online
if not already tenured. The majority of business faculty who participated in the survey agreed that they preferred to teach in a face-to-face environment over online.

Qualitative tenured business faculty agreed to consider teaching online only after being requested by higher ranking colleagues. Because of their strong identity as an educator, to their employer, their coursework and also an unconscious concern with their own relevance did they consider the challenge of teaching online. For all business faculty (including tenured) who participated in the quantitative survey, the main factor that was considered when learning to teach online was institutional support and training followed by the use of web/video conferencing tools to replicate face-to-face interaction that they were accustomed to. The highest ranked factors which were not considered important by all business faculty when they considered learning to teach online included promotional opportunities, previously taken a course online as a student and incentives. A higher percentage of tenured business faculty than non-tenured faculty surveyed believed promotional opportunities were not an important factor when considering learning to teach online.

The learning process to teach online included the dimensions of instrumental learning, emotional learning and dialogue with colleagues for the qualitative participants. A majority of quantitative business faculty surveyed agreed that their institution had a formal strategy to develop and make online education a viable educational medium for students and they received an appropriate level of training and support to teach online.

For the qualitative tenured business faculty participants who taught online they indicated that the flipped classroom approach was the primary change made to their face-to-face course due to having taught online. This primarily entails producing videos of
lectures for students to review outside of class and spend more time in class for learning activities. This is considered a more student-centered or constructivist model of learning. For the quantitative participants, a majority of faculty agreed that teaching online impacted their teaching methods in their face-to-face course. For tenured business faculty, highly interactive group activities proved to be relevant and was subtly introduced into their face-to-face coursework. For all business faculty surveyed, highly interactive group activities and use of web/video conferencing tools proved to be relevant and was subtly introduced into their face-to-face coursework.

For qualitative tenured business faculty a perspective change to teach online occurred only after reflection on several factors including their identity as an educator, their responsibility to their employer, their coursework, avoiding obsolescence, being part of something new and remaining relevant, meeting the needs of students, and improved technological capabilities. Numerous participants reflected over a period of several years before making the decision to teach online. For the quantitative participants, a difference was not noted between tenured and all other business faculty with time taken to reflect on the factors that led to a perspective change. Tenured business faculty indicated that as time taken to reflect is reduced, the more important were factors considered leading to a change in perspective to teach online and potential transformation in identity as an educator. The main factor considered moderately relevant for a change in perspective after taking time to reflect about teaching online was a growing confidence in teaching online. For all business faculty surveyed again, as time taken to reflect is reduced, the more important were factors considered leading to a change in perspective to teach online and potential transformation in identity as an educator. The main factors considered
moderately relevant for a change in perspective after taking time to reflect about teaching online included a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online to replicate the face-to-face experience and an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online. For the quantitative participants, time spent in reflection ranged in a majority of the cases from 6 months to two years. Lastly, tenured business faculty surveyed primarily believed they would be successful teaching online if their institution provided the necessary technical support and training.

In conclusion, this research study has provided a number of implications for practice within higher education. The concept for this study originated due to a desire to keep avenues of learning and achieving educational goals within reach and open doors for individuals who cannot always learn in a traditional style. Through a study of the Transformational Journey of Educators in Technology, highlighting tenured business faculty and the importance of having them participate with teaching online coursework, it will afford students an opportunity to gain quality learning outcomes from those individuals who have gained the highest level of success within their profession.
Figure 1- Phases of Transformative Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>A disorienting dilemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Self-examination with feelings of guilt or shame, sometimes turning to religion for support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>A critical assessment of assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Recognition that one’s discontent and the process of transformation are shared and others have negotiated a similar change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Exploration of options for new roles, relationships and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Planning a course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>Acquiring knowledge and skills for implementing one’s plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8</td>
<td>Provisionally trying out new roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9 (added 1991)</td>
<td>Renegotiating relationships and negotiating new relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 10</td>
<td>Building competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 11</td>
<td>A reintegration into one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s new perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2- Data Display
## Qualitative Participants-Pseudonyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Institution/Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Teaches Finance coursework</td>
<td>Private University/Western U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Teaches Negotiation Skills coursework</td>
<td>Public University/Eastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby</td>
<td>Teaches Human Resource Management &amp; Leadership in Organization</td>
<td>Public University/Eastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Finance professor, Academic Director and Founder of University's Executive MBA Program</td>
<td>Public University/Southwestern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Teaches courses in Employment Law, Union Management Relations and Human Resource Management</td>
<td>Public University/Northeastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Teaches Marketing coursework</td>
<td>Public University/Southeastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Teaches MBA Managerial Accounting</td>
<td>Public University/Northeastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Professor (Emeritus) of Management and Business Administration</td>
<td>Public University/Southern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Teaches capstone Strategic Management Course</td>
<td>Public University Midwestern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marv</td>
<td>Professor (Emeritus). Pioneered Dartmouth BASIC language project</td>
<td>Private University/Western U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Teaches Strategic Management coursework</td>
<td>Public University/Northeastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Teaches Quantitative Marketing coursework</td>
<td>Public University/Midwestern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Teaches Business, Economic &amp; Statistics coursework</td>
<td>Public University/Midwestern U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Teaches Business Management coursework</td>
<td>Private University/Northeastern U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resistance Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Quality of Education</td>
<td>1) Not as rich an experience online; economic pressures; social bias.</td>
<td>1) Highest ranked concern with business faculty/tenured. Included lack of face-to-face contact; emulating the classroom experience; academic integrity; lack of support or training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Time &amp; Effort</td>
<td>2) Learning technology; interact with students; greater explanation necessary; work with expert staff; grading, 24/7 monitoring email; prepare video lectures; complete course in advance; administrative burdens.</td>
<td>2) 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; and 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; ranked concern of business faculty/tenured. Expedited grading also ranked 6 out of 9 categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Lack of Flexibility</td>
<td>3) Course syllabus cannot be deviated as easily online; reliance on technology heightens resistance.</td>
<td>3) The 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; ranked concern for all business faculty/tenured. Included accelerated course format concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Career Concerns &amp; Beliefs</td>
<td>4) Would teach online if not tenured and teaching online not seen as an inhibitor to promotion/tenure.</td>
<td>Lack of experience teaching online lowest rated concern of business faculty/tenured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Business faculty/tenured would teach online if not tenured and teaching online not seen as an inhibitor to promotion/tenure. Prefer face-to-face over line; believe tenured faculty should teach online to support quality online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors Considered to Learn to Teach Online</strong></td>
<td>Identity as an educator, to school, coursework; be a model employee, avoid obsolescence and learn new tasks; unconscious concerns with relevance lead to conscious thoughts above.</td>
<td>Business faculty/tenured ranked as important (from high-low):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional Support/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of Web/Video conferencing tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Department needs your class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhancing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flexible (faculty) schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Requested to teach online by colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business faculty/tenured ranked as not important (from high-low):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• *Promotional Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Previously taken online course as a student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*More tenured faculty believed promotional opportunities not as important than all other business faculty. Business faculty/tenured agreed that that their institution had a formal strategy to develop online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact of Teaching Online on Face-to-Face Coursework

Majority of tenured business faculty altered teaching practices. Ideas came from instructional design staff. A flipped classroom (constructivist learning) utilized.

Specific teaching practice changes:
- Active vs passive learning
- Instructor as facilitator
- More time allotted for outside speakers/greater interactivity
- Use technology to deliver quizzes/tests online; grade online
- Use transcripts with recorded lectures

General practice enhancements:
- More detailed questions/use rubrics
- Manage online discussion forums more efficiently
- Greater attention on design of overall course
- Increased technology IQ
- Appreciation of student perspective to learn and apply knowledge

Business faculty/tenured agreed their institution provided adequate training and support to teach online.

Business faculty/tenured agreed that teaching online impacted their teaching methods/procedures in face-to-face class.

Specific teaching practice changes utilized ranked (high-low):
- More detailed syllabus
- Highly interactive group activities
- Small group discussion
- Occasional use of web/video conference tools noted.

Specific teaching practice changes not utilized ranked (high-low):
- Recorded lectures
- Online exams

Relevant teaching practice changes subtly introduced in face-to-face course by tenured business faculty:
- Highly interactive group activities

Relevant teaching practice changes subtly introduced in face-to-face course by all business faculty:
- Highly interactive group activities
- Use of web/video conference tools

#### Perspective Change to Teach Online

Tenured business faculty reflected on several factors over a period of several years which allowed for a perspective change to teach online and lead to a potential transformation in identity and mindset. These included:

- Identity as an educator, employer, coursework
- Avoiding obsolescence
- Being part of something new and remaining relevant
- Meet need of students
- Improved technology capabilities
- Tenured business faculty should teach online to benefit higher education

Tenured business faculty believed they would be successful teaching online if:
- Provided technical support/training
- Enhanced technical skills
- Dialogue with colleagues
- Peer mentoring an effective way to be successful learning to teach online

No differences were noted between tenured and all other business faculty with time taken to reflect on factors that led to a change in perspective. It was proven significant that time taken to reflect does predict a change in perspective to teach online.

The time spent in reflection on the factors that were important to a perspective change to teach online ranged from 6 months to 2 years.
Business faculty/tenured ranked (high-low) the factors that were important to a perspective change to teach online:

- Growing confidence in teaching online
- Improved technology capabilities of institution
- Promote student learning
- Received positive feedback when teaching online
- Dialogue with colleagues
- Changed view of effectiveness of teaching online

Business faculty/tenured ranked (high-low) the factors that were not important to a perspective change to teach online:

- Less relevant as a faculty member
- Maintain control of course
- Institutional requirement to teach online

Conclusion:
For business faculty/tenured as time taken to reflect is reduced the more important the factors are in leading to a change in perspective to teach online and lead to a potential transformation in identity and mindset.
For tenured business faculty a growing confidence in teaching online was considered moderately relevant to a change in perspective after having taken time to reflect about teaching online.
For all business faculty a changed view of the effectiveness of teaching online and an institutional requirement for faculty to teach online was considered moderately relevant to a change in perspective after having taken time to reflect about teaching online.

**Transformative Learning Model**
Unconscious mindset > conscious thought (habit of mind) > revised point of view (meaning scheme) > critical reflection = altered mindset and identity.
APPENDIX B
RECRUITMENT SCRIPT & INTERVIEW GUIDE

Hello. My name is Michael G. McVey. I am a Doctoral Candidate in Adult Education at Penn State University-Harrisburg, PA. I am conducting research on tenured business faculty resistance to online education and what may have led to a change in perspective regarding teaching online. I am also interested to understand how teaching online impacted one’s approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments.

The criteria I utilize to select participants for a semi-structured interview include:

a) The educator previously was against online education as a viable educational medium but now finds teaching in this context enjoyable and productive.

b) Tenured business faculty.

c) Previously taught in a face-to-face format and now teach online courses.

After review of your institutions web site and course guide, I identified your name as a tenured online educator in business. If you meet the above listed criteria and would be interested in participating in this research study, I would appreciate if I could discuss your story. By gaining an understanding of what common factors lead tenured business faculty to a change in perspective with teaching online and ultimately accepting online education as an educational format, it could benefit adult education and institutions of higher learning. Specifically, the knowledge gained through this research can be communicated to tenured faculty in an effort to alleviate their concerns which will ultimately serve students in their quest for quality higher education.

Sincerely,

Michael McVey
Doctoral Candidate in Adult Education
Penn State University-Harrisburg, PA.

IRB Protocol: 00003765 Transformational Journey of Educators in Technology
Interview Questions-McVey Dissertation

**Purpose:** Given the lack of data-based research studies on faculty resistance to online education in general and business faculty more specifically and what may have led to a change in perspective regarding teaching online, the purpose of this mixed methods research study is two-fold. One, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured business faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change in mindset of tenured business faculty who were initially resistant and how has teaching online impacted their approach to teaching in face-to-face learning environments.

**Background/Teaching Methods:**

1) What is your educational background?
2) What is your teaching philosophy?
3) What formal coursework or training have you had to teach online courses?
4) Describe your online teaching experience.
5) Describe your face-to-face teaching experience.
6) Describe your current role at ___________.
7) Do you believe that online coursework is as effective as face-to-face classroom in terms of quality of education?
8) What do you see as the biggest challenges with online learning for students? Instructors?
9) How have your teaching methods changed in your face-to-face practice after having taught online? If so how?
10) Why did you make these changes?
11) What has been the learning outcome from these changes from student’s perspective?
12) Do you believe the work effort is the same to prepare for an online course vs face-to-face. If not, how is it different?

**Perspective Transformation:**
**Macro Level:**
1. Tell me your story of what led to your change in perspective.

Probing questions:
   a. Do you strictly teach face-to- face courses? Have you taught online or hybrid courses? If so, why did you initially resist teaching online?
b. What factors contributed to your resistance to online education and then eventual acceptance? What specifically made a difference in your mind to change your mindset?

c. Do you believe other tenured faculty from different educational departments have similar perceptions of teaching online and could benefit from your new perspective?

d. Were you required to teach online and is that the main reason you now do so?

e. Did you reflect on your beliefs and reconsider previously held positions with online education? If yes, what caused you to step back and reconsider your assumptions and beliefs?

f. Did you see colleagues successfully teach online? If so, did this contribute to a change of view with online education?

g. What would you say was the learning process with your change in mindset?

2. Would incentives to teach online increase motivation to adopt the educational format? If so what type of incentives?

3. Do you view teaching online as affording the same tenure and promotion opportunities as traditional course work?

4. Would you recommend online courses for students if they have the option to take a class in the traditional setting? If Yes, Why?

5. What is your opinion with your institutions’ level of training and support with online education?

6. Did you ever assist in the development of an online course? If yes, why did you choose to participate?

7. What major business/academic associations do you or your colleagues belong to?
Hello, my name is Michael G. McVey. I am a Doctoral Candidate in Adult Education at Penn State University-Harrisburg PA. The focus of this short (10 minute) survey is to determine how certain faculty groups overcome potential resistance to teaching in online educational formats and understand how this may or may not impact teaching practices in their face-to-face environment.

You were carefully chosen to participate in this survey to gain valuable insight to address the concern of business faculty resistance with teaching online. Specifically, in understanding how business faculty are able or not able to overcome resistance to teaching in an online format, what factors may lead to a change in mindset, and how it has or has not impacted teaching practices in traditional classroom environments. The knowledge gained through this research can be communicated to faculty across the world in an effort to alleviate their concerns with teaching online which will ultimately aid students in their quest for quality higher education in an online environment.

I have received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct this research. Your responses will be completely anonymous and data will be gathered through the Qualtrics database. Thank you for contributing your valuable knowledge to this critical concern for higher education. I do appreciate very much your contributions because without your feedback I will not be able to fully complete my dissertation research.

Sincerely,

Michael McVey
Doctoral Candidate in Adult Education
Penn State University-Harrisburg, PA.

IRB Protocol: 00003765 Transformational Journey of Educators in Technology
SURVEY
Thank you for choosing to participate in this survey! The following definitions will assist you as you proceed to answer the survey questions:

Online Education - courses exclusively taught over the Internet.

Face-to-Face - courses taught exclusively in the traditional classroom setting at a physical location.

Purpose

The purpose of this mixed methods research study is two-fold: one, to explore the experiences of tenured and non-tenured faculty with online education and two, to assess the process of change for faculty who were initially resistant to teaching online and how has teaching online impacted their approach to instruction in face-to-face learning environments.

In your career, have you taught both online and face-to-face courses in higher education?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

How many courses have you taught online in your career?

____

I prefer to teach in a face-to-face environment rather than online.

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Somewhat agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Somewhat disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

I prefer to teach in an online environment rather than face-to-face.

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Somewhat agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Somewhat disagree
If you have concerns with teaching online courses, check all concerns that apply.

- Amount of Work
- Takes More Time
- Lack of Experience
- Quality of Education
- Less Flexible Syllabus
- Grading
- Accelerated Course Format
- Working with Technology
- Other
- None

How important were the following factors when you considered teaching online classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Support/Training</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use Of Web/Video Conferencing Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Needs Your Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Your Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Taken An Online Course As A Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested to Teach Online By Dean Or Academic Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching online courses places me at a disadvantage later in my career.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree
Teaching online courses will inhibit my ability to achieve tenure status.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Somewhat agree
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree
- ○ Somewhat disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree
- ○ Not Applicable

It is important that tenured faculty teach online courses to benefit higher education.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Somewhat agree
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree
- ○ Somewhat disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree

If you are a tenured faculty member would you be likely to teach online if you were not tenured?

- ○ Extremely likely
- ○ Somewhat likely
- ○ Neither likely nor unlikely
- ○ Somewhat unlikely
- ○ Extremely unlikely
- ○ Not Applicable

If you are a tenured faculty member, what led you to believe you could be successful teaching online after many years of teaching in a face-to-face environment? Check all that apply.

- □ Institution provided the necessary training
- □ Institution provided technical support
- □ You consulted with colleagues to gain a new perspective
- □ You believed it is important to teach online to enhance your skills
- □ Other
If you initially resisted teaching online coursework but now do so, how important were the following factors in your change in perspective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed View Of The Effectiveness Of Teaching Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Control Of Course After Moving Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialog With Colleagues Who Had A Successful Online Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern For Becoming Less Relevant As A Faculty Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Confidence In Teaching Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Requirement For Faculty To Teach Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Positive Feedback As You Began To Teach Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Technological Capabilities of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer Opportunities to Promote Student Learning in Innovative Ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you had a change in perspective regarding your willingness to teach online coursework, how much time did this change take to occur?

- ○ 0-6 months
- ○ 7-12 months
- ○ 13-24 months
- ○ 25-36 months
- ○ > 36 months
- ○ Other
- ○ Not Applicable

I believe online education is as effective in providing students with quality learning outcomes as traditional face-to-face coursework.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Somewhat agree
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree
- ○ Somewhat disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree

Teaching online classes has impacted the teaching methods used in my face-to-face class.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Somewhat agree
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree
- ○ Somewhat disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree

Because you have taught online, to what extent have you used the following teaching methods/procedures for your face-to-face course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Lectures For Review By Students Outside Of Class</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use Of Web/Video</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Small Group Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Detailed Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Online Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My institution has a formal strategy to develop and make online education a viable educational medium for students.

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Somewhat agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Somewhat disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

My institution provides an appropriate level of training and support for me to teach effectively online.

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Somewhat agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Somewhat disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

Does your institution provide incentives to teach online coursework?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Unknown
If you answered Yes to the question above, please check the type of incentives you received to teach online coursework. Check all that apply.

- Financial Incentive
- Reduced Course Load
- Other

Peer mentoring of other online instructors is an effective method to learn to teach online coursework.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Demographics

This section will request data about the participant.

Which race/ethnicity best describes you? (Please choose only one)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- Hispanic American
- White/Caucasian
- Multiple Ethnicity/Other (Please specify)

Gender

- Male
- Female
- Other
Status. Check all that apply.

- ☐ Tenured
- ☐ Non-Tenured
- ☐ Full-time
- ☐ Part-Time
- ☐ Other

Academic Rank

- ☐ Full Professor
- ☐ Associate Professor
- ☐ Assistant Professor
- ☐ Instructor
- ☐ Adjunct Professor
- ☐ Other

Number of years teaching online courses.

[ ]

Number of years teaching face-to-face courses.

[ ]

Age

[ ]

Location

- ☐ Northeast U.S.
- ☐ Mid-Atlantic U.S.
- ☐ Southeast U.S.
• Southwestern U.S.
• Midwest U.S.
• Western U.S.
• Canada
• Other

Select the level of coursework at which you have taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your academic business discipline?

• Management
• Marketing
• Accounting
• Finance
• Economics
• Other

Is the institution you are currently employed by considered:

• Private for-profit
• Private not-for-profit
• Public not-for-profit
• Other
• Not Applicable

If you are tenured faculty and were initially resistant to teaching online but now do so willingly, if you would like to participate in a short interview to discuss your change in perspective, please provide your email address and I will contact you to arrange a meeting (optional). Thank you!
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