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ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS OF ONLINE INSTRUCTION BY DEPARTMENT CHAIRS IN THE FIELD OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 8, 2005

EDNA LYNN LEVERNIER

A.A. EMANUEL COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE

B.B.A. GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

M.B.A. GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Ed.S. GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Ed.D. GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Directed by: Professor Michael D. Richardson

The rapid global emergence of a multi-billion dollar electronic (e)-learning industry has forced department chairs in the field of educational leadership and administration in higher education institutions across the United States to assess the value, quality, and legitimacy of online instruction. For many, the concept of online education significantly challenges deeply held pedagogical beliefs and educational values such as academic freedom, protection of intellectual property rights, academic integrity, and quality. For others, the “fit” of online education with existing departmental and institutional mission statements, cultures, budgets, reward systems, policies and procedures, is unclear or uncertain. In an age where “technology has expanded our
ability to create, transfer, and apply knowledge by factors of 100 to 1,000 every decade” (Duderstadt, 2001), critics have labeled members of the traditional Academy as being slow and unresponsive to technological change and unresponsive to the demands of an increasingly diverse and technologically savvy customer base. The department chair as “academic leader” (Hecht, et al., 1999) is being called upon to lead his or her faculty body toward a more customer-responsive pedagogy that is either supplemented or replaced by digital technologies (Bergquist, 1992; Rowley, et al., 1998; Duderstadt, 1999; Duderstadt, 2001).

The researcher’s intent was to assess educational administration department chairs’ perceptions regarding the prevalence and scope, value, quality, and legitimacy of online education, its equivalency with traditional face-to-face instruction, and whether or not they agree with its pedagogical and philosophical tenets. It was also the researcher’s intent to assess the perceived “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets, and faculty members, and the extent to which and from whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations.

Major conclusions from the study included (1) a perception by educational administration department chairs that online instruction is appropriate for educating and training students in a people-oriented, people-driven field such as educational administration, (2) a perception that online instruction is comparable in academic rigor, quality, and effectiveness to traditional face-to-face instruction (3) an acknowledgement that online education is not merely an instructional “fad,” but an instructional innovation that has a place in courses or degree programs deemed amenable by chairs and their
faculty, (4) a perception that educational administration faculty are ready and willing to embrace online education as a valid, legitimate mode of instruction and, on average, have a moderate knowledge of and skill level in using instructional technologies, (5) a perception that while educational administration department chairs are aware of increasing student demands for online educational opportunities, most did not perceive students to show a stronger interest in completing their graduate degree programs online rather than face-to-face, (6) a perception that students, as customers, not be permitted to dictate the subject matter taught and course delivery mode, (7) an indication that they do not feel pressure from deans, vice presidents of academic affairs/provosts, accrediting bodies, employers of graduate students, and for-profit online institutions of higher education to offer online courses and degree programs, (8) the acknowledgement by department chairs that while they highly value providing faculty members with timely and adequate financial rewards, recognition, technical support, and professional development and training support, they are often unable to identify funding in support of these efforts, and (9) the perception that content-laden courses and courses not dependent upon the demonstration or learning of people-skills are most amenable to fully online or Web-facilitated delivery.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

"To be ignorant of what happened before you were born is to be ever a child. For what is man's lifetime unless the memory of past events is woven with those of earlier times?"-- Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC), Roman statesman, orator, philosopher

History of Educational Access in American Higher Education

History of Face-to-Face Instruction

The history of face-to-face instruction in America is rooted in the age of antiquity. Early philosophers—the Sophists, Socrates, Plato, and others—originated the idea of face-to-face instruction. The Sophists used oratory and rhetorical persuasion to draw the attention of crowds in the open marketplace as they traveled on foot from place to place (Lucas, 1994). Socrates (469 B.C. – 399 B.C.) attracted followers, both men and women, who gathered at The Academy for the purpose of uncovering transcendent knowledge (Lucas, 1994). And, Plato gave face-to-face instruction and learning a more formal structure by engaging students in the study of discussion, forensic debate, and formal argumentation (Lucas, 1994). This type of instruction formed the basis for all learning, from the Roman civilization to the age of exploration, and when the United States was formed and in its early years, face-to-face instruction still prevailed.

History of Distance Higher Education in America

Beginning in the late 1800s, two Americans would play a pivotal role in extending face-to-face instructional delivery beyond the classroom, thus breaking the
newly emerging nation out of a well-worn pattern established during the age of antiquity. Anna Eliot Ticknor is credited with being the mother of American correspondence study schooling by mail (Mathieson, 1971). She founded and managed the Boston-based Society to Encourage Study at Home in 1873 (Mathieson) and effectively offered rudimentary higher education instruction and services to women in Boston who had increasingly begun to demand more and better access to higher education (Mathieson). Later, William Rainey Harper, appointed by John D. Rockefeller as president of the University of Chicago, would further extend the distance education concept. Convinced that correspondence instruction was a legitimate university enterprise, he promoted it as a means of taking the work of universities beyond campus walls to the American Institute for Sacred Literature and the Chautauqua institutes, both located outside of the Chicago area (Pittman, 1995). He is credited with establishing the first university-level, distance education correspondence program in the United States in 1892.

Distance higher education in America soon evolved from its early correspondence study roots to instructional delivery via educational radio during the decade from 1925 through 1935 (Bates, 1990, Saettler, 1990). Notable university "schools on the air" were located at the Universities of Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, and at Oregon State College. Though many advocates were excited by the potential for increased educational access via radio, the events of World War II forced the early and permanent closure of most educational radio programs in higher education (Bates, Saettler).

Following World War II, members of the military and higher education communities realized that existing brick-and-mortar college and university campuses, and
the existing pool of faculty, would be inadequate to meet the needs of the large number of recently discharged military veterans seeking immediate higher education and employment (Lucas, 1994, Saettler). Thus, in order to meet their urgent demands for higher education, researchers in the United States armed services would soon collaborate with researchers and educators in higher education to pursue distance learning opportunities via motion pictures and film (Saettler, 1990, McLsaac & Gunawardena, 1996).

In the early 1950s, motion picture and film technologies would advance and be absorbed into a newer instructional technology—educational television. Many educators and advocates believed that this new innovation held the potential to solve problems of teacher shortages (particularly in the sciences, mathematics, and specialized subjects), overcrowded classrooms, and poorly prepared teachers (Saettler, McLsaac & Gunawardena, 1996). Television would indeed reach out and touch and educate the masses, and would usher in a new age of electronics in which manufacturers would compete to create smaller, better, and faster television and mass communication hardware components (Bates, 1987, Saettler, Lockard & Abrams, 2001). The computer chip or central processing unit (CPU) would become the dominant hardware component that would profoundly influence the next wave of distance education innovation (Saettler, Lockard & Abrams). The continued micro-miniaturization of CPU's and computer hardware components would increase the rate of convergence between computing and telecommunications technologies and education (Saettler, Duderstadt (2001), Lockard & Abrams). During the 1960s and 1970s, the federal government poured millions of dollars
into the research and development of computer-assisted instruction (CAI) which would
benefit teachers and students at all levels of education (Saettler).

Today, distance education via the Internet—online education—represents an
advanced manifestation of the early microprocessor-driven educational movement. The
use of the Internet for online instructional delivery has converted many traditional
institutions of higher education from a physical space, a community of learners, and a
center of culture (Duderstadt, 2001), to a digital educational environment where barriers
of space and time and place no longer exist (Duderstadt).

Online instructional technologies have enabled today's technology-savvy
computer users to create, transfer, and apply knowledge at faster rates, with greater
accuracy (Duderstadt, 2001). College and university faculty members and administrators
who use online technology to deliver instruction at a distance have, for better or worse,
become a significant part of an overall higher education enterprise in America that is
currently valued at approximately $180 billion dollars, and an estimated world market
currently valued at $3 trillion dollars (Duderstadt). Experts predict an increase in value
of this enterprise of $300 billion annually, and an increase in the reach of this enterprise
to 30 million students—one half traditional learners and one half employed adult learners
(Duderstadt).

Common Threads in Distance Higher Education in America Across the Decades

The history of distance education in America is replete with examples of changing
modes of instructional delivery, each newer, faster, and better than previous ones. It is,
however, significant to note, that while these modes have changed over time, the issues
and problems encountered by college and university administrators with regard to
distance education have varied little. For example, all generations of distance education administrators have faced faculty and stakeholder doubts concerning the legitimacy of using distance education methods, and the wisdom of using distance education to reach a larger, less scholarly public (Pittman, 1995, McIsaac & Gunawardena, 1996). In addition, each generation has had to mediate faculty and stakeholder concerns over curriculum richness, academic rigor, and reach, and has struggled to achieve a “fit” between the instructional technologies used in distance education and institutional or departmental mission (Pittman). Each generation of distance education administrators has also struggled to balance the teaching loads, research agendas, and salary and reward requests of full-time residential (on-campus) faculty with the needs of part-time or adjunct faculty and students’ instructional demands (Pittman, Miller & Seagren, 1997, Selingo, 2003). Finally, each generation has struggled to make their respective distance education programs financially viable (Pittman, Miller & Seagren). Today’s distance education administrators, especially, face intense internal and external pressures to adopt instructional technologies that will increase revenues, contain costs, and expand higher educational access (Blustain, Goldstein, & Lozier, 1999; Duderstadt, 1999; Farrington, 1999; Katz, 1999, & Duderstadt, 2001).

Access to Higher Education in America

The Drive for an Educated Citizenry

Given America’s rich history of distance education, it would almost appear that an invisible, driving force has propelled instructional advancement and progress in America. It would appear that this drive toward increased and improved higher
educational access could have roots in the democratic ideals espoused by both Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

**The Jeffersonian Ideal.**

According to Arrowood (1930), Thomas Jefferson believed that it was “of advantage to the state to promote higher education” because it was “in colleges and universities where statesmen, legislators, and judges were formed, on whom public prosperity and individual happiness would so much depend” (p. 63). Jefferson believed, however, in three distinct classes of citizens: those who performed labor in business, agriculture, and handicraft; those who would enter the learned professions such as medicine and law; and the wealthy, who should attempt to live responsible and useful private lives (Arrowood).

**The Jacksonian Ideal.**

While the ideals espoused by Thomas Jefferson would shape the actions and minds of many citizens, perhaps it is the educational ideals espoused by Andrew Jackson that are more closely aligned with goals and tenets of distance education in America today. For it is Jackson who believed in equal educational, economic, and political opportunity for the common man (Schlesinger, 1946).

**The Drive for an Educated Citizenry in Today’s Global Society**

Today, as in the days of Jefferson and Jackson, there is a strong drive by educators, policy makers, students, parents, and others to develop an educated citizenry. Whereas the citizens governed by Jefferson and Jackson lived in the ages of agriculture and industrial expansion (Schlesinger, 1946), respectively, citizens in today’s global society live in the age of knowledge, where information is a commodity, and rapid access
of accurate data drives most business and personal decisions (Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier, 1999; Duderstadt, 1999; Farrington, 1999; Katz, 1999, and Duderstadt, 2001). The Internet and digital communication technologies have made it possible for people of all socio-economic and education levels, race and ethnicity categories, and geographic locations to access information, educational and job opportunities, and improve their quality of life (Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier, 1999; Duderstadt, 1999; Farrington, 1999; Katz, 1999, and Duderstadt, 2001). Given the apparent ubiquitous nature of Internet access in America, it would be easy for one to assume that all people can easily avail themselves of its information, services, and benefits. However, researchers, in an October 2000 report entitled, *Falling Through the Net: Toward Digital Inclusion, A Report on Americans' Access to Technology Tools*, issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce, acknowledge that “while Internet access and computer ownership are rising rapidly for almost all groups of Americans, a digital divide between the technology “haves” and “have-nots” still remains and has even expanded slightly in some cases” (p. 14).

These researchers reported significant increases in home Internet access for the purposes of enrolling in online courses and conducting job searches for those with an elementary education, those with some high school education, those in the lower to middle socio-economic classification, both employed and unemployed, and those identified as Black or Hispanic. It would appear advantageous for higher education administrators to embrace and adopt Internet and digital communications technologies in order to provide more and better quality distance educational services to these population segments. Norman Y. Mineta, the United States Secretary of Commerce, issued a written
charge in this report to the members of the higher education community, “to use the data contained in this report to better target and enact policies and programs to close the disparities in access to computers, the Internet, and online education that still are being experienced by some in our nation” (p. 2).

The Evolution of Administrator Roles and Responsibilities in American Higher Education

According to Cohen (1998), administrative positions have evolved by type, number, and nature of responsibilities across the colonial, emergent nation, university transformation, mass higher education, and contemporary eras in American higher education.

Administrator Roles and Responsibilities During the Colonial Era

No class of faculty, masters, teachers, or professors existed to organize America’s institutions of higher education during the colonial period of 1636 through 1789 (Cohen, 1998). The university president was generally a homegrown member of the clergy who served at the pleasure of the governing board of trustees, and presided over all college functions, taught all classes, raised money, and recruited and disciplined students (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968; Cohen, 1998). According to Cohen and other historians, the profession or group known today as faculty members did not exist as such. Rather, tutors provided academic assistance to students on a limited basis (Cohen, 1998; Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999).

Administrator Roles and Responsibilities During the Emergent Nation Era

In contrast, faculty gained permanent, professional status at institutions of higher education during the emergent nation era of 1790 through 1869 (Cohen, 1998). The rise
of the professoriate as a career can largely be attributed to the introduction of specialized courses in the fields of mathematics, natural science, and the arts (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968; Cohen, 1998). It was during this era that the president came to be seen as the representative of the trustees, less a member of the faculty, and more concerned with broad, academic management activities (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968; Cohen, 1998; Hecht, Higgonson, Melch, & Tucker, 1999). Cohen noted that from the professor’s point of view, the president was the spokesman and representative of the board of governors, not the leader of the faculty.

Administrator Roles and Responsibilities During the University Transformation Era

During the university transformation era of 1870 through 1944, student enrollment in America’s colleges and universities grew from “63,000 in 1879 to 1,677,000 in 1945; the number of faculty increased from 5,553 to 150,000 over the same period, and the number of institutions increased from 250 to 1,768 over the same period” (Cohen, 1998, p. 98, see Table 3.1 Statistical Portrait of the University Transformation Era). The growth in student enrollment, faculty, and institutions coincided with America’s push toward the Industrial Revolution, a period in which the nation’s youth and workers moved from the farms into the cities to seek manufacturing jobs and related education and training (Brickman & Lehrer, 1962; Cohen, 1998). During this time period, college and university governance structures shifted notably in the direction of administrative hierarchies and bureaucratic management systems (Cohen, 1998). In addition, authority centered in the office of the president; deans were appointed to preside over schools; and chairs of academic departments were responsible for interpreting institutional policies (Brickman & Lehrer, 1962; Cohen, 1998). During this era,
academic departments became more democratic, with rotating chairs, equal voting rights, and equal voices for the members (Cohen, 1998).

Administrator Roles and Responsibilities During the Mass Higher Education Era

During the mass higher education era of 1945 through 1975, higher education administrators at all levels dealt with issues of increasing faculty professionalization and unionization and addressed issues of academic freedom (Cohen, 1998). Cohen noted that it was during this era, that the push for universal higher education access reached its peak. He further noted that administrators at all levels of colleges and universities felt increasing pressure to shape institutional and departmental policy according to recommendations of various external commissions and associations. It was during this era that the university expanded its role toward serving the greater public good (Cohen).

Administrator Roles and Responsibilities During the Contemporary Era

During the contemporary era of 1976 through 1998, the role of higher education administrators appeared to more closely resemble that of business executives, as institutions began to look and act more and more like business corporations (Bergquist, 1992; Cohen, 1998). According to Cohen, presidents were being selected less because of their scholarly accomplishments, and more for their ability to manage large-scale enterprises. He stated, “Collegial governance became a distant memory” (p. 386). And, the concept of “shared governance, in which every constituent group is perceived to have a part in deciding every issue” (Cohen, p. 386), took hold, thus complicating the nature of higher education administrators’ roles and responsibilities. The trends established during the contemporary era continue even today.
The Training of Higher Education Administrators

Given the complex and dynamic nature of higher education administration in America, one would have assumed that institutions would have placed tremendous value on the continued training and development of their administrators. Seagren, Creswell, and Wheeler (1993) stated, however, that contrary to this assumption, most colleges and universities have not valued the continuous training of their professional staff. They characterize training for administrators today as "casual to nonexistent, oriented only toward understanding administrative procedures, and situational rather than holistic or systematic" (p. xvi). Similarly, Davies (1995) suggested "systematic training of Heads (of academic departments in higher education) in managerial areas is needed to supplement their existing expertise in academic fields" (p. 131). According to Greene, Loughridge, and Wilson (1996), department chairs or heads, as they are sometimes called, historically have been either elected or appointed to the position based on their ability to conduct research, not on their ability to manage, teach, or administer the affairs of the academic unit.

The Pivotal Role of the College or University Department Chair in American Higher Education

According to Greene, Loughridge, and Wilson (1996), the academic department leadership role has evolved from that of academic leader to academic manager. Halsey and Trow (1971) noted that the role of the academic department chair, historically, was to provide academic leadership to his or her colleagues by managing the budget and syllabus, defending and promoting the department, and giving research guidance to younger colleagues. However, according to Birnbaum (1988), the name, "department
head," has been ascribed to a person, hired by and ultimately responsible to the academic dean. According to Greene, Loughridge, and Wilson (1996), increasing financial, government, and institutional pressures for accountability have forced deans to hire academic managers to assist them in developing and implementing institutional policies and managing a variety of accountability issues. However, since it appears that the use of the term "department chair" is far more ubiquitous in the literature than the use of the term "department head", for the purpose of this dissertation, the researcher will use the term "department chair" to identify all those who lead individual academic departments.

Peltason (1984) stated, "An institution can run for a long time with an inept president but not for long with inept chairpersons" (p. xi). Today the role of department chair is both critical and pivotal in a higher education institution.

Anderson (1997) noted that today's department chair role is complicated and is one of "great responsibility and little power" (p. 2). He defined the chair as an "emissary who interprets to his or her colleagues the revealed truths that he or she is privileged to hear from on high" (p. 1) as well as an advocate and champion of faculty members' needs and departmental programs and courses. He further observed that today's chair, much like chairs of previous generations, still conducts his or her work in "a community of professional heretics and blasphemers, and in a culture of professional doubters, skeptics, pragmatists, and cynics, rather than in a universe of faithful believers" (p. 2). He suggested that today's chair can succeed and, indeed, profoundly impact, the lives of his or her department's faculty members, students, and other constituents, if he or she has
sufficient knowledge, political skill, and is the beneficiary of a little bit of fortuitous opportunity (Anderson).

Anderson (1997) noted, "The most significant change in the department chair's role has been the evolution from colleague and leader to manager" (p. 4). Bergquist (1992), in The Four Cultures of the Academy, pointed toward the gradual movement of campus leadership away from the traditional, collegial culture, which he defines as "one that encourages diversity of perspective and relative autonomy of work" (p. 17), toward a managerial culture, that mimics the ideas, terminology, and procedures of private sector businesses. Birnbaum (1988) characterized the traditional university as a "loosely coupled" culture. Bergquist stated that relationships among faculty members and administrators in the collegial culture were informal, non-hierarchical, and long-term. He observed that men and women who successfully navigated the traditional, collegial culture often "held positions of high prestige based on their scholarly activities, research, or length of time or tenure as faculty members" (p. 17) and could often influence the political process indirectly without direct or overt intervention. In sharp contrast to the traditional leadership roles that arose from the collegial culture, are the roles and dictates of today's managerial culture. Bergquist stated, "In the managerial culture, the highest value is assigned at the instructional level to the learning of students—particularly learning that can be assessed quantitatively and attributed specifically to a planned educational event" (p. 76).

Deans and others in upper-level university administration present this student-focused instructional value to department chairs and faculty members while, at the same time, demanding that they deliver instruction efficiently and at the lowest cost possible
It appears that an academic leader's scholarly and research credentials are not as highly valued by members of the managerial culture. Rather, Bergquist suggested that today's department chairs and deans are deemed competent if they can conform to traditional values couched in corporate terminology. For example, Bergquist stated those in the managerial culture believe department chairs should:

- Establish and implement an implicit or explicit mission and administer activities in conformance with this mission; support the teaching and learning process; establish and support the curriculum; create a climate for high-quality research; encourage service to the university and community and beyond; acquire and distribute financial resources through budgetary management, and manage the academic personnel function (p. 78).

Proponents of the managerial culture view faculty members' instructional roles differently as well. Bergquist stated that they "encourage faculty members to be acquainted with new instructional technologies that have recently become available at relatively low cost" (p. 81). They would agree that by doing so, "students can more readily acquire specified competencies if instruction is supplemented by technologies that allow for low-cost, individualized instruction" (Bergquist, 1992, p. 82).

Bergquist summarized the position of proponents of the managerial culture by stating that they seek:

- Competent administrators, faculty members, and students who respect and work within a formal, hierarchical structure; this structure in turn encourages clarity of communication, specificity of roles and outcomes,
and careful delegation of responsibilities. The goal of leadership is attained when a competent person fills a clearly specified role (p. 83).

Proponents of the managerial culture seldom and vaguely refer to the traditional collegial culture’s values of collegiality and charismatic leadership (Bergquist, 1992).

Bergquist (1992) also observed that change inside of the academy formerly took place through quasi-political negotiations that were often conducted behind closed doors. He suggested that today, academic leaders and faculty members influence and change processes, policies, and ideas by “being skillful in managing people and money” (p. 83). As such, Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998) observed that members of the academy today are caught in a “shift from reflection to rapidity and from finite data to volumes of specific information” (p. 5). Department chairs and other academic leaders can no longer afford to endlessly debate and deliberate the consequences and opportunities introduced by rapid technological change (Anderson, 1997). Rowley et al., aptly noted that higher education constituencies in today’s knowledge-based society and age of information are simply “not willing to wait for the traditional academy to catch up” (p. 12).

Anderson (1997) opined that many aspects of chairing a department—or cat herding—have ever been much different from what chairs experience today. He stated, The professoriate has not changed in such fundamental ways that department chairs will be able to forget about cajoling, encouraging, stroking, admonishing, motivating, feeding, and figuring out rewards while also arbitrating disputes and sometimes—maybe often—being the object of indifference or wrath (p. 4).
The Role of Today's College or University Department Chair in Technology Innovation and Adoption

Anderson (1997) observed that today, academic deans' expectations of department chairs are higher than ever. They want chairs who can help chart un navigated waters, provide definitive leadership regarding university mission and goals, and demonstrate aptitude for and interest in the job (Anderson). They especially want a department chair who can assess the impact of technology on teaching and learning; guide faculty members in matching the appropriate technologies, whether manual or computer-mediated, to the pedagogical needs of each course and degree program; identify resources for faculty development, training, and technological and institutional support; develop and implement evaluation tools to ensure online education quality and academic integrity; and serve as a catalyst and leader of instructional change where warranted (Anderson, 1997; Bates, 2000; University of Illinois, 1999; Rahman, 2001, & Wallentine and King, 2001).

Bates (2000) noted that while past technologies such as overhead projectors, slide shows, film, and videotapes have enhanced presentational quality and left the basic method of instruction unchanged, "the new technologies of the Internet and multimedia are not just enhancing the teaching and learning environment; they are fundamentally changing it" (p. 215). He equated the impact of Internet and multimedia technologies on education with that of the printing press. While Bates (2000) acknowledged that department chairs do not need to be experts in the use of technology for teaching, he states that they do need to have a good understanding of the relationship between technology and teaching and develop strategies for dealing with the impact of new
technologies on teaching. Given the uncertainty and rapidity of technological change, Anderson (1997) implored chairs to "take an expansive rather than a defensive or reactionary stance in their leadership roles as the going gets rougher and future becomes more uncertain" (p. 9).

Statement of the Problem

The rapid, global emergence of a multi-billion dollar electronic (e)-learning industry has forced administrators and faculty in higher education institutions across the United States to assess the value and legitimacy of a new instructional innovation—online instruction. Online instruction could best be described as the new face of an old topic—distance education. Both innovations share common historical threads: a thrill of using state-of-the-art instructional technology, a promise of increased educational access, a hope for improved curricular and experiential richness, and an expectation of increased revenues and reduced instructional costs. While online instruction is, indeed, touted by many in the popular media and marketplace to be the next, greatest innovation in higher education, it is less clear the extent to which department chairs in the field of higher educational administration embrace this new phenomenon.

It is widely accepted that those who hold the position of chair in departments of higher education administration assume many roles in their respective departments of educational administration. The chair, is at once, a faculty advocate, a liaison to the dean and other members of a university's administration, a filter through which those in administration convey protocol, policy, and culture, and a monitor of stakeholder opinions, attitudes, and needs.
It is unknown whether these department chairs in the field of higher educational administration value online instruction and whether or not they agree with its pedagogical and philosophical tenets. It is also unknown whether they perceive a "fit" between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets, and the extent to which and from whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations. Therefore, there appears to be a need for more definitive, empirical research on the perceptions of online instruction held by department chairs in the field of higher educational administration in the United States.

Research Questions

The following overarching question will guide this study: What are the perceptions of department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States regarding online instruction?

Sub questions that will further delineate this study are:

1. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration characterize the prevalence of online education in their departments, colleges, and universities?

2. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States perceive the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation, of online instruction?

3. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States compare traditional face-to-face instruction with fully online or computer-mediated instruction?
4. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States characterize their department's philosophy of instruction and pedagogy?

5. To what extent do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States perceive a “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets?

6. To what extent and from whom do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations?

7. To what extent do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States believe that upper-level administrators fail to consider their opinions, feedback, and perceptions when selecting, designing, implementing, and evaluating instructional and curricular innovations such as online instruction?

Conceptual Framework

The graphic depiction below (see Figure 1) represents the conceptual framework that will become the basis of this dissertation. It is the researcher's desire to collect and analyze data regarding the perceptions of department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States regarding online instruction.
Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

- Online Instruction

- Perceptions of department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States
Significance of the Study

Much of the research done to date regarding online instruction has focused primarily on student perceptions, student learning processes and outcomes, and faculty perceptions of online instruction across colleges within the same institution and between institutions at the state and national levels. No empirical studies have focused solely on the perceptions of department chairs in the field of educational administration in the United States. Yet, recent data indicates a pressing need for department chairs to critically evaluate their departments' role, if any, in online education. For example, Blumenstyk (2003) reported that the number of students signing up for graduate online and on-campus degrees is on the rise in the United States. She noted that the U. S. Department of Education reported that 130,000 students earned master's degrees in education in the 2001 academic year and an additional 6,700 received doctorates in education for the same time period. She reported that more than half of the students now studying with the largest for-profit providers of graduate programs in education are enrolled at institutions owned or related to Sylvan Learning Systems, Inc. (p. A30). It appears that rapidly increasing graduate education student enrollments are bolstering for-profit companies' confidence that they can reach and serve students just as well if not better than traditional colleges and universities and that they believe that they are in a position to capture a previously untapped undergraduate education degree market (Blumenstyk). Leaders of for-profits also appear to believe that the time is right to give traditional institutions of higher education a competitive run for their students, curricula, and money. They are capitalizing on the commonly acknowledged fact that classroom teachers who choose to pursue graduate degrees in education do so to “advance their
careers and earn more money” (Blumenstyk, 2003, p. A30). They want a quick, easy program of study and are willing and able to shop around for the best priced online program to meet their needs (Blumenstyk, p. A30).

However, key players in education are not going down without a fight. According to Blumenstyk, who interviewed Arthur E. Wise, president of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education or NCATE, the problem with for-profit institutions is that they “do not assume any responsibility for knowledge generation” (p. A30). Blumenstyk also observed that students enrolled in for-profit education courses or degree programs are much less likely to be exposed to researchers engaged in scholarship on important curriculum and pedagogical issues and methods. As such, the quality of education these students obtain is much lower and for-profits thus fulfill the fears of Noble and Feenberg and others who have stated that online education contributes to the de-skilling or de-professionalization of the professoriate (Feenberg, 1999; Noble, 2001.

Given these high stakes, Blumenstyk reported that some academic leaders at traditional colleges and universities have acknowledged that they have become complacent, that they would benefit from the challenges posed by for-profit online education companies, and that they are positioning their departments to actively confront instructional change. Therefore, there appears to be a need for a definitive, empirical study to assess the perceptions of department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States toward online education. Undergraduate and graduate students, faculty members, parents, employers of college of education graduates, accreditation agencies, and other stakeholders would greatly benefit by knowing how department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States
perceive online education. Specifically, they would benefit by knowing the prevalence with which online courses and degree programs in educational administration are offered, whether department chairs value online education and view it as legitimate, whether online instruction is congruent with their and their faculty members' instructional and pedagogical philosophies, how they perceive online education compared with traditional face-to-face instruction, and whether they perceive there to be a "fit" between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets.

It is of further importance that these stakeholders understand the extent and from whom these department chairs feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations. These department chairs hold the greatest potential for guiding the direction of instructional design and curriculum selection, shaping faculty incentive and reward structures, providing rich, meaningful faculty development opportunities, and establishing collaborative, shared governance with faculty members.

Of great concern to the researcher, is how, in an effort to expedite decision making, there is an apparent trend by administrators, at the levels of dean and above, in institutions of higher education, to fail to consider the opinions, feedback, and perceptions of department chairs and the faculty members they represent. Particularly, it appears that department chairs have become a secondary and, often ignored, resource regarding the selection, design, implementation, and evaluation of instructional and curricular innovations such as online instruction. In addition, it is of concern to the researcher, that these department chairs may not be playing as rich and meaningful a role in shaping the related faculty development, reward, promotion and tenure, and funding
opportunities and policies that provide the supporting infrastructure for instructional development and delivery as they could be.

Faculty members, department chairs, and university and college administrators are under increasing pressure from stakeholders to put aside their skepticism of online education (Anderson, 1997). Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998) noted that many of today's stakeholders of higher education are simply no longer "willing to wait for the traditional academy to catch up" (p. 12) with instructional innovation and are turning to private for-profit educational organizations and others outside of the academy for instructional services and content. As "primary movers of the department's mission" (Wallentine & King, 2002, p. 3), today's department chair in the field of educational administration, can play a critical role in guiding the faculty and university administrators in the selection, design, implementation, and evaluation of instructional and curricular innovations such as online instruction. As liaison between the faculty and upper-level university administrators, today's chair also has the opportunity to play a rich and meaningful role in shaping the related faculty development, reward, promotion and tenure, and funding opportunities and policies that will provide the support for technology-enhanced instructional development and delivery.

Procedures

Given the above stated significance of the study, the researcher designed a study that will collect and analyze the perceptions of department chairs in the field of educational administration in the United States regarding online instruction.
Research Design

A descriptive survey was used to assess department chair perceptions of online education in departments of Educational Administration across the United States. A descriptive study is a non-experimental research design and thus, independent variables will not be manipulated. According to Nardi (2003), researchers conduct a descriptive study in order to present basic demographic information profiling study respondents, to describe the issues under study, and “to obtain more details and a stronger sense of the variety of ways people engage with the world around them” (p. 15). The survey included structured questions, requiring Likert-scaled response selection, and open-ended questions, requiring written or typed responses.

Description of Population/Subjects

The entire population, 209 department chairs, department heads, and program directors/coordinators in the field of Education Administration, in colleges and universities across the United States, was surveyed. The entire population was surveyed to provide the best opportunity for obtaining a higher survey response rate than could be obtained by drawing a random sample from this population.

Data Collection

A self-administered, descriptive survey consisting of Likert-scaled and open-ended questions was developed by the researcher to assess department chair perceptions of online education in the field of Educational Administration in colleges and universities across the United States. According to Nardi (2003), questionnaires (or surveys) are the most efficient tool for surveying large samples of respondents and in shorter periods of time than interviews or other research methods. Nardi strongly advised researchers to
develop a questionnaire that is visually appealing, readable, and comprehensive, yet
easy to complete in a short period of time. He stated that making “multiple drafts,
pretesting items, conducting pilot studies, and fine-tuning the final format” (p. 79) was
essential to the development of an effective survey.

Therefore, the researcher developed a preliminary study and piloted it with faculty
members selected from within the College of Education, at Georgia Southern University.
In so doing, the researcher established face validity of this study and determined that this
survey adequately and completely assessed the perceptions of the population addressed
by this study. The researcher also conducted an extensive literature review for the
purpose of establishing content validity.

The researcher conducted this survey both online and by mail, via the United
States Postal Service. According to Nardi (2003), an increasingly popular way of
creating and distributing self-administered questionnaires is with computers. He noted
that marketing researchers and others find that response rates increase with this method.
Requests for permission to obtain survey data as well as the survey instrument itself were
posted online on the study website and mailed, via the United States Postal Service, to
each potential survey respondent after obtaining approval from her dissertation
committee and Georgia Southern University’s Institutional Review Board. E-mail
addresses and mailing addresses were obtained from the 2003-2004 National Council of
Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) Directory.

The researcher posted and mailed follow-up reminders to survey respondents as
needed in order to achieve a minimum 60% population respondent rate. According to
Kerlinger (1986), a 40 to 50 percent return rate is common in survey research. He states
that since higher percentage return rates are rare in behavioral research, the researcher must content himself with returns as low as 50 or 60 percent. Following data collection, the researcher began the process of data analysis.

Data Analysis

Survey responses to Likert-scaled questions and responses obtained from open-ended questions were systematically transformed and aggregated into units to permit precise description of relevant content characteristics (Holsti, 1969). Open-ended item responses were analyzed, common themes identified, and frequency counts of survey responses recorded by the researcher. Categorized data were tabulated and frequency counts were generated via the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software package (Weitzman & Miles, 1995). Frequency counts of commonly agreed upon categorized data were converted to percentages for reporting purposes. Frequencies (e.g., the item measured is assessed for its frequency of occurrence), means (e.g., measure of central tendency that specifies the arithmetic average in which scores were added and then divided by the number of cases), and standard deviations (e.g., measure of variability that indicates how far all scores in a distribution vary from the mean) were generated via SPSS and will be used to summarize survey responses. In addition, the researcher conducted comparisons of the demographic information provided by survey respondents. Findings that were consistently noted in the analyses were identified and discussed (Daugherty & Funke, 1998).

Limitations

The scope of the research performed in this study was limited by the lack of control over survey participants' response rates and the inability of the researcher to
control survey respondents' honesty in completing both Likert-scaled and open-ended questions. The scope was also limited by whether the department chair, the assumed survey respondent, would complete the survey, and whether he or she believed the survey topic to be relevant to his or her role as department chair.

Delimitations

The researcher determined that it would be more time and cost effective to survey the entire population of 209 department chairs, department heads, and program directors/coordinators in the field of educational administration in the United States, than to survey the entire population (approximately 3,000+) of faculty in the field of educational administration in the United States. The researcher further determined that it would not be feasible to conduct in depth face-to-face or telephone interviews with department chairs in this study. Using a Likert-scaled survey and open-ended questions appeared to better meet the data, time, and financial needs of the researcher in this study.

Definition of Terms

Asynchronous computer-based instruction – Asynchronous computer-based instruction facilitates connections between learners and faculty using computers, networks, telecommunications, groupware, and the World Wide Web (e.g., via electronic mail (e-mail), listservs, chat rooms, bulletin boards, videoconferencing, and course management software that features online quizzes, exams, grade books, surveys, and Web content hyperlinks) (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

Bulletin Boards – Bulletin boards are virtual meeting areas on the World Wide Web (WWW) where participants can begin a discussion known as a thread by posting/typing a new message, contribute posting comments to an existing thread, compile entries made to
a particular thread, expand (make all threads of a particular discussion visible) and collapse (hide threads of a particular discussion) threads (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

Chat rooms – Chat rooms are virtual meeting areas on the WWW through which participants can communicate with each other via typed messages. Messages are submitted to the group or privately to a single participant or group when the computer user/typist presses the Enter key on his/her computer keyboard. Chat room conversations may be monitored or unmonitored by a chat room moderator. Monitored chat room discussions may be saved to disk or printed as hard copies (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

Commoditization – According to Wiegel (2000), a product or service (e.g., delivery of education online) becomes a commodity when it can be more readily compared with other products like it, and competition revolves strictly around the price of the good.

Dean – According to Cohen (1982), the dean is leader of an academic unit, such as a school (e.g., School of Education) or college (e.g., College of Education). The dean generally reports to a higher academic officer in the college or university administrative hierarchy such as a provost or vice president of academic affairs.

Department chair – According to Fife (1982), the department chair is an individual either appointed by a dean or selected by the faculty from within the faculty ranks, who is responsible for developing and implementing policies and procedures related to curriculum structure, program offerings, budget allocations, faculty hiring, evaluation, promotion, tenure, training and development, and other critical academic issues.

According to Bennett and Figuli (1990), the department chair often assumes the role of
faculty cheerleader, mentor, and coach and is the custodian of academic standards and protector of faculty teaching, research, and service interests, the leader of departmental culture, and a change agent.

Distance learning/education – According to the United States Distance Learning Association (1998), distance learning is the acquisition of knowledge and skills through mediated information and instruction, encompassing all technologies and other forms of learning at a distance.

Edutainment industry – According to Akins, Duderstadt, and Von Houweling (2002) the edutainment industry is a global knowledge and learning industry, in which the activities of traditional academic institutions converge with other knowledge-intensive organizations such as telecommunications, entertainment, and information service companies.

Face-to-face instruction – Instruction in which both the instructor and student(s) participate in instruction and learning face-to-face, in the same physical location.

For-profit educational providers – Commercial firms or educational institutions that are incorporated for the purpose of delivering educational content and student services for profit are known as for-profit educational providers.

Fully online education – According to Allen and Seaman (2002) and McArthur (2002), fully online education has no face-to-face component

Higher education stakeholders – According to Hoy and Miskel (2002), academic administrators in higher education are accountable to both internal and external stakeholders including students, parents, employers, alumni, members of local, state, and
federal government agencies/groups/offices, members of the local and global citizenry, nonprofit organizations, and others.

**Internet** – The Internet, sometimes called simply "the Net," is a worldwide system of computer networks - a network of networks in which users at any one computer can, if they have permission, get information from any other computer (and sometimes talk directly to users at other computers). It was conceived by the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) of the U.S. government in 1969 and was first known as the Advanced Research Projects Agency Network (Source: [http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition](http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition)).

**Internet Service Provider (ISP)** – An Internet Service Provider (ISP) is a company that provides individuals and other companies access to the Internet and other related services such as Web site building and virtual hosting (Source: [http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition](http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition)).

**Listserv** – A listserv is a small program that automatically redistributes e-mail to names on a mailing list. Users can subscribe to a mailing list by sending an e-mail note to a mailing list they learn about. (Source: [http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition](http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition)).

**Real time** – Real time is a level of computer responsiveness that a user senses as sufficiently immediate or that enables the computer to keep up with some external process (for example, to present visualizations of the weather as it constantly changes) and describes a human rather than a machine sense of time. (Source: [http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition](http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition)).
Streaming Audio – Streaming audio is an interactive software technology that permits computer users to listen to audio clips on the WWW while they are being downloaded to his/her computer from a Web server (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

Streaming Video – Streaming video is an interactive software technology that permits computer users to watch a video on the WWW while it is being downloaded to his/her computer from a Web server (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

Synchronous computer-based instruction – Synchronous computer-based instruction is instruction in which faculty dissemination of knowledge and student receipt of knowledge takes place at the same time (i.e., realtime), on the WWW, through streaming video or audio techniques (where students can both see and hear the instructor through their computers via their Internet Service Provider (ISP)), whiteboarding (where faculty members and students use a digital white board, pen, and eraser to communicate online), or online chat communication (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

Traditional instruction – According to Allen and Seaman (2002), traditional instruction is delivered face-to-face, in person, with no online technology. Course content is delivered in face-to-face and in person.

Virtual – Virtual is the quality of effecting something without actually being that something (i.e., virtual videoconference, virtual reality games) (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

Web-facilitated course – According to Allen and Seaman (2002), a Web-facilitated course typically uses Web-based technologies like WebCT or Blackboard to supplement or enhance traditional face-to-face instruction. According to McArthur (2002), the amount of online content and the degree of online interaction increases considerably
through Web-facilitated instruction. For example, graduate level classes may meet face-to-face only for the first class meeting and then move to the Web for online class discussions, team problem solving exercises, independent assignment submission on a regular basis via the Web, and then meet face-to-face for final exams or presentations.

**Whiteboarding** – Whiteboarding is a method of online communication whereby online participants use a virtual white board (similar to a blackboard), pen, and eraser to communicate their ideas during an online teleconference. (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

**World Wide Web (WWW or “The Web”)** – The WWW is all the resources and users on the Internet that are using the Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) (A broader definition comes from the organization that Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee helped found: The WWW Consortium states: "The WWW is the universe of network-accessible information, an embodiment of human knowledge.") (Source: http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition).

**Summary**

There appeared to be a need for a definitive, empirical study to assess the perceptions of department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States regarding online education. Much of the research conducted to date has focused primarily on student and faculty perceptions of online education and has been based largely on anecdotal evidence. Thus, a survey consisting of Likert-scaled and open-ended questions, was delivered, online and via the United States Postal Service, to the entire population of department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States, and became the basis of a descriptive study.
The researcher assessed and reported the demographics of this population, how they perceive the value of online instruction, defined their philosophy of instruction and pedagogy, and characterized their faculty members’ philosophy of instruction and pedagogy. The researcher assessed and reported how this population perceives a “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets and from whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations.

It was the hope of this researcher that by conducting this study, she would bring attention to the rich and meaningful role that department chairs in the field of higher education administration can bring into the shaping of related faculty development, reward, promotion and tenure, and funding opportunities and policies that provide the supporting infrastructure for instructional development and delivery.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998) stated, "The information age is spawning its own educational system with and without the participation of the members of the traditional academy" (p. 13). In today's information age, where "technology has expanded our ability to create, transfer, and apply knowledge by factors of 100 to 1,000 every decade" (Duderstadt, 2001, p. 2), many faculty members and academic leaders representing the old "collegial" (Bergquist, 1992) academy are indeed wary of the latest computer-mediated technologies. They are especially skeptical of the application of the latest technologies to higher education instruction. Academic leaders surveyed by Allen and Seaman (2001), indicated that they perceived the majority of faculty members at their institutions as lagging behind students and administrators in their willingness and readiness to embrace instructional innovation. However, Anderson (1997) noted that faculty members and academic leaders no longer have the luxury of endlessly debating and deliberating the consequences and opportunities introduced by rapid technological change. Indeed, Rowley, et al., noted that many of today's stakeholders of higher education have grown impatient and are simply "not willing to wait for the traditional academy to catch up" (p. 12). These stakeholders are forcing faculty members and
academic leaders to adopt instructional innovations for a variety of reasons. For example, Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998) stated,

Employers want competent graduates schooled in practicalities and problem solving; students want flexible curricula that will allow them to mix and match subjects for both basic and applied knowledge; boards expect rapid change from a deliberate university community, and presidents are cautious middle persons sometimes caught between tradition-oriented faculty and strong-willed trustees (p. 52).

In addition, Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, and Tucker (1999), noted that parents of 18 to 24-year old students expect faculty members and academic leaders to “intellectually prepare a new generation of professionals and citizens” (p. 135) and give them the tools they need to secure life-long income and employment (Anderson, 1997).

These stakeholders want the academy to change its ways and its leadership. Indeed, many are demanding that academic leaders like department chairs and deans step up to the plate and lead the faculty body toward a more customer-responsive pedagogy that is either supplemented or replaced by digital technologies (Bergquist, 1992; Rowley, et al., 1998; Duderstadt, 1999; Duderstadt, 2001)

It is, therefore, incumbent upon today’s department chair, as “academic leader” (Hecht, et al., 1999), to effectively and proactively lead and manage instructional change processes that affect his or her department. The department chair must “take the time and trouble to learn and understand more than anyone else in the department, the department’s overall instructional mission and goals” (Anderson, 1997, p. 2), processes, policies, and human and financial resources.
Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, and Schreck (2000) suggested that the department chair first gain an understanding of the scope and prevalence of online education in his or her department and assess national trends. Schmidt, et al., Rahman (2001), and faculty seminar participants in a University of Illinois (1999) roundtable discussion of online education have suggested that the department chair reflect upon and gain an understanding of his or her own, and faculty members’ perceptions of the value, quality, and legitimacy of online education. These researchers have also suggested that the department chair gain an understanding of what motivates or deters faculty members’ interest and participation in online education (Schmidt, et al., Rahman, University of Illinois).

In addition, Schmidt et al. (2000) suggested that the department chair inventory the instructional technologies currently used by his or her faculty members in order to better assess the prevalence with which they are used and gain a better understanding of the resources needed to update instructional delivery.

By gaining an understanding of the department’s “big picture” of technology and its application to instruction, the department chair can more intelligently engage faculty members, students, administrators, and stakeholders in a meaningful discussion of how technological innovation can be used to improve instruction and meet the needs of the larger community.

The Scope of Online Education

Schmidt et al., (2000) defined the scope of online education in terms of the frequency with which departments offer online education classes, the percentage of credit hours attributable to these classes, and the level (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, or by
degree) at which these classes are offered. As such, the department chair can benefit greatly by understanding the national scope and prevalence of online education in the United States.

Regarding the national scope of online education in the United States, Allen and Seaman (2002), reported data that reflected the increasing prevalence of online education across all institution types. They reported for the fall 2002 academic term that 81% of all higher education institutions offered at least one fully online or blended course and 34% offered fully online degree programs. They also noted that public four- and two-year, non-profit institutions appear to be adopting online education more quickly than their private counterparts. They further noted that academic leaders were more likely to believe online education to be a critical long-term strategy for reaching students seeking associates and doctoral degrees. In addition, they predicted a 20% overall growth rate in online courses offered by all institution types for the 2002-2003 academic year. Interestingly, they predicted a 40% growth rate in online enrollment at for-profit institutions alone—a fact that has served as a wake-up call to leaders of many traditional, non-profit institutions of higher education.

In sharp contrast to the findings of Allen and Seaman (2002), Schmidt, et al. (2000) provided evidence that department chairs in the field of political science indicated a low preference for and prevalence of online education. They reported that 57.5% of these chairs did not use online technology for any of their courses. They also noted that less than 5% of these chairs reported that online education accounted for 10% or more of their department's total credit hours. Of particular significance was their finding that the majority of these chairs agreed that distance education was not currently and would not
likely be a major component of their curricula in the future. In addition, regarding the issue of prevalence by level, they reported that these chairs indicated that they used distance education primarily in their undergraduate degree programs.

The Department Chair's Perception of Online Education

Senge (2000) noted, “Every organization is a product of how its members think and interact” (p. 19). He and other open-social systems theorists like Hoy and Miskel (2002) and Bolman and Deal (1993) would encourage the department chair to reflect on what motivates and drives their personal mission and goals within the broader context of the departmental mission and goals. By doing so, he or she can thus be more empathetic to the needs of faculty members and stakeholders and lead more effectively.

In like manner, Schmidt et al., (2000) have also suggested that the department chair reflect on how he or she (and thus, indirectly, his or her faculty members) perceives the value, quality, and legitimacy of online education and what motivates or deters his or her interest and participation in online education (Schmidt, et al.).

At the national level, Allen and Seaman (2002) offered evidence that academic leaders are beginning to accept online education as a legitimate form of instructional delivery. For example, 57% of those surveyed believed learning outcomes to currently be equal or superior to face-to-face learning outcomes (Allen & Seaman). They further reported that approximately 33% of these leaders expected learning outcomes for online education to be superior to face-to-face in 3 years, and that nearly 75% expected these outcomes to be equal to or better than face-to-face instruction in 3 years (Allen & Seaman). Interestingly, they reported that 59.6% of academic leaders believed that their
faculty members accepted the value and legitimacy of online education (Allen & Seaman).

In sharp contrast to the results obtained by Allen and Seaman (2002), Schmidt, et al. (2000) reported that department chairs in political science, overall, were skeptical and harshly critical of online education. They reported that nearly 75% agreed that online education was generally not an appropriate way of teaching political science (Schmidt, et al.). They noted that even when delivered at its best, online education was incapable of ever being as good or effective as traditional face-to-face instruction (Schmidt, et al.). They also reported that while 44.3% of these chairs did not describe online education as a fad, 62.7% believed their departments would not use online education to some extent in the future (Schmidt, et al.). In addition, they reported that many of these chairs believed that online education would diminish the quality of the educational processes in their departments and universities (Schmidt, et al.). They concluded that the scope of and interest in using online education as an instructional delivery method in political science departments across the United States is narrow and low overall (Schmidt, et al.).

Faculty Members’ Perceptions of Online Education

Wallentine and King (2002) observed that faculty members are the department chair’s most valuable assets. They further noted that it is incumbent upon the chair to motivate them to be “primary movers of the department’s mission” (p. 3). The department chair can broaden and deepen his or her understanding of how to motivate faculty members to evolve the department’s instructional mission, by first gaining an understanding of how they perceive the value, quality, and legitimacy of online education. They observed that the time the chair takes to gain this understanding is time
well spent. The department chair will thus be in a better position to recognize and reward faculty members for their contributions to online education and the departmental mission and bolster his or her case to upper-level administrators for additional financial, technical, and administrative support (Wallentine & King).

Assessing Faculty Interest in Participating in Online Education

Based upon findings presented by researchers including Daugherty and Funke (1998), Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998), Betts (1999), Vodanovich and Piotrowski (1999), McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh (2000), Lord and Bishop (2001), researchers with the Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001), Allen and Seaman (2002), Carnevale (2002), and Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002), faculty members show a stronger interest in using online technologies to supplement existing face-to-face courses and degree programs (thus engaging in Web-facilitated instruction) than in delivering fully online courses or degree programs.

For example, Vodanovich and Piotrowski (1999) reported that the majority of industrial organization psychology faculty they surveyed reported that using computer technologies such as e-mail, the Internet, and other basic software, could effectively supplement instruction and that they believed that the benefits of using such technology generally outweighed the shortcomings. These researchers conducted a follow-up study in 2001 and reported the level of faculty usage of the Internet as an educational tool to be higher than in 1999 and reported faculty members indicated a more positive attitude toward using computer technologies in instruction.
Researchers with the Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001) who conducted a survey of 734 full-time, regular faculty teaching in the University of Tennessee statewide system of higher education in 2001, also reported strong faculty interest (90% of faculty surveyed) in using online technologies to enhance or supplement existing face-to-face instruction.

Daugherty and Funke (1998), Betts (1999), and Lord and Bishop (2001) reported that the majority of faculty survey respondents held favorable views of using computer-mediated technology to supplement instruction, believed that Web-based technologies had the potential to be effective teaching and learning tools, and reported that they would continue to use these applications in their coursework.

Carnevale (2002) reported that the majority of faculty members surveyed at Eastern University, an evangelical institution, which offers an Internet-based domestic program geared toward working adults who want to complete their degrees, preferred to supplement face-to-face instruction with online technologies, rather than teach a course entirely online. He stated these faculty members were simply not convinced that fully online education could constitute a quality education and reported that online faculty members characterized “the experience of replicating the fellowship of the on-campus experience to be an asynchronous, solitary undertaking” (Carnevale, 2002, p. A51).

McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh (2000) reported that 25.8% of faculty members surveyed preferred to deliver instruction using a combination of online and face-to-face methods. They reported that 96.7% stated that face-to-face meetings effectively supplement online instruction by promoting social interaction, allowing
students to make course project presentations face-to-face, take exams, and submit homework, and allowing instructors to more effectively assess student progress and answer student questions.

Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002), who conducted a survey of 171 instructors of online, undergraduate nursing courses to evaluate perceptions of Web-based teaching experiences by nursing college faculty, reported that faculty members indicated a slightly more enthusiastic support for online education. They reported that 47% preferred teaching online; 27% preferred teaching in a traditional face-to-face classroom, and 26% preferred to teach using a combination of online and face-to-face instruction (Christianson, et al., 2002). In contrast to the findings presented by many researchers, they further reported that 75% perceived online instruction to be a good fit with their personal teaching style, 67% believed levels of intellectual engagement online to be comparable to traditional face-to-face courses, and 83% either agreed or strongly agreed that online courses were an effective approach to undergraduate education (Christianson, et al., 2002). Interestingly, they noted that even those instructors who were not sure online instruction was a good fit with their own personal teaching style still felt Web-based instruction was a legitimate method of delivering college coursework. However, they noted that while all agreed that any course could be taught online, most agreed that skills development was still best facilitated by hands-on activities in a face-to-face classroom setting.

The research conducted by Allen and Seaman (2002) reveals a conservative faculty view of online education. They conducted a survey of 994 Chief Academic Officers at degree granting institutions of higher education in the United States, and
reported that academic leaders perceived that overall, faculty members at all institutions (e.g., public two- and four-year non-profit institutions and private two- and four-year for-profit institutions), remained more conservative with regard to the quality of online education and its ability to equal face-to-face learning. They further reported that these leaders perceived faculty, overall, to be less likely than students or the institution as a whole, to accept the value and legitimacy of online education. In addition, they reported that the leaders of larger institutions that offered fully online and/or blended courses reported a more favorable response toward online learning outcomes than their counterparts at smaller institutions.

While there appears to be a pervading sense that fully online education is conceptually or philosophically out of reach for many faculty members surveyed, Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998), based on the results of their faculty study, have concluded that the traditional face-to-face lecture method of teaching will continue to endure in higher education, but will continue to be increasingly supplemented and sometimes replaced by newly evolving technologies for information transfer.

Assessing Factors that Motivate and Inhibit Faculty Participation in Online Education

Black (1992) noted that faculty support for distance and online education is dependent upon the degree to which they perceive distance or online education to be congruent with their educational beliefs and values. Current literature is replete with quantitative studies that have identified factors that affect faculty members’ willingness to teach online or use computer technologies to supplement face-to-face instruction (Bette, 1999; Vodanovich & Piotrowski, 1999; Groves, Zemel, & Paula, 2000; McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh, 2000; Vodanovich & Piotrowski, 2001;
Christianson, Tiene, & Luft, 2002; Jones, Lindner, Murphy, & Dooley, 2002; O’Quinn & Corry, 2002; Giannoni & Tesone, 2003).

By seeking to understand faculty motivating and inhibiting factors, department chairs can more effectively match people and resources, create a collaborative teaching culture, provide technology training and institutional support that helps faculty members use their course preparation and instructional time more productively, reward faculty members for their instructional successes, and promote a positive culture of academic change (Groves, Zemel, and Paula, 2000; Wallentine and King, 2001). Rahman (2001) noted that it would be helpful for department chairs to classify faculty members’ arguments against online education as either practical concerns or philosophical objections.

Practical Concerns Over Online Education.

Researchers reported that most faculty members perceive that preparing and delivering online education results in a disproportionate increase in their time, effort, and workload (Daugherty and Funke, 1998; Sherman, 1998; Vodanovich and Piotrowski, 1999; McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh, 2000; Schifter, 2000, Rahman, 2001). They further noted that many faculty members, by their own admission, feel that they lack the technical expertise and skills needed to deliver online instruction or use computer-assisted technologies (Daugherty and Funke, 1998; Betts, 1999; Vodanovich and Piotrowski, 1999; Schifter, 2000; O’Quinn and Corry, 2002). As Friedheim and Jaffee (1999) noted, for generations of faculty members that did not grow up with computers, the learning curve for (integrating technology) is particularly steep.
Researchers have also reported that faculty members are not motivated to learn or use online instructional technologies because their institutions have failed to provide them with adequate technical training, support, or rewards and recognition (Daugherty and Funke, 1998; Matthew, Parker, and Wilkinson, 1998; Betts, 1998; Vodanovich and Piotrowski, 1999; Schifter, 2000; Rahman, 2001; Carnevale, 2002; O’Quinn and Corry, 2002). In addition, Carenval (2002) reported that many faculty members have observed that administrators at their institutions have not made paying for elaborate online education programs a top strategic priority.

Concerns Over Quality.

By far the most frequently cited philosophical concern expressed by faculty members is the concern that online education, when compared to traditional face-to-face instruction, does not constitute quality education. Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998) stated, “There is a genuine resistance to change within the academy among those (faculty members) who believe that they are caretakers of the storehouse of human knowledge and the guardians of quality” (p. 22).

Belief That Online Education is Impersonal.

Many faculty members feel that online education robs them and their students of quality interpersonal exchanges that promote individual and collective self-knowledge (Noble, 1999). Noble stated, “It is a sign of our current confusion about education that we must be reminded of this obvious fact: that the relationship between people is central to the educational experience.” (1999, ¶ 4).
Belief That Online Education Lacks Academic Rigor and Integrity.

For those who define educational quality in terms of academic rigor and integrity, online education fails to make the grade (Ridley & Husband, 1998). Ridley and Husband (1998) suggested several underlying concerns that contribute to this deeply held belief. They stated that in terms of academic rigor, what is at stake with online education is the confidence that academics have in the validity of academic credits earned online and a concern that instructors have applied comparable standards in assigning grades to their online or traditional students (Ridley & Husband). In addition, they stated that what is at stake is the suspicion among faculty members that online students can receive better grades for equivalent learning or equivalent grades for learning at a lower level in online classes (Ridley & Husband). Similarly, Born and Miller (1999) concluded that faculty members in the Agronomy Department at Iowa State University agreed that web-based distance education could be as challenging as on-campus courses, but agreed that their greatest concern was the effectiveness of student/professor interactions and the overall quality of a web-based degree.

In addition, regarding academic integrity, Ridley and Husband (1998) noted that many faculty members believe that online education promotes a poor work ethic in which students do not work independently of others and turn in their own work (Ridley & Husband). Luke (1998) noted that this suspicion is often fueled by the fact that traditional faculty members have, for decades, grown accustomed to delivering corporal instruction. In sharp contrast to online instruction, corporal instruction allowed them to “attest to students’ learning, by seeing them, having them appear physically in seminar
rooms and offices, observing them directly doing seat time in lecture halls, making them sit for exams, and watching them perform in labs” (Luke, p. 6).

However, Ridley and Husband (1998) noted that often times, faculty members’ suspicions of student academic dishonesty are unfounded. In their 1998 study, they disproved their research hypothesis that academic cheating is more prevalent in online courses than in traditional face-to-face courses. They tentatively concluded, “Concerns raised by some academics regarding academic rigor and integrity in online education, though legitimate, were exaggerated, if not unfounded” (p. 4). Similarly, Luke noted, “Faculty fears over student dishonesty and indolence on the Web are real but unfounded given the fact that students in face-to-face classes often find clever means to evade professors' personal sovereignty in systems of corporal instruction” (p. 6).

Belief That Traditional Universities Are “Selling Out” to Market- or Consumer-Driven Educational Interests.

Other researchers like Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998), reported that faculty members believe online education to be a capitulation to a consumer- or market-driven, rather than a provider-driven system of higher education. They stated that faculty members whom they interviewed and surveyed have consistently stated, “Learners do not necessarily know what they really need to learn and, if (faculty members) simply give learners what they want, quality and rigor will suffer” (p. 22). They further stated, “Letting the educational customer (learner) dictate the subject matter will corrupt the very foundation of what has made the academy great” (p. 23). Indeed it appears that many faculty members are unwilling to “trade academic excellence and quality for crass consumerism” (Rowley, et al., 1998, p. 22).
Researchers have further noted that many faculty members and academic leaders feel threatened by the increasing commercial presence in higher education instruction and delivery. Katz (1999) characterized today's marketplace threat this way:

Today, nontraditional sources of university-caliber instruction, such as software developers and publishers, are becoming increasingly important suppliers of course content and materials in select and highly remunerative educational niches. Interactive multimedia will demand ongoing faculty participation (including "virtual office hours") and will blur many of the existing distinctions between college and university investments in course materials and investments made by commercial publishers (p. 29).

Katz (1999) further noted that the "pressure on traditional resources, coupled with the emergence of technology-based education delivery systems, may well force colleges and universities, who rarely express their policies, intentions, and practices in competitive terms, to think and act globally and competitively" (p. 36).

Yet, despite negative faculty members' perceptions of educational quality delivered by "diploma mills" (Noble, 1999), Weigel (2000) noted, "Commercial firms with substantial curriculum development budgets could develop online courses that could have compelling richness while being offered at a low price" (p. 4).

Peter Shapiro of William Paterson University, who was interviewed by Carlson (2002) in The Chronicle of Higher Education, encouraged faculty members and academic leaders to evolve their negative views of online education by re-envisioning the online educational process. He stated:
If educational institutions can get to the point where professors visualize an online course as a mosaic or jigsaw puzzle with various parts that they can mix, match, and alter, then professionally produced materials will have a better chance of finding a home in more traditional (academic/instructional) spaces (p. 11).

However, researchers have failed to address perhaps faculty members' biggest and most deeply held fear that commercial education providers are leading Americans in the disturbing trend to define higher education as the "mere transfer of information" (Weigel, 2000, p. 4).

Noble (2001) stated, "Faculty members represent the last line of defense against the wholesale commercialization of academia, of which the commodification of instruction is just the latest manifestation" (p. 32). As such, it is incumbent upon today's department chair to leverage faculty members' knowledge, skills, and perceptions to "defend the department from corporate raiders of the curriculum" (Weigel, p. 4).

Belief That Online Education Devalues Traditional Face-to-Face Education.

Researchers have also reported that faculty fear that online instruction contributes to the devaluation of traditional face-to-face instruction (Novek, 1996). For example, Noble (2001), in his series of "Diploma Mills" essays, argued that the increasing pressure for institutions to quickly and conveniently "produce" trained skilled graduates for immediate "consumption" by today's employers, has contributed to the devaluation of the traditional academy's mission. Noble, like Thomas Jefferson and others, has asserted that this mission should be to educate a more responsible, well-rounded citizenry, rather than simply focus on providing them with job-training or survival skills. Similarly,
disdain of administrators who appear to be leveraging instructional technology to trim financial bottom lines and eventually replace faculty members with CD-ROMs (Feenberg, 1999; Noble, 1999).

Allen and Seaman (2002) also reported trends that appear to reinforce Feenberg’s assertion that “the source of innovation in online education has clearly shifted from the faculty to the administration” (p. 4) and that “faculty members’ pedagogical objectives have taken the back seat to budgetary ones” (p. 5). They reported that for 1998, 49% of all instructional faculty were part-time; 7% full-time, non-tenure-track; 6% were full-time; no tenure at institution, and 38% were full-time tenured/tenure track. They attributed the declining numbers of full-time tenured/tenure track faculty members to the economic recession of the late 1980s and early 1990s and the rapid increase in student enrollments for the same period (Allen & Seaman).

Yet, in spite of these recent trends and the accompanying declining faculty morale that is often generated by reports of these trends, Feenberg (1999) noted, “The systematic rejection of online education (by faculty members) will not solve the problem of the de-skilling and de-professionalization of the academy” (p. 7). He stated, “Faculty members (and department chairs) have to take responsibility now for shaping online education and reclaim lost ground in building programs for the many students who can benefit from the new forms of distance education” (p. 7).

Belief Online Education is a Passing Fad

Recent results from an Educause Center for Applied Research study, presented by Young (2004) in The Chronicle of Higher Education, bolsters many faculty members’ contention that online education is simply a fad “that has not lived up to the hype that
greeted its arrival on campuses” (p. A30). He reported that Educause researchers provided strong evidence that the majority of students believe technology has little impact on teaching. These researchers reported that students indicated that technology was very effective in making education more convenient for them, but believed faculty members should limit their use of technology in the classroom. They further noted that the majority of students believed that most faculty members used technology badly. They reported that students showed particular disdain for faculty members who simply read PowerPoint slides verbatim as a substitute for lecturing or interacting with students. However, Young also reported that students' did note some advantages of using technology in the learning process. Specifically, the students rated their use of online course management systems (e.g., WebCT, Blackboard) very highly and noted that they believed taking online quizzes and using computer interactive learning tools helped them learn more effectively. Similarly, Jafee (1999) reported that students who used interactive electronic exercises to meet the requirements of his U. S. history survey course, learned to take on the role of historian, construct knowledge on their own, and expand their writing skills by experimenting with various forms of data analysis and presentation.

Belief That Online Education Threatens Academic Freedom.

Colley (2003) noted that faculty members' concerns regarding online education's effect on their right of academic freedom relate primarily to issues of censorship, job security and employment issues, maintaining control over curriculum, and protecting intellectual property rights. Regarding censorship, Colley (2003) observed that many faculty members worry that a new standard of free speech will emerge in which faculty
participants in electronic communications will be held to a higher standard than those engaged in printed or oral communications. Regarding faculty job security, Colley (2003) noted that many faculty members fear being replaced by “virtual free-lancers not bound by geographic constraints” (p. 5). He further noted that such fears support many faculty members’ contention that as “distance education programs and courses proliferate, pressure on administrators to loosen hiring restrictions may likely increase” (p. 13). As such, faculty members fear that this loosening of hiring restrictions will result in a de-skilling or de-professionalization of the academy (Feenberg, 1999; Noble, 2001) in which instruction is delivered largely by part-timers or adjuncts who lack the proper academic degrees and credentials. These faculty members also perceive administrators’ interest in online education to be motivated by their desire to achieve budget savings and stretch institutional human resources in instruction (Colley, Feenberg, Noble).

Regarding the threat of online education to faculty members’ control over terms of employment, Colley (2003) noted that many faculty members perceive a real threat to the traditional tenets of tenure and lifelong employment. Feenberg (1999) and Noble (2001) have noted that faculty members must constantly fight the perception held by private sector critics that they have become a disposable instructional commodity. Indeed, these tenets are under increasingly harsh criticism from private sector critics who decry faculty tenure and lifelong employment as “insane” (Carlin, 1999, p. 9) and arcane. Colley further noted that online education “puts new kinds of pressures on tenured faculty members” (p. 16) who feel that administrators are setting them up for failure. He noted that many faculty members perceive that they are being forced to participate in online education and accommodate administrators who seek to overfill online classes in
order to capitalize on online education's perceived economies of scale (Colley). He further noted that faculty members perceive that administrators are not giving them the time and resources to support their online teaching efforts, and that they are failing to recognize and reward faculty contributions to online education (Colley).

Regarding faculty governance over curriculum, Colley (2001) stated that many faculty members fear losing control of the curriculum. Faculty members have for decades controlled where, when, and to whom instruction is delivered (Duderstadt, 1999). He reported that many faculty members' disdain the current trend whereby some administrators use online education as a means to maximize enrollment figures and minimize instructional costs (Colley). In addition, faculty members have also controlled who creates, uses, and revises course materials (Alger, 2002). As such, Colley stated, "Many faculty believe this control to be the aspect of academic freedom most significant to their survival in the higher education environment of the future (p. 20)."

Regarding the protection of faculty members' intellectual property rights, it appears that the solutions posed by the legal system and institutions appear to provide many faculty members too little information and no reassurances (Maloney, 1999; Slaughter & Leslie, 2000). For example, Slaughter and Leslie noted that the United States court system is doing little to prevent the erosion of faculty intellectual property rights. They stated that the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in favor of A-Plus Notes, a company that hired students attending a university to take notes, which it then marketed to the student body as a whole, without the faculty members' permission (Slaughter & Leslie). They reported that the court upheld the fair use doctrine which
stated that the content of courses at public universities, delivered in public settings, is
not protected by copyright nor owned by the university (Slaughter & Leslie).

Others have suggested that the requirements of the “Work for Hire,” “Fair Use”
doctrines, and contractual arrangements between faculty and institutions fail to provide
faculty members with a clear picture of how the institution protects their intellectual
property rights and further contributes to their sense of institutional information overload
(Maloney; Slaughter & Leslie; Alger, 2002).

Noble (1999) noted that faculty members at University of Washington (and other
colleges and universities across the United States) perceive that department chairs, deans,
and other academic leaders are engaged in selling the rights of online course materials
created by faculty members to the “highest bidder” (1999), thus reducing higher
education to a commodity offered for profit. Noble also noted that faculty members
perceive administrators as surrendering their intellectual property rights and alienating
their course ownership and control. He further noted that the eventual “owners” of
commoditized online products and services may or may not have any relationship to the
original creators of that intellectual property in the educational process (Noble).

Factors that Motivate Faculty to Participate in Online Education

Researchers have identified many and various factors that motivate faculty
members to participate in online education. For ease of analysis, Betts (1999) broadly
categorizes these factors as either extrinsic or intrinsic (Betts, 1999).

Extrinsic factors reported by faculty member survey or focus group participants
included the opportunity to receive new or updated hardware or software for instructional
purposes (Groves, Zemel, & Paula, 2000; OIT, 2001), to access and use technology-
enhanced classrooms (OIT, 2001); to receive credit towards promotion and tenure and/or financial remuneration (e.g., merit pay increases, stipends, grant funding for project and course development) (OIT, 2001, Giannoni & Tesone, 2003). Additional extrinsic factors reported by researchers included the opportunity to receive technical support with computer equipment, course release time, and improved job security, as well as access to workshops and hands-on training opportunities (OIT, 2001; Giannoni & Tesone, 2003). Other extrinsic factors reported by researchers included the opportunity to involve students more in technology, improve student learning, and increase student interest in technology (Groves, Zemel, & Paula, 2000; McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh, 2000), use technological innovation to improve course quality, and to meet needs of students at a distance as significant motivating factors (McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh, 2000).

Intrinsic factors reported by faculty member survey or focus group participants included their personal motivation to use technology (Schifter, 2000), ease of use of online technology (Groves, Zemel, & Paula, 2000), and the opportunity to develop new ideas, improve teaching, and increase the intellectual challenge of developing and delivering online courses (Schifter, 2000; Giannoni & Tesone, 2003). Additional intrinsic factors reported by researchers included the opportunity to diversify program offerings (Schifter, 2000), provide greater flexibility to students (Schifter, 2000), and take advantage of the perceived flexibility in work hours/location provided by online instructional opportunities (McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh, 2000).
Betts (1998) conducted perhaps the most comprehensive study of faculty motivators and deterrents. She surveyed 539 faculty members and deans at The George Washington University. She reported that faculty members who participated in distance education identified their top motivators as the opportunity to reach new audiences at a distance, develop new ideas, use technology, increase the intellectual challenge of teaching, and increase in overall job satisfaction (Betts). She further reported that faculty participators noted that distance education provides them with teaching collaboration opportunities, a creative format for course delivery, particularly to adult learners, and the opportunity to use “cutting edge” technologies and increase University competitiveness (Betts). She also reported that faculty non-participators in distance education indicated their top 5 motivators to be salary increase, monetary support for participation, the opportunity to develop new ideas, more ideal working conditions, and intellectual challenge (Betts).

Similarly, Born and Miller (1999) noted that faculty members’ perceptions of Web-based distance education were significantly higher for faculty members who delivered the online M. S. of Agronomy degree program than for those who did not teach in this online program. They also reported that faculty members who were involved in other distance education efforts, were familiar with the online degree program, or had viewed a degree program lesson online viewed Web-based distance education more favorably than those faculty members who had limited online teaching exposure.
Interestingly, two researchers who surveyed faculty members and academic deans reported that deans and faculty members perceived the factors that would motivate both participating and non-participating faculty members differently (Betts, 1998; Schifter, 2000). Schifter reported that academic deans perceived the top motivating factors influencing all faculty members to be their personal motivation to use technology, monetary reward, intellectual challenge, credit toward promotion and tenure, and course release time (Schifter). Similarly, Betts (1998) reported that academic deans perceived the top motivating factors for faculty to be monetary support, personal motivation to use technology, salary increase, credit toward promotion and tenure, and course release time. Schifter aptly concluded, “Administrators must recognize these differences and provide the necessary opportunities for faculty members to develop online pedagogical skills, which will only happen when faculty are comfortable using technology in their teaching” (p. 21).

Factors That Deter Faculty Member Participation in Online Education

Researchers have identified many and various factors that deter faculty member participation in online education. A significant deterrent factor common to several studies was faculty concern over receiving adequate and timely training in using advanced instructional technologies in order to keep pace with instructional technology and student demands for higher-tech instructional delivery (Daugherty and Funke, 1998; Betts, 1999; Passmore, 2000; Bower, 2001; Language Australia, 2001). Faculty concerns over the availability and adequacy of monetary rewards for instructional material design, development, and implementation (Betts, 1999; Passmore, 2000; Bower, 2001; Language Australia, 2001), the protection of faculty intellectual property rights (Betts, 1999;
Bower, 2001), and a concern that online education could undermine faculty ownership in the teaching process (Language Australia, 2001) were also deterrents frequently identified by researchers. In addition, faculty concern over the quality and effectiveness of online education (Betts, 1999; Language Australia, 2001), the perceived lack of student-faculty face-to-face interaction (Language Australia, 2001), and student resistance to and lack of knowledge of or familiarity with online education and advanced technology (Daugherty and Funke, 1998), were also reported as significant faculty deterrents to participating in online education.

Finally, Rockwell, Schauer, Fritz, & Marx (1999) reported that some faculty surveyed perceived online teaching to be an obstacle to tenure and promotion criteria. They reported that faculty perceived that administrators appeared to differentiate between professional recognition of junior and senior faculty (Rockwell, et al., 1999).

Technologies Used by Faculty Members in Delivering Online Education

Researchers have provided evidence that most faculty members use basic, rudimentary instructional technologies to supplement or replace traditional face-to-face instruction. For example, in an early study, Daugherty and Funke (1998) reported that the majority of faculty surveyed used the Internet and basic computer-based applications such as e-mail and Microsoft PowerPoint, to supplement traditional face-to-face instruction. Similarly, Vodanovich and Piotrowski (1999) reported that the majority of industrial organization psychology faculty surveyed reported that 28% had posted syllabi and course materials on the Internet, 8.5% had used distance learning technologies, 35.4% had made Internet-based assignments, 8.5% had given Internet-based tests, 13.4% had incorporated Internet-based tutorials, 29.3% had assigned Internet-based exercises to
students, 75.6% had used e-mail to communicate with students, 59.8% had used the Internet to assess scholarly literature, and 20.7% had used the Internet to present course content. Interestingly, in a 2001 follow-up study, they reported that faculty usage of the Internet as an educational tool was higher, but was still rudimentary.

Further, researchers with the Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001), have also reported similar results from their survey of 734 full-time, regular faculty teaching in the University of Tennessee statewide system of higher education in 2001. For example, they noted that faculty cited e-mail as the technology they most frequently used to support face-to-face instruction followed by posting course content on the Web and using the computer to create lecture handouts or track grades.

Lord and Bishop (2001) indicated that some faculty members are slowly moving beyond using basic distance education technologies. They surveyed faculty members at Floyd Community College in Rome, Georgia, and reported that most used interactive CDs provided by textbook publishers, collaborative essay-writing, computer simulation, and online clinical medical practice software, and posted course content on their personal web pages, to enhance student learning and supplement face-to-face instruction. They reported that beginning with fall term 1998, every student was issued a laptop computer and every classroom was equipped with fixed, wired student desks, "smart" instructor workstations, large-screen projectors for computer and VCR formats.
Leading the Department in Positive, Proactive Instructional Change

Machiavelli (1505), in The Prince, stated,

There is no more delicate matter to take in hand, nor more
dangerous to conduct, nor more doubtful of success, than to step
up as a leader in the introduction of change. For he who innovates
will have for his enemies all those who are well off under the
existing order of things, and only lukewarm support in those who
might be better off under the new (p. 21).

Having gained an understanding of the department’s “big picture” of technology
and its application to instruction, the department chair must then turn his or her attention
to the day-to-day tasks that will lead members of his or her department toward positive,
proactive instructional change. Toward this end, many researchers offer suggestions for
how the department chair can lead his or her department in today’s rapidly changing
instructional environment.

Anderson (1997) posed an interesting question. He asked, “Will (department
chairs and faculty members) lament what is inevitably to be left behind, or embrace what
lies ahead?” (p. 4) Katz (1999) strongly encouraged the department chair, other
academic leaders, and faculty members to ask themselves 3 questions. He stated they
should ask, “Should we get involved in online education”? (p. 46) “What will it mean
pedagogically, culturally, and economically to get involved in online education?” (p. 46)
Will members of academic departments in traditional institutions of higher education be
willing to be merely “consumers (and deliverers) of other people’s intellectual content?”
And, perhaps most importantly, Katz stated that leaders should ask, "Is our non-involvement in online education sustainable?" (p. 46)

The position of department chair, as noted by Anderson (1997), is "one of great responsibility and little power" (p. 2) and as such, the challenges facing the department chair are many. Several researchers have provided department chairs and academic leaders with guidelines and postulates that specifically address issues of technology adoption and implementation, faculty selection, motivation, and empowerment, and a myriad of other related leadership and managerial issues.

Online Education Adoption and Implementation

**Formulating a Common Premise Regarding the Adoption of Instructional Innovations.**

Researchers have suggested that a department chair must first work with his or her faculty members to formulate a common premise regarding the adoption of instructional innovations. Giannoni and Tesone (2003) suggested a common premise in which the chair and faculty members agree that "learning is not bound by place, time, speed, or style; learning takes place best when students are engaged; technology is the best tool to foster student engagement, and research in these areas is bona fide scholarship" (p. 4).

**Identifying the Courses, Degree Programs, and Students most Amenable to Online Instruction.**

University of Illinois faculty seminar participants who contributed to the 1998-1999 report, "Teaching at an Internet distance: The pedagogy of online teaching and learning," suggested that the department chair and faculty members must, then, identify
the student population that will best benefit from online education. They indicated that to do so will require them to consider the viability of the many contexts of online course delivery and evaluate which courses, degree programs, and student populations are most amenable to online instruction (University of Illinois, 1999). For example, seminar participants in the University of Illinois study noted that while online course delivery appears to be appropriate for professional training, continuing education, and undergraduate and graduate education of traditional and non-traditional students, "it may not be desirable for students in performing advanced graduate work or for traditional students who need the maturing, socializing components of an undergraduate college education" (p. 2).

Making a Gradual Movement Away from Traditional Face-to-Face Instruction.

Seminar participants in the University of Illinois study suggested that department chairs seeking to lead traditional faculty members towards participation in online education, should make the shift from traditional face-to-face instruction gradually. For example, they suggested that faculty members use text-based computer mediated communication to supplement courses they have traditionally taught in the discussion or seminar modes and gradually introduce interactive, graphically-based materials to courses they have traditionally taught in the lecture mode (University of Illinois, 1999, p. 3).

Carefully Considering the Impact of Class Size on Online Education Effectiveness.

Seminar participants in the University of Illinois study further noted that department chairs seeking to place existing or new courses or degree programs online carefully consider the impact class size has on effective online educational delivery.
They indicated that to retain the “high touch” characteristics of traditional face-to-face instruction in the “high-tech” online classroom, would require department chairs to set enrollment limits so that small student-to-faculty ratios could be achieved. They also observed that it is still more costly to deliver online instruction than to deliver face-to-face instruction. They stated, “The scenario of hundreds of thousands of students enrolling in a well-developed, essentially instructor-free online course does not appear realistic, and efforts to do so will result in wasted time, effort, and expense” (p. 3). They further observe that even though the number of non-traditional students seeking online educational opportunities is rapidly increasing, “large numbers of traditional students will continue to want to pay for a directly attentive professor and the on-campus social experience (p. 4).”

Convincing Skeptical Faculty Members of the Value and Legitimacy of Online Education

Rahman (2001), a professor and the director of online programs for the Sawyer School of Management at Suffolk University, has identified several postulates to guide the department chair who has decided to pursue online education courses and/or programs in his/her department.

He noted, as others have observed, that the number of online education detractors far exceeds the number of supporters at most traditional colleges and universities. As such, the first leadership task facing the department chair should be to convince them of the value and legitimacy of online education. Schmidt et al., (2001), state “It is imperative that distance learning not be seen (by faculty members, students, or other stakeholders) as a poor stepchild within the broader departmental curriculum, nor that it be seen as providing watered-down versions of on-campus offerings” (p. 13).
Rahman (2001) offered several postulates that the department chair can use to bolster his/her case for communicating and convincing faculty to embrace online education. He first encouraged department chairs to borrow entrepreneurial terminology used in business to convince faculty members that by “accepting online education as innovative and entrepreneurial, (they and the department) will be able to move from the old tradition of teaching students to a new learner-driven paradigm” (p. 3). As such, the department chair must lead his/her department in growing and encouraging an innovation supportive, rather than an innovation averse, instructional environment (Rahman). Seminar participants in the University of Illinois study noted that department chairs should make it clear to faculty members that they are not motivated to increase the number of online courses because of poor instructor performance in large face-to-face classrooms” (p. 3). They noted, “On any issue involving pedagogy, faculty members committed to teaching should have the first and last say” (p. 3), but also be held accountable for good teaching.

Helping Faculty Members Connect Online Education to the Departmental and University Missions

Giannoni and Tesone (2003) observed that many faculty members who are reluctant to participate in online education have expressed concern that “online education denigrates pedagogical aspects of the institutional mission” (p. 5). It is, thus, important that the department chair seeks faculty input and “buy in” to the department’s instructional mission with respect to online education.
In fact, Rahman (2001) noted that faculty members who are convinced that online education supports the departmental and/or university mission are more likely to support the department chair’s efforts in placing courses and programs online. Wallentine and King (2001) stated that the department chair must seek faculty input for developing the departmental vision and mission, must exhibit “rational exuberance” by demonstrating a commitment to the vision through time, effort, and resources, and create a sense of urgency to achieve the vision through short-term wins and rewards for both faculty members and the university” (p. 3).

Rahman (2001) also encouraged the department chair to develop a mission statement that emphasizes the strengths of online education such as access, customer intimacy or total customer solution, and flexibility. King, who is dean of the College of Engineering at Kansas State University, and Wallentine, who is Department Head of the Department of Computing and Information Sciences at Kansas State University (2001), stated that they have successfully employed the strategy of “Management by Walking Around (www.futurecents.com/mainmbwa.htm)” to promote faculty support of online education. The department chair can use positive language taken directly from the vision or mission statement to reinforce the benefits of online education to skeptical faculty members (Rahman). By actively linking the department mission or vision and online education, the department chair can seek faculty “buy in” to online education informally—in the halls, faculty lounge, or faculty offices (Rahman).
Assembling a Core Group of Faculty Evangelists to Promote Online Education to Skeptical Faculty Members

In addition, Rahman (2001) stated that department chairs often find the task of converting faculty opinion toward online education a difficult task. As such, he stated that department chairs should “assemble a core group of faculty members—preachers, red herrings, and foot soldiers—to preach the religion of online education” (p. 8). Finally, on another critical note, Rahman suggested that the department chair seek the active and vigorous support of his or her dean for his or her department’s online education efforts. He noted that by having the dean’s full support, greater faculty support and future online courses or program successes could almost be assured (Rahman).

Selecting Suitable Faculty Members from Existing Ranks to Teach Online

Rahman (2001) next provided the department chair with a framework for evaluating faculty interest in and support of online education. He suggested that the department chair has the best shot at converting and recruiting “teaching professors who are technology averse but who are shy to, but interested, in exploring the unknown” (p. 6). He noted that generally, the department chair need only offer these faculty members encouragement, training, technology support, and rewards and recognition to bring them on board as online instructors (Rahman). He further noted that research faculty with a technology interest to teach online may possibly be good candidates to recruit for online teaching, but only if they demonstrate a willingness to sacrifice their research time to prepare for online courses.

Rahman also encouraged department chairs to focus their recruitment efforts on regular and “star” faculty first. That is, he believed that the chair should focus on those
faculty members who are well organized, consistently meet deadlines, know how to
use technology tools for instruction, and prepare accurate, complete, timely course
materials. He further implored chairs not to waste their time or efforts to recruit faculty
members “who are not good teachers and hate technology” (p. 6).

Convincing Existing Faculty Members That the time is Now to Teach Online

When recruiting existing faculty to teach in online courses or programs, Rahman
(2001) stated that many often offer the excuse that now is not the right time to go online.
He stated, “There is no right time for faculty members to start online programs” (p. 8)
and suggested that the department chair take an incremental approach to faculty selection.
He also noted, “to recruit one quality online faculty member is good, two is better, and
more will come in the future” (p. 8).

Recruiting and Hiring the Best Faculty to Teach Online

Wallentine and King (2001) noted the critical role the department chair plays in
selecting and hiring new faculty who are willing to teach online. They suggested that
department chairs hire faculty members “who understand and appreciate the leverage
gained from cooperative or team effort” (p. 3). They noted that once new hires are
brought on board, the department chair must then nurture a core group of online teaching
faculty who respect and like each other, bring teaching expertise as well as subject area
knowledge to the team, and take pride in achieving their team’s instructional goals
(Wallentine and King). They also noted the important role the department chair must
play in evaluating individual team member’s performance, in rewarding and recognizing
their online teaching efforts and contributions, and in denying promotion or tenure to
those who lose sight of team teaching values (Wallentine and King).
Encouraging All Faculty Members in Their Online Teaching Efforts

University of Illinois faculty seminar participants noted that the department chair should also consider the question of how to encourage faculty to implement technology in their teaching. They stated that, for starters, the department chair should let his or her faculty members know that “teaching innovation is expected, respected, and rewarded as an important scholarly activity” (p. 3) in his or her department. They also stated that the department chair should preface these expectations by noting that not all classes are amenable to online delivery” (p. 3). Similarly, Giannoni and Tesone (2003) noted that chairs can motivate faculty members, especially seasoned faculty members, to participate in online learning environments by helping faculty members see how the goals and values of online education are often the same as those applauded by the traditional academy. For example, they stated that most faculty members highly value courses in which students learn how to develop and use higher-level critical thinking and analytical skills and written and oral communication skills. They suggested that the department chair leverage these similarities to involve skeptical faculty members in making online education “a research area worthy of pioneering and establishing for future potential” (p. 5).

Giannoni and Tesone (2003) also suggested that the department chair leverage the desire expressed by many traditional faculty members to teach highly motivated students. They note that many nontraditional learners at a distance are more highly motivated to participate in chat room sessions, complete their online assignments in an accurate and timely manner, and value the learning experience more than traditional, place-bound students.
Recognizing and Rewarding Faculty Members Who Participate in Online Education

After the department chair communicates his/her online vision or mission to faculty members, convinces them of the value and legitimacy of online education, and recruits the best faculty to teach online, he/she must then reward and recognize the contributions of these faculty members to the department’s online education program (University of Illinois report, 1999; Rahman, 2001; Wallentine & King, 2001). Rahman (2001) noted that it is ironic that faculty members don’t always require money as a reward for participating in online education. He stated that in his research sample, financial consideration ranked 9th among 12 questionnaire items addressing faculty motivators. He also noted that receiving monetary rewards for participation in online education was more important to adjunct faculty members than to full time professors (Rahman). In fact, Wallentine and King (2001) stated that often the best reward a department chair can give faculty members is the gift of recruiting the best students.

Wallentine and King (2001) also suggested that if department chairs and deans are unable to pay what the competition pays, they should compensate faculty members participating in online education in other ways. For example, they stated that department chairs should attempt to match faculty members’ instructional duties with their teaching goals, assign them to teach classes they want to teach, provide them with the needed space to conduct their research and teaching duties, recruit students who are capable to assist them, and raise funds from external sources to provide faculty members’ homes with high speed Internet access and up-to-date computers” (p. 6).
Identifying Resources for Faculty Development, Training, and Support

The department chair must also identify resources for faculty development and training and technical support so that they can become better teachers using technology (Wallentine and King, 2001). Wallentine and King noted that in this age of declining state and federal funding support, the department chair and dean must pursue extramural funding opportunities to support faculty instructional and technology efforts.

Rahman (2001) stated that the department chair must also cultivate a stable and consistent instructional “operation” in order to attract faculty members, either existing or newly hired, to online education. He noted that one way they can do this is to hire the best technology and administrative support personnel available and make certain that they are available to answer questions and help online faculty as soon as problems arise.

Protecting Faculty Members’ Most Valuable Asset—Their Time

Department chairs can best assist both online participating and non-participating faculty members by protecting the use of faculty members’ most valuable resource-time—and by making meaningful decisions that affect instructional faculty members on a timely basis. For example, Wallentine and King (2001), suggested that department chairs “keep committee assignments (often viewed by faculty members as mechanisms for avoidance of responsibility and time wasters) to a minimum, provide time-management training, and provide them with up-to-date technology to leverage and enhance their skills” (p. 4). In addition, they asserted that by making timely decisions that affect instructional faculty, department chairs can send a signal to faculty members that they care how their decisions affect faculty time on task and morale, team spirit, and sense of entrepreneurship.
Protecting Faculty Members' Intellectual Property Rights and Academic Freedom

Katz (1999) suggested that one of the most important ways the department chair can lead faculty members in evolving instruction toward technological innovation, is to take steps to protect their intellectual property rights and academic freedom. He suggested that the academic leader (or chair) “address the very sensitive issue of who owns the rights—for distribution and sale purposes—to the institution’s materials and collections” (p. 44). He further stated that academic leaders must address the “exportable nature of course materials beyond campus” (p. 45). He noted that the chair must address issues of “risk sharing, royalties, residuals, cost-sharing, compensation strategies, and property rights” (p. 45).

Creating the Expectation of Quality in Online Education

Rahman (2001) asserted, “Enhanced quality enhances credibility” (p. 10). Given the increasing faculty skepticism over the value and legitimacy of online education, it is incumbent upon the department chair to lead faculty members in developing and implementing effective online course and program evaluation tools. University of Illinois faculty seminar participants (1999) suggested that department chairs lead their faculty in developing evaluation tools that will “rigorously compare the learning competence of online instructional methods with what is being done and should be done in the traditional classroom” (p. 4). In particular, they suggested that chairs “examine the strength of the professor-student and student-student interactions, the depth at which students engage in the material, the professor’s and students’ access to technical support, as well as look for evidence of academic maturity (e.g., critical thinking and synthesis skills)” (p. 4).
Similarly, Rahman (2001) proposed that the department chair and faculty members develop course and/or degree program audits for evaluating online course content, technology and tools used to deliver online instruction, and course materials used. He also suggested that the department chair use student course evaluations and best practices postulates as evaluation tools, increase their knowledge base about online education, seek continuous feedback and criticism, and make the pursuit of quality online education a never-ending journey (Rahman).

Others like faculty seminar participants at University of Illinois and Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, and Schreck (2000) have also noted the critical role that department chairs play in ensuring and developing quality online courses and programs. The University of Illinois faculty seminar participants suggested, “Quality is best assured when ownership of developed materials remains in the hands of faculty members” (p. 3), and when faculty members work with their department chair to develop an effective system of evaluating online learning effectiveness. Similarly, Schmidt, et al., stated, the department chair can get skeptical faculty over the hump with regard to online instructional quality, academic integrity, equivalency to face-to-face instruction, and thus instill a strong sense of commitment to the evolving instructional possibilities associated with online instruction.

Selling the Faculty, the Administration, and Stakeholders on Online Education

Finally, Wallentine and King (2001) suggested that since the department chair does not really act as a “boss” of faculty members in the true sense, the chair must actively assume the role of “marketer” of his/her department’s online instructional mission and goals. They suggested that the chair must “sell” faculty members on the
merits of the online instructional mission and vision, sell opportunities, not problems, and advocate the result, not all of the obstacles to getting there. As faculty advocate, liaison and conduit of all that comes down the pipe from upper administration (Bergquist), the chair must also, according to Wallentine and King, keep the “big picture” firmly at the forefront; make financial requests within the limits of reason and current budget restrictions, tie all online education proposals to college and/or university goals, bring in partners and collaborators to distribute “buy in” and credit for online successes, and seek faculty and stakeholder input in establishing aggressive but attainable goals for online education.

Table 1 reports the findings of major studies on department chair, faculty member, and academic administrator perceptions of online education. The researchers, topic of research, the research methodology, and outcomes and recommendations for each study are identified in the table. The table follows the summary.

Summary

Researchers have indicated that department chairs, in order to best evaluate the consequences and opportunities presented by delivering courses or programs fully or partially online, should first gain an understanding of the scope and prevalence of online education in his or her department and assess national trends. They have suggested the chair also inventory the instructional technologies currently used by his or her faculty members in order to better assess the prevalence with which they are used and gain a better understanding of the resources needed to update instructional delivery. Researchers have further suggested that the department chair reflect upon and gain an understanding of his or her own, and faculty members’, perceptions of the value, quality,
and legitimacy of online education. Part of this process requires the department chair to gain an understanding of what motivates or deters faculty members' interest and participation in online education. Though no exact prescription exists for managing complex online instructional processes or change, researchers have identified guidelines that may assist the department chair in leading his or her department in positive, proactive instructional change. These guidelines can serve as the foundation from which chairs, faculty members, students, administrators, and stakeholders can intelligently engage in a meaningful discussion of how technological innovation can be used to improve instruction and meet the needs of each member of the educational and larger communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic of Research</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Outcomes/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Seaman (2002) Describes the quality and extent of online education in the United States for Fall 2002</td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
<td>Prevalence of fully online and Web-facilitated instruction increasing in United States, strongest interest by academic leaders that online education will be a critical long-term strategy for associate degree and doctoral degree programs, perceive faculty to lag behind student and institutional views of value and legitimacy of online education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betts (1999) Identifies motivating and inhibiting factors to faculty participation in distance education (DE)</td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
<td>Schools with deans with distance education (DE) teaching experience and/or positive attitudes toward DE had larger percentages of faculty participating in DE; intrinsically motivated faculty were more likely than extrinsically motivated faculty to participate in DE, no significant differences found between faculty identified and dean perceptions of motivating factors to participate in DE, significant differences were found between faculty and deans regarding inhibiting factors. DE participants' top 5 motivating factors were ability to reach new audiences that cannot attend classes on campus, opportunity to develop new ideas, personal motivation to use technology, intellectual challenge, overall job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianson, Tiene, &amp; Luft, (2002) Evaluates perceptions of Web-based teaching experiences by nursing college faculty</td>
<td>Quantitative survey Qualitative Telephone interviews</td>
<td>High interest in teaching fully online and Web-facilitated courses, informatics and nursing research courses are most amenable to fully online instruction, even those who do not prefer to teach online agreed it was just as effective as face-to-face instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giannini &amp; Tesone (2003) Describes factors that influence faculty to participate in online instruction</td>
<td>Qualitative Informal convenience sample focus group</td>
<td>Top 5 motivators convenience sample were release time, teaching development, intellectual challenge, technical support, job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic of Research</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Outcome (s)/Recommendation (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groves, Zemel, &amp; Paula (2000) Describes faculty use of, interest in, and attitudes towards technology in teaching and learning</td>
<td>Quantitative: survey</td>
<td>reports faculty self ratings of good to expert technology knowledge of Internet and WWW, computer-aided instruction; most frequently used technologies are Internet/WWW, e-mail, and software; top 5 motivational factors for use are equipment availability, improved student learning, increased student interest, advantages over traditional methods of teaching, ease of use; concluded it is critical that administrators recognize faculty concerns at all stages of technology adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Lindner, Murphy, &amp; Dooley (2002) Describes faculty philosophy toward distance education (DE) competence, value, and information technology support</td>
<td>Quantitative: survey</td>
<td>most are not philosophically opposed to distance education (DE), reported overall neutral attitude of competence with DE by faculty, concluded that increasing value of DE must be communicated more effectively in order to impact philosophical positioning of those opposed to DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, &amp; Waugh (2000) Describes faculty backgrounds and practices in teaching online and their concerns about online education</td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
<td>identified top 5 motivators to teach online were to involve students more in technology, to use technological innovation to improve course quality, to meet needs of students taught at a distance, increase flexibility in work hours/location, and increased student demand for online course opportunities, preference by faculty to offer combination online/faceto-face course delivery, face-to-face component is essential to manage social interactions, view demonstrations/presentations, monitor exams and progress checks, submit homework and answer questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)
Review of Literature Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001)</th>
<th>Topic of Research</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Outcome (s)/Recommendation (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies instructional technologies used by faculty (what, when); to identify faculty technology support needs</td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
<td>high interest in using basic instructional technologies to supplement face-to-face instruction, motivated by access to new equipment, software, training, rewards/promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| O'Quinn &amp; Corry (2002) | Describes inhibiting factors in faculty participation in online instruction | Quantitative survey | identifies top 5 inhibiting factors from distance-only faculty were lack of monetary support, concern about workload, lack of salary increase, lack of technological background, lack of administrative, technical, or clerical support, top 5 inhibiting factors from combo faculty were concern about workload, lack of release time, lack of salary increase, lack of monetary support, lack of administrative, technical or clerical support; top 5 inhibiting factors from classroom-only faculty were concern about course quality, workload, lack of release time, lack of merit pay, lack of monetary support, top 5 inhibiting factors from division chairs regarding their own participation in distance education were concern about workload, lack of release time, lack of monetary support, lack of administrative, technical or clerical support |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Topic of Research</strong></th>
<th><strong>Methodology</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome(s)/Recommendation(s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schifter (2000)</td>
<td>Examines motivating and inhibiting factors for faculty participation in Asynchronous Learning Networks (ALN) or distance education (DE)</td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, &amp; Schreck (2000)</td>
<td>Evaluates political science department chairs’ perceptions of current and future state of distance learning</td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vodanovich &amp; Piotrowski (2001)</td>
<td>Describes attitudes of faculty in psychology toward Web-based instruction</td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Much of the research done to date regarding online instruction has focused
primarily on student perceptions, student learning processes and outcomes, and faculty
perceptions of online instruction across colleges within the same institution and between
institutions at the state and national levels (Daugherty & Funke, 1998; Rowley, Lujan, &
Dolence, 1998; Lord & Bishop, 1999; Vadanovich & Piotrowski, 1999; Office of
Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative
Technology Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 2001; Rahman, 2001;
McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh, 2000; Schifter, 2000; Allen & Seaman, 2002;
Carenvale, 2002; Christianson, Tiene, & Luft, 2002). Empirical studies in which the sole
focus has been the perceptions of department chairs in the field of higher education
administration in the United States did not exist to date. However, Schmidt, Shelley, Van
Wart, Clayton, & Schreck (2000), conducted a research study in which they surveyed the
perceptions of 296 department chairs in the field of political science in the United States
with regard to their perceptions of the current and future state of distance learning, in
particular online education. Rahman (2001) stated, "The survival and success of online
education depends on the support of faculty leadership, administrative leadership, and the
active participation of a significant cohort of faculty members" (p. 2). Thus, the
department chair is a critical factor in the success of online education. The rapid change
in computing and information technology continues to be a financial, capital, and human resource burden to traditional institutions of higher education (Wallentine & King, 2001). It is therefore incumbent upon today's department chairs, especially those leading departments of educational administration, to prepare to meet these changes head-on, to obtain an understanding of the technologies involved, to identify and understand the forces driving the use of technology in instruction, and to understand the factors that motivate or deter faculty interest in teaching online (Anderson, 1997; University of Illinois faculty seminar participants, 1999; Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, & Schreck, 2000; Rahman, 2001; Wallentine & King, 2001; Giannoni & Tesone, 2003). Therefore, there appears to be a need for a definitive, empirical study to assess the perceptions of department chairs in the field of educational administration in the United States. A survey will be used to assess department chair perceptions of online education in departments of Educational Leadership across the United States. In this chapter, a comprehensive plan for research design, data collection, and data analysis will be presented.

Research Questions

The following overarching question guided this study: What are the perceptions of department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States regarding online instruction?
Sub questions that further delineated this study were:

1. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration characterize the prevalence of online education in their departments, colleges, and universities?

2. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States perceive the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation, of online instruction?

3. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States compare traditional face-to-face instruction with fully online or computer-mediated instruction?

4. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States characterize their department’s philosophy of instruction and pedagogy?

5. To what extent do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States perceive a “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets?

6. To what extent and from whom do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations?

7. To what extent do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States believe that upper-level administrators
fail to consider their opinions, feedback, and perceptions when selecting, designing, implementing, and evaluating instructional and curricular innovations such as online instruction?

Research Design

A descriptive study was used to assess department chair perceptions of online education in departments of Educational Leadership across the United States. German philosopher, Edmund Husserl (1931), believed that the starting point for knowledge was one’s experience with phenomena and his or her related perceptions.

A descriptive survey was chosen because it supports the intent of answering the research questions, gaining information, and is characterized by Gay (1996) as one that describes current situations. According to Nardi (2003), researchers conduct descriptive studies to present basic demographic information profiling study respondents, to describe the issues under study, and “to obtain more details and a stronger sense of the variety of ways people engage with the world around them” (p. 15).

Population

A review of the literature indicated that department chairs occupy a key position within a university’s administrative structure. They serve dual roles as academic leaders and managers and, thus, appear to be in the best position to critically evaluate online instruction. As academic leaders, they are in a position to evaluate the impact of online education at the faculty and student level. As academic managers, they share information with members of a university’s higher administration and participate in meetings in which all aspects (e.g., academic, budgetary, policy, planning, etc.) of online education
are discussed, decided, and voted upon. As members of the greater academic, business, and social communities, they are in a unique position to obtain, analyze, and filter feedback from internal and external higher education stakeholders.

The entire population, of approximately 209 department chairs in the field of educational administration, in colleges and universities across the United States, was surveyed. The entire population was surveyed to provide the best opportunity for obtaining a higher survey response rate than could be obtained by drawing a random sample from this population.

Instrumentation

Nardi (2003) noted that questionnaires (or surveys) are the most efficient tool for surveying large samples of respondents and in shorter periods of time than interviews or other research methods. The researcher adapted elements of a survey created by Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, and Schreck (2000) in their study: The challenges to distance education in an academic social science discipline: The case of political science. These researchers addressed issues that are relevant to department chairs in educational administration including the prevalence of online courses and degree programs within the chair’s department, the department chair’s perceptions of the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation of online education, the extent and types of technologies used to supplement and replace instruction, and other relevant issues. Schmidt, et al., designed and field-tested a 21-question national survey instrument in the fall of 1998. They then made appropriate adjustments to the survey and mailed the new adjusted survey to 812 political science departments representing both undergraduate and
graduate education programs in the United States. The researcher sent an e-mail to each member of this research team requesting permission to adapt elements of this survey to her descriptive study. The researcher received e-mails from Drs. Schmidt and Shelley granting permission to adapt the survey. The researcher developed additional Likert-scaled (Renis Likert, 1932) and open-ended questions to the Schmidt, et al. survey, to assess department chair perceptions of online education in the field of educational administration in colleges and universities across the United States (See Appendix I). The researcher established content validity of this study, defined by Kerlinger (1964) as the “representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content—the substance, the matter, the topics—of a measuring instrument” (p. 458). The researcher conducted an extensive literature review for the purpose of establishing content validity. The researcher established face and content validity of the proposed survey instrument by asking her dissertation committee members to review and critique the proposed survey. Nardi (2003) stated, “The best way of assessing whether the questionnaire flows, the instructions are adequate, the working of the items and format are clear, and the survey takes a reasonable time to complete is to pilot test it” (pp. 85-86). He stated that the researcher should “give the questionnaire to people similar to those who will make up the sample to be studied” (p. 86) and “arrange to discuss survey responses with each respondent” (p. 86). Each member of the researcher’s dissertation committee is a full time faculty member in the Department of Educational Leadership, Technology, and Human Development in the College of Education at Georgia Southern University.
Following the development of the survey instrument, the researcher developed a cover letter to accompany each survey. The letter described the nature of the study, informed respondents that their responses will be anonymous, provided respondents with a survey completion due date and postage-paid envelope for returning survey responses (Nardi, 2003). Nardi defined anonymous survey responses as those in which "no names or identification numbers are given that might be linked to particular respondents" (p. 84).

Data Collection

The researcher conducted this survey both online and by mail, via the United States Postal Service. According to Nardi (2003), an increasingly popular way of creating and distributing self-administered questionnaires is with computers. He noted that marketing researchers and others find that response rates increase with this method. The survey respondent consent form and the survey instrument were posted online on the study website and mailed, via the United States Postal Service, to each potential survey respondent after obtaining approval from the dissertation committee and Georgia Southern University’s Institutional Review Board. E-mail addresses and mailing addresses were obtained from the book, *Educational Administration Directory 2002-2003, 21st edition*, edited by Kenneth E. Lane.

The researcher mailed follow-up reminders to survey non-respondents in order to achieve a minimum 45% response rate. Kerlinger (1986) stated that high percentage return rates are indeed rare in behavioral research. He noted that the researcher may have to be satisfied with return rates as low as 50 or 60 percent. However, Dillman (1978)
stated that three conditions must be met to maximize survey response rate. He stated the researcher must minimize the cost for participants who respond, maximize the reward for responding, and establish trust with the participants. Dillman noted that the failure of surveys to produce satisfactory results occurs as often from poor administration as from poor design of the questionnaire. To ensure that the maximum benefit can be achieved from conducting a descriptive survey, Dillman suggested that the researcher carefully construct the cover and follow-up letters, observe a specific timetable, and construct understandable and relevant survey questions. Similarly, Nardi (2003) advised researchers to develop a questionnaire that is visually appealing, readable, and comprehensive, yet easy to complete in a short period of time.

The researcher mailed and posted online the surveys on November 8, 2004. A second set of packets containing the survey and a reminder letter was mailed via the United States Postal Service on December 8, 2004. The researcher continued to accept survey responses through January 31, 2005.

Data Analysis

The researcher read respondents' responses to open-ended survey questions, compared the data, noted common themes, and recorded categories and frequencies of responses. The researcher summarized these responses by topic and frequency and presented the findings in tabular format in Chapter IV. According to Nardi (2003), "Content analysis is necessary for open-ended responses using a list of categories to summarize answers" (p. 87).
The researcher used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 12.0, computer software package (Weitzman & Miles, 1995) to analyze data obtained from Likert-scale survey item responses. The researcher assigned numeric values to each response category of each Likert-scaled (Likert, 1932) question response, thus establishing a code for each variable (Nardi, 2003). The researcher developed a codebook to "provide a detailed list of survey (questionnaire) items with their complete wording, the names of all variables, the relevant codes for each response categories, the location of the code in the data file, and other guidelines for skipping responses or dealing with missing answers (Nardi, p. 87).

SPSS generated frequency distributions (e.g., the item measured is assessed for its frequency of occurrence) of categorized data, means (e.g., measure of central tendency that specifies the arithmetic average in which scores are added and then divided by the number of cases), and standard deviations (e.g., measure of variability that indicates how far all scores in a distribution vary from the mean). In addition, the researcher compared survey responses by respondent demographics (e.g., size of student body, size of department, and geographic region). The researcher answered each research question and presented and discussed all supporting data findings and results in text format in Chapter IV.

Item Analysis

A survey item analysis was presented in Appendix H and contained a listing of all items in the data collection instrument, the literature that supported the inclusion of the item in the data collection instrument, and the research question that each item answered.
Summary

A survey consisting of 5-point, Likert-scaled questions was posted online and distributed via the United States Postal Service to 209 department chairs in departments of educational leadership across the United States. This survey was designed to assess department chairs' perceptions of online education. Department chairs were selected as the target population because of the broad as well as detailed view of educational administration processes afforded them in their dual role as academic leaders and managers.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

The data and data analysis are reported in this chapter. A concise review of the intent of the research is also provided. Following the introduction, demographic data will be summarized. Following the presentation of demographic data, findings for each section of the survey will be presented with accompanying descriptive statistics and open-ended question response summaries, where applicable. These findings will be addressed in terms of each applicable sub-question. An overall summary will conclude this chapter.

Introduction

The intent of the research in this study was to assess the perceptions of department chairs in the field of educational administration in the United States regarding online education. The participants in this study comprised the entire population of 209 department chairs in the field of educational administration, in colleges and universities across the United States offering Ph.D. and/or Ed.D. degrees in Educational Administration or Leadership. One hundred six surveys were completed and returned via the United States Postal Service for a return rate of 50.72%. Likert-scale response selections were defined as follows: “1” – Strongly Agree, “2” Agree, “3”-Disagree, “4”-Strongly Disagree, and “0”- Unsure. None of the participants chose to complete the online version of this survey. Data collected from this study was analyzed using SPSS for Windows 12.0.
Research Questions

The following overarching question guided this study: What are the perceptions of department chairs in the field of educational administration in the United States regarding online instruction?

Sub questions that further delineated this study were:

1. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration characterize the prevalence of online education in their departments, colleges, and universities?

2. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States perceive the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation of online instruction?

3. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States compare traditional face-to-face instruction with fully online or computer-mediated instruction?

4. How do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States characterize their department’s philosophy of instruction and pedagogy?

5. To what extent do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States perceive a “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets?
6. To what extent and from whom do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations?

7. To what extent do department chairs in the field of higher education administration in the United States believe that upper-level administrators fail to consider their opinions, feedback, and perceptions when selecting, designing, implementing, and evaluating instructional and curricular innovations such as online instruction?

Data Analysis

Findings for Survey Section XII: Demographics

Section XII of the survey consisted of two questions that addressed the survey respondent demographics. Demographic data collected pertained to the student body size of the participant’s university and the number of faculty in the participant’s department. Demographic data pertaining to the geographic region of each survey respondent was also collected.

Descriptive statistics are provided for each question in the “Findings” paragraphs for each question below.

Findings: Question XII.1

Descriptive Statistics: Estimated Total Student Body Size at Participants’ Institutions

106 survey participants answered question XII.1. Participants selected the approximate size of the total student body at their institutions from five multiple-choice format answers. Five (4.7%) selected a total student body size of “Under 5,000”; 20 (18.9%) selected a total student body size of between 5,000 and 10,000; 21 (19.8%),
between 10,000 and 15,000; 16 (15.1%), between 15,000 and 20,000, and 42 (39.6%), “Over 20,000.”

Findings: Question XII.2

Descriptive Statistics: Estimated Total Faculty Members in Participants’ Educational Administration/Leadership Departments

106 survey participants answered question XII.2. Participants selected the approximate size of the total number of faculty in their respective Educational Administration/Leadership departments. 18 (17.0%) selected a total faculty number of between two and six; 21 (19.8%), between seven and 10; 30 (28.3%), between 11 and 15; 25 (23.6%), between 16 and 25, and nine (8.5%), “Over 25”.

Descriptive Statistics: Geographic Dispersion of Survey Participants

106 participants completed and returned the survey instrument in this study. The researcher used the mailing list of numerically coded surveys to categorize surveys received from participants according to 4 major geographic regions in the United States: Northeast, South, Midwest, and West. The researcher chose these categories from the U.S. Census Bureau geographic regions map of the United States. The names of the individual institutions were in no way linked to this analysis. Ten (9.43%) responses were provided from participants whose institutions were categorized in the Northeast region of the United States; 40 (37.74%), South; 33 (31.13%), Midwest, and 23 (21.70%), West.
Findings for Survey Section I: Perceptions of Department Chairs Regarding the Prevalence, Value, and Legitimacy of Online Instruction

Section I of the survey consisted of six questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions of the prevalence, value, and legitimacy of online instruction. Data obtained from the analysis of Section I questions can be related to Sub-Questions 1, 2, and 4. Sub-Question 1 pertained to the perception by department chairs of the prevalence of online instruction in their departments, colleges, and universities; Sub-Question 2 pertained to department chairs’ perceptions of the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation, of online instruction, and Sub-Question 3 pertained to department chairs’ characterization of their department’s philosophy of instruction and pedagogy. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section I are presented in Table 2.

Findings: Question 1.1

A mean score of 3.41 (SD = .633) for Question 1.1 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Online education is largely an instructional “fad”.” 48.1% strongly disagreed and 46.2% disagreed with this statement. Five survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure.” The most frequently occurring response was “Strongly Disagree” (4).

Findings: Question 1.2

A mean score of 1.74 (SD = .627) on Question 1.2 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “The strength of online education is not in the medium, but in the way it is used.” 33.7% strongly agreed and 60.4% agreed with this statement. Five survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure.” The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).
Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Survey Section I, Questions 1.1-1.6, Concerning Perceptions of the Prevalence, Value, and Legitimacy of Online Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question #</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Online education is largely an instructional &quot;fad.&quot;</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The strength of online education is not in the medium, but in the way it is used.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Online instruction cannibalizes existing courses, student enrollments, and faculty resources.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Online instruction is not appropriate for educating and training students in people-oriented, people-driven fields such as educational administration.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The benefits of using online instruction exceed the shortcomings.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>It is easy to do online education badly.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
Findings: Question 1.3

A mean score of 3.08 (SD = .805) on Question 1.3 indicated department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Online instruction cannibalizes existing courses, student enrollments, and faculty resources.” 45.5% disagreed and 33.0% strongly disagreed with this statement. 13 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question 1.4

A mean score of 2.83 (SD = .790) on Question 1.4 indicated department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Online instruction is not appropriate for educating and training students in people-oriented, people-driven fields such as educational administration.” While 54.2% disagreed and 17.7% strongly disagreed with this statement, 21.9% agreed and 6.3% strongly agreed with this statement. Five survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question 1.5

A mean score of 2.33 (SD = .783) on Question 1.5 indicated department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “The benefits of using online instruction exceed the shortcomings.” While 54.2% agreed with this statement, 26.5% disagreed. 18 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question 1.6

A mean score of 1.57 (SD = .762) on Question 1.6 indicated department chairs strongly agreed with the statement, “It is easy to do online education badly.” 54.6%
strongly agreed and 39.2% agreed with this statement. Three survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; six did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Strongly Agree” (1).

Findings for Survey Section II: Perceptions of Faculty Member and Student Readiness and Interest in Participating in Online Education

Section II of the survey consisted of six questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions of faculty member and student readiness and interest in participating in online education. Data obtained from the analysis of Section II questions can be related to Sub-Questions 1, 2, and 4. Sub-Question 1 pertained to the perception by department chairs of the prevalence of online instruction in their departments, colleges, and universities; Sub-Question 2 pertained to department chairs’ perceptions of the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation, of online instruction, and Sub-Question 3 pertained to department chairs’ characterization of their department’s philosophy of instruction and pedagogy. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section II are presented in Table 3.

Findings: Question II.1

A mean score of 3.02 (SD = .684) on Question II.1 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Faculty members in my department generally believe online education to be an instructional ‘fad’.” 63.2% disagreed and 21.1% strongly disagreed with this statement. Six survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions II.1-II.6 Concerning Perceptions of Faculty Member and Student Readiness and Interest in Participating in Online Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1 Faculty members in my department generally believe online education to be an instructional “fad.”</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2 Students in my department show a stronger interest in completing their degree programs online than in participating in programs largely delivered face-to-face.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3 Faculty members in my department are not ready to embrace online education.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4 Faculty members in my department are not willing to embrace online education.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.5 I believe my department’s culture can best be described as technology averse.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6 The majority of students attending classes offered by my department are motivated to seek graduate degrees in education for career advancement and increased pay.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
Findings: Question II.2

A mean score of 2.92 (SD = .763) on Question II.2 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Students in my department show a stronger interest in completing their graduate degree programs online than in participating in programs largely delivered face-to-face.” While 48.4% disagreed and 23.1% strongly disagreed with this statement, 26.4% agreed that students in their departments show a stronger interest in completing their graduate degree programs online than in participating in programs largely delivered face-to-face. 10 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question II.3

A mean score of 2.63 (SD = .723) on Question II.3 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “Faculty members in my department are not ready to embrace online education.” While 46.5% disagreed and 10.1% strongly disagreed with this statement, 39.4% agreed that faculty members in their departments were not ready to embrace online education. Two survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question II.4

A mean score of 2.82 (SD = .668) on Question II.4 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Faculty members in my department are not willing to embrace online education.” While 62.1% disagreed and 11.6% strongly disagreed with this statement, 23.2% agreed that faculty members in their departments were not
willing to embrace online education. Six survey respondents selected a response of "Unsure"; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Disagree" (3).

Findings: Question II.5

A mean score of 2.33 (SD = .783) on Question II.5 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “I believe my department’s culture can best be described as technology averse.” 57.7% disagreed and 33.0% strongly disagreed with this statement. Three survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; six did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question II.6

A mean score of 1.71 (SD = .682) on Question II.6 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “The majority of students attending classes offered by my department are motivated to seek graduate degrees in education for career advancement and increased pay.” 51.6% agreed and 40.0% strongly agreed with this statement. Five survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; six did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings for Survey Section III: Department Chairs’ Perceptions Regarding the Congruence of Online Education with Departmental Instructional Mission

Section III of the survey consisted of five questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions regarding the congruence of online education with departmental instructional mission. Data obtained from the analysis of Section III questions can be related to Sub-Question 5 regarding department chairs’ perceived “fit” between online
instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section III are presented in Table 4.

Findings: Question III.1

A mean score of 1.80 (SD = .657) on Question III.1 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “Using Web-facilitated instruction supports the instructional mission of my department more than using fully online instruction.” 56.7% agreed and 32.2% strongly agreed with this statement. 11 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question III.2

A mean score of 2.63 (SD = .932) on Question III.2 indicated that department chairs differed with respect to the statement, “I believe that fully online education will play a significant role in my department’s strategic plan over the next 3 years.” While 43.8% agreed and 8.3% strongly agreed, 25.0% disagreed and 22.9% strongly disagreed that fully online education will play a significant role in their department’s strategic plan over the next 3 years. Five survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question III.3

A mean score of 2.88 (SD = .895) on Question III.3 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Fully online education should be a major component of my department’s curricula.” While 45.2% disagreed and 25.8% strongly disagreed, 20.4% agreed that fully online education should be a major component of their
Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions III.1-III.5 Concerning Perceptions of Congruence of Online Education with Department’s Instructional Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question #</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td>Using Web-facilitated instruction supports the instructional mission of my department more than using fully online instruction.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>I believe that fully online education will play a significant role in my department’s strategic plan over the next 3 years.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3</td>
<td>Fully online education should be a major component of my department’s curricula.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4</td>
<td>Duplicate question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.5</td>
<td>I believe fully online education will play a significant role in my department’s long-term strategic plan.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
department’s curricula. Eight survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; three did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question III.4

Question III.4 was inadvertently duplicated in the survey. Results for this question were eliminated from this analysis.

Findings: Question III.5

A mean score of 2.54 (SD = .938) on Question III.5 indicated that department chairs differed with respect to the statement, “I believe that fully online education will play a significant role in my department’s long-term strategic plan.” While 43.3% agreed and 11.1% strongly agreed, 25.6% disagreed and 20.0% strongly disagreed that fully online education will play a significant role in their department’s long-term strategic plan. 11 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings for Survey Section IV: Department Chairs’ Perceptions Regarding the Equivalency of Online Education with Face-to-Face Instruction

Section IV of the survey consisted of nine questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions regarding the equivalency of online education with face-to-face instruction. Data obtained from the analysis of Section IV questions can be related to Sub-Questions 3 and 4. Sub-Question 3 pertains to department chairs’ perceptions of how traditional face-to-face instruction and fully online or computer-mediated instruction compare. Sub-Question 4 pertains to department chairs’ characterization of their
departments' philosophy of instruction and pedagogy. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section IV are presented in Table 5.

Findings: Question IV.1

A mean score of 1.85 (SD = .719) on Question IV.1 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “Effective teaching is possible through online education.” 55.6% agreed and 31.3% strongly agreed with this statement. Two survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question IV.2

A mean score of 2.01 (SD = .773) on Question IV.2 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “Students can develop higher order critical thinking and analytical skills by participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education.” While 50.5% agreed and 25.8% strongly agreed with this statement, 20.4% disagreed that students can develop higher order critical thinking and analytical skills by participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education. Eight survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; five did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question IV.3

A mean score of 3.18 (SD = .622) on Question IV.3 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “I believe learning outcomes of online education to be greater than traditional face-to-face learning outcomes.” 61.7% disagreed and 28.7% strongly disagreed with this statement. 11 survey respondents selected a response of
Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions IV.1-IV.9 Concerning Perceptions of Equivalency of Online Instruction with Face-to-Face Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Effective teaching is possible through online education.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Students can develop higher order critical thinking and analytical skills by</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I believe learning outcomes of online education to be greater than traditional</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Online students receive better grades than learners receiving the same</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction in a face-to-face instructional environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Online courses are less academically rigorous than face-to-face courses.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Online students receive equivalent grades to learners receiving the same</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction in a face-to-face environment, but learn at a lower level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Assessing student integrity online is comparable to assessing student</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity in a face-to-face instructional environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Fully online, blended, and Web-facilitated instruction cannot equate to</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face instruction, even when delivered at its best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 It is important that faculty members’ scholarly activities support what</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they teach in the classroom regardless of instructional delivery mode.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
“Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question IV.4

A mean score of 3.06 (SD = .564) on Question IV.4 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Online students receive better grades than learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face instructional environment.” 74.1% disagreed and 16.7% strongly disagreed with this statement. 50 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question IV.5

A mean score of 2.94 (SD = .846) on Question IV.5 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Online courses are less academically rigorous than face-to-face courses.” While 50.6% disagreed and 25.3% strongly disagreed with this statement, 16.9% agreed online courses are less academically rigorous than face-to-face courses. 22 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question IV.6

A mean score of 2.85 (SD = .715) on Question IV.6 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Online students receive equivalent grades to learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face environment, but learn at a lower level.” While 47.5% disagreed and 18.6% strongly disagreed with this statement, 33.9% agreed that online student receive equivalent grades to learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face environment, but learn at a lower level. 45 survey
respondents selected a response of “Unsure”, two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings: Question IV.7

A mean score of 2.68 (SD = .752) on Question IV.7 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “Assessing student integrity online is comparable to assessing student integrity in a face-to-face instructional environment.” While 41.5% disagreed and 14.6% strongly disagreed, 41.5% agreed that assessing student integrity online is comparable to assessing student integrity in a face-to-face instructional environment. 22 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2). (Note: While multiple modes exist for this question, the smallest value, “Agree” (2) was reported in the SPSS output).

Findings: Question IV.8

A mean score of 2.67 (SD = .851) on Question IV.8 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “Fully online, blended, and Web-facilitated instruction cannot equate to face-to-face instruction, even when delivered at its best.” While 45.4% disagreed and 15.5% strongly disagreed with this statement, 29.2% agreed that fully online, blended, and Web-facilitated instruction cannot equate to face-to-face instruction, even when delivered at its best. Eight survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).
Findings: Question IV.9

A mean score of 1.63 (SD = .644) on Question IV.9 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “It is important that faculty members’ scholarly activities support what they teach in the classroom, regardless of instructional delivery mode.” 51.0% agreed and 44.1% strongly agreed with this statement. Two survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings for Survey Section V: Department Chairs’ Perceptions Regarding the Quality of Online Education Compared with Face-to-Face Instruction

Section V of the survey consisted of 8 questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions regarding the quality of online education when compared with face-to-face instruction. Data obtained from the analysis of Section V questions can be related to Sub-Question 2 that pertains to department chairs’ perceptions of the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation of online instruction. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section V are presented in Table 6.

Findings: Question V.1

A mean score of 2.24 (SD = .877) on Question V.1 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “A quality education can best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment.” While 37.6% agreed and 22.6% strongly agreed with this statement, 33.3% disagreed that a quality education can best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment. 12 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).
Findings: Question V.2

A mean score of 2.36 (SD = .815) on Question V.2 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, "It is more difficult to succeed at online education than it is to fail." While 51.7% agreed and 11.2% strongly agreed, 27.0% disagreed that it is more difficult to succeed at online education than it is to fail. Fifteen survey respondents selected a response of "Unsure"; 2 did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Agree" (2).

Findings: Question V.3

A mean score of 2.79 (SD = .715) on Question V.3 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, "Fully online instruction will improve the educational processes in my department." While 55.1% disagreed and 13.5% strongly disagreed, 28.1% agreed that fully online instruction will improve the educational processes in their departments. 15 survey respondents selected a response of "Unsure"; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Disagree" (3).

Findings: Question V.4

A mean score of 2.05 (SD = .701) on Question V.4 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, "Web-facilitated instruction will improve the educational processes in my department." While 60.4% agreed and 18.8% strongly agreed, 17.7% disagreed that Web-facilitated instruction will improve the educational processes in their departments. Nine survey respondents selected a response of "Unsure"; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Agree" (2).
Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions V.1-V.8 Concerning Perceptions of Quality of Online Instruction in Comparison to Face-to-Face Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question #</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N(^1)</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.1</td>
<td>A quality education can best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>It is more difficult to succeed at online education than it is to fail.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>Fully online instruction will improve the educational processes in my department.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4</td>
<td>Web-facilitated instruction will improve the educational processes in my department.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.5</td>
<td>Teaching effectiveness standards used to evaluate faculty members who teach fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from the standards used to evaluate student learning outcomes in face-to-face courses.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.6</td>
<td>Standards used to evaluate student learning outcomes in fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from those used to evaluate student learning outcomes in face-to-face courses.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.7</td>
<td>Basic Web-based technologies (e.g. chat rooms, discussion boards, posting of online course content, grades, and assignments, and e-mail) can be used by faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction in my department</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.8</td>
<td>Advanced Web-based technologies (e.g. streaming video/audio lectures, field experience simulations, and IP conferencing) can be used by faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction in my department</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
Findings: Question V.5

A mean score of 2.54 (SD = .735) on Question V.5 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, "Teaching effectiveness standards used to evaluate faculty members who teach fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from the standards used to evaluate faculty members who teach face-to-face courses." While 44.0% agreed with this statement, 41.8% disagreed that teaching effectiveness standards used to evaluate faculty members who teach fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from the standards used to evaluate faculty members who teach face-to-face courses. 14 survey respondents selected a response of "Unsure"; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Agree" (2).

Findings: Question V.6

A mean score of 2.85 (SD = .703) on Question V.6 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, "Standards used to evaluate student learning outcomes in fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from those used to evaluate student learning outcomes in face-to-face courses." While 58.5% disagreed and 14.9% strongly disagreed with this statement, 23.4% agreed standards used to evaluate student learning outcomes in fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from those used to evaluate student learning outcomes in face-to-face courses. 11 survey respondents selected a response of "Unsure"; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Disagree" (3).
Findings: Question V.7

A mean score of 1.71 (SD = .588) on Question V.7 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, "Basic Web-based technologies (e.g. chat rooms, discussion boards, posting of online course content, grades, and assignments, and e-mail) can be used by faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction in my department." 60.2% agreed and 35.0% strongly agreed with this statement. One survey respondent selected a response of "Unsure"; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Agree" (2).

Findings: Question V.8

A mean score of 1.86 (SD = .718) on Question V.8 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, "Advanced Web-based technologies (e.g. streaming video/audio lectures, field experience simulations, and IP conferencing) can be used by faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction in my department." While 56.1% agreed and 30.6% strongly agreed with this statement, 10.2% disagreed that advanced Web-based technologies (e.g. streaming video/audio lectures, field experience simulations, and IP conferencing) can be used by faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction in their departments. Six survey respondents selected a response of "Unsure"; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was "Agree" (2).

Findings for Survey Section VI: Department Chairs’ Perceptions of Deans’ Support

Section VI of the survey consisted of six questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions of their deans’ support for their instructional efforts. Data obtained from the analysis of Section VI questions can be related to Sub-Question 7 that pertains
to department chairs’ perceptions regarding the consideration given by upper-level administrators for their opinions, feedback, and perceptions when selecting, designing, implementing, and evaluating instructional and curricular innovations such as online instruction.

The descriptive statistics for questions in Section VI are presented in Table 7.

Findings: Question VI.1

A mean score of 1.73 (SD = .647) on Question VI.1 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “My dean values my opinions pertaining to curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy.” 59.8% agreed and 35.3% strongly agreed with this statement. One survey respondent selected a response of “Unsure”; four did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question VI.2

A mean score of 1.68 (SD = .628) on Question VI.2 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “My dean fully supports my efforts to supplement face-to-face instruction with Web-based or computer-mediated technologies.” 53.8% agreed and 39.8% strongly agreed with this statement. 13 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question VI.3

A mean score of 1.96 (SD = .806) on Question VI.3 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “My dean understands the importance of helping me identify funding for online faculty training, development, and rewards.” While 52.2% agreed and 28.9% strongly agreed, 13.3% disagreed that their deans understand the importance of helping them identify funding for online faculty training, development, and
rewards. 16 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question VI.4

A mean score of 2.09 (SD = .923) on Question VI.4 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “My dean would support my department’s decision to offer fully online courses and degree programs.” While 43.2% agreed and 28.4% strongly agreed with this statement, 18.9% disagreed and 9.5% strongly disagreed with this statement. 11 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question VI.5

A mean score of 2.19 (SD = .851) on Question VI.5 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “My dean actively seeks my input in implementing online degree programs or online courses.” While 48.3% agreed and 20.2% strongly agreed with this statement, 23.6% disagreed with this statement. 17 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings: Question VI.6

A mean score of 2.02 (SD = .802) on Question VI.6 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “My dean effectively communicates my department’s ideas regarding curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy to senior-level university administration members.” While 53.4% agreed and 25.0% strongly agreed with this statement, 15.9% disagreed that their deans effectively communicate their departments’ ideas regarding curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and
Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions VI.1-VI.6 Concerning Perceptions of Deans’ Support of Department Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question #</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI.1</td>
<td>My dean values my opinions pertaining to curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.2</td>
<td>My dean fully supports my efforts to supplement face-to-face instruction with Web-based or computer-mediated technologies.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.3</td>
<td>My dean understands the importance of helping me identify funding for online faculty training, development, and rewards.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4</td>
<td>My dean would support my department’s decision to offer fully online courses and degree programs.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.5</td>
<td>My dean actively seeks my input in implementing online degree programs or online courses.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.6</td>
<td>My dean effectively communicates my department’s ideas regarding curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy to senior-level university administration members.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
pedagogy to senior-level university administration members. 18 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings for Survey Section VII: Department Chairs’ Perceptions of Their Ability to Fund and Support Fully Online or Web-facilitated Instruction

Section VII of the survey consisted of seven questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions of their deans’ support for their instructional efforts. Data obtained from the analysis of Section VII questions can be related to Sub-Question 5 which pertains to department chairs’ perceptions regarding the extent to which they perceive a “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section VII are presented in Table 8.

Findings Question VII.1

A mean score of 2.70 (SD = .839) on Question VII.1 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to adequately financially reward faculty members in my department who participate in online education.” While 45.5% disagreed and 16.2% strongly disagreed with this statement, 30.3% agreed that they were able to identify funding opportunities that allow them to adequately financially reward faculty members in their departments who participate in online education. Seven survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).
Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions VII.1-VII.7 Concerning Perceptions of Department Chair’s Ability to Fund and Support Fully

Online or Web-Facilitated Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to adequately financially reward faculty members in my department who participate in online education.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.2</td>
<td>Duplicate question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.3</td>
<td>Recognizing faculty members in my department who participate in online education is important to me.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.4</td>
<td>Providing faculty members in my department who participate in online education with timely, useful technical support is important to me.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.5</td>
<td>I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to fund the needed technical support for faculty members in my department who participate in fully online or Web-facilitated education.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.6</td>
<td>I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to fund training and development opportunities to develop my faculty members technical skills using online or Web-based instructional technologies.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.7</td>
<td>Providing faculty members in my department who participate in online education with training and development opportunities they need to acquire and improve their skills in using instructional technologies is important to me.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
Findings Question VII.2

Question VII.2 is identical to Question VII.1. Results from this question were eliminated from this analysis.

Findings Question VII.3

A mean score of 2.04 (SD = .720) on Question VII.3 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “Recognizing faculty members in my department who participate in online education is important to me.” While 63.9% agreed and 18.6% strongly agreed with this statement, 12.4% disagreed with this statement. Nine survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings Question VII.4

A mean score of 1.75 (SD = .626) on Question VII.4 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “Providing faculty members in my department who participate in online education with timely, useful technical support is important to me.” 58.0% agreed and 34.0% strongly agreed with this statement. Six survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings Question VII.5

A mean score of 2.53 (SD = .807) on Question VII.5 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to fund the needed technical support for faculty members in my department who participate in fully online or Web-facilitated education.” While 44.8% indicated disagreement and 9.4% strong disagreement, 35.4% indicated agreement and 10.4%
indicated strong agreement with this statement. 10 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question VII.6

A mean score of 2.48 (SD = .813) on Question VII.6 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to fund training and development opportunities to develop my faculty members’ technical skills using online or Web-based instructional technologies.” While 41.4% disagreed and 9.1% strongly disagreed with this statement, 38.4% agreed and 11.1% strongly agreed that they were able to identify funding opportunities that allow them to fund training and development opportunities to develop their faculty members’ technical skills using online or Web-based instructional technologies. Seven survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question VII.7

A mean score of 1.77 (SD = .664) on Question VII.7 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “Providing faculty members in my department who participate in online education with training and development opportunities they need to acquire and improve their skills in using online instructional technologies is important to me.” 60.0% agreed and 33.0% strongly agreed with this statement. Six survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).
Findings for Survey Section VIII: Department Chairs’ Perceptions of Pressures to Adopt Fully Online or Web-Facilitated Instruction

Section VIII of the survey consisted of eight questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions of their deans’ support for their instructional efforts. Data obtained from the analysis of Section VIII questions can be related to Sub-Question 6 which pertains to department chairs’ perceptions regarding to what extent and from whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section VIII are presented in Table 9.

Findings Question VIII.1

A mean score of 2.39 (SD = .778) on Question VIII.1 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “Potential students increasingly are demanding online education from my department.” While 47.6% agreed and 10.5% strongly agreed with this statement, 34.3% disagreed that potential students are increasingly demanding online education from their departments. One respondent did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings Question VIII.2

A mean score of 2.86 (SD = .769) on Question VIII.2 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “I feel pressure from my dean to improve the financial bottom line of my department or college by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.” While 51.5% disagreed and 19.2% strongly disagreed with this statement, 25.3% agreed that they feel pressure from their deans to improve the financial bottom line of their departments or colleges by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. Six survey respondents selected
Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions VIII 1-VIII 8 Concerning Perceptions by Department Chairs of Pressures to Adopt Fully Online or Web-Facilitated Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question #</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII 1</td>
<td>Potential students increasingly are demanding online education from my department</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 2</td>
<td>I feel pressure from my dean to improve the financial bottom line of my department or college by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 3</td>
<td>I feel pressure from the vice president of academic affairs or provost at my university to improve the financial bottom line of my department or college by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 4</td>
<td>I feel pressure from my dean to accommodate increasing graduate education student enrollments by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 5</td>
<td>I feel pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 6</td>
<td>I feel pressure from employers of my department’s graduates/students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 7</td>
<td>I feel pressure from for-profit, online institutions that offer graduate degrees in education, to shift the instructional focus of my department away from face-to-face delivery toward online delivery</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 8</td>
<td>I feel pressure from accrediting agencies to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question VIII.3

A mean score of 2.81 (SD = .776) on Question VIII.3 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “I feel pressure from the vice president of academic affairs or provost at my university to improve the financial bottom line of my department or college by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.” While 52.6% disagreed and 16.8% strongly disagreed with this statement, 25.3% agreed that they feel pressure from their deans to improve the financial bottom line of their departments or colleges by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. 11 survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question VIII.4

A mean score of 2.85 (SD = .783) on Question VIII.4 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “I feel pressure from my dean to accommodate increasing graduate education student enrollments by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.” While 52.0% disagreed and 19.0% strongly disagreed with this statement, 24.0% agreed that they feel pressure from their deans to accommodate increasing graduate education student enrollments by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. Five survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).
Findings Question VIII.5

A mean score of 2.64 (SD = .799) on Question VIII.5 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “I feel pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.” While 38.5% disagreed and 15.4 strongly disagreed with this statement, 41.3% agreed they feel pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. One survey respondent selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings Question VIII.6

A mean score of 3.06 (SD = .649) on Question VIII.6 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “I feel pressure from employers of my department’s graduates/students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.” While 58.0% disagreed and 24.0% strongly disagreed with this statement, 18.0% agreed they feel pressure from employers of their department’s graduates/students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. Five survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question VIII.7

A mean score of 2.68 (SD = .898) on Question VIII.7 indicated that department chairs differed with regard to the statement, “I feel pressure from for-profit, online institutions that offer graduate degrees in education, to shift the instructional focus of my department away from face-to-face delivery toward online delivery.” While 37.0% disagreed and 20.0% strongly disagreed with this statement, 34.0% agreed and 9.0%
strongly agreed they feel pressure from for-profit, online institutions that offer graduate degrees in education, to shift the instructional focus of their department away from face-to-face delivery toward online delivery. Four survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question VIII.8

A mean score of 3.21 (SD = .571) on Question VIII.8 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “I feel pressure from accrediting agencies to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.” 63.4% disagreed and 28.7% strongly disagreed with this statement. Four survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings for Survey Section IX: Department Chairs’ Perceptions of Market Forces and Competition in Higher Education

Section IX of the survey consisted of five questions that addressed department chairs’ perceptions of market forces and competition in higher education. Data obtained from the analysis of Section IX questions can be related to Sub-Question 6 which pertains to department chairs’ perceptions regarding to what extent and from whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations. The descriptive statistics for questions in Section IX are presented in Table 10.

Findings Question IX.1

A mean score of 2.18 (SD = .738) on Question IX.1 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “My department competes for the same students
Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Questions IX.1-IX.5 Concerning Perceptions by Department Chairs of Market Forces and Competition in Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question #</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Valid N¹</th>
<th># of Unsure Responses</th>
<th># of Missing Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td>My department competes for the same students enrolled in graduate programs of education offered by for-profit online institutions.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.2</td>
<td>I perceive traditional institutions offering educational administration degrees online to be “selling out” to consumer-driven interests.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.3</td>
<td>Online education contributes to the de-skilling and de-professionalization of faculty members in my department.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.4</td>
<td>Educational consumers (learners) should dictate subject matter taught and course delivery mode.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.5</td>
<td>Students choose to earn their graduate education degree from my department primarily because we maintain high academic standards and value academic integrity.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The Valid N represents the total number of (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Strongly Disagree, and (4) Disagree responses indicated by survey respondents for a particular survey question.
enrolled in graduate programs of education offered by for-profit online institutions.

While 54.4% agreed and 15.5% strongly agreed, 26.2% disagreed that their departments
compete for the same students enrolled in graduate programs of education offered by for-
profit online institutions. Two survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one
did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings Question IX.2

A mean score of 2.70 (SD = .860) on Question IX.2 indicated that department
chairs differed with regard to with the statement, “I perceive traditional institutions
offering educational administration degrees online to be “selling out” to consumer-driven
interests.” While 45.8% disagreed and 16.7% strongly disagreed with this statement,
28.1% agreed and 9.4% strongly agreed that they perceived traditional institutions
offering educational administration degrees online to be “selling out” to consumer-driven
interests. Nine survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not answer
this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question IX.3

A mean score of 2.99 (SD = .729) on Question IX.3 indicated that department
chairs disagreed with the statement, “Online education contributes to the de-skilling and
de-professionalization of faculty members in my department.” While 59.8% disagreed
and 21.6% strongly disagreed, 14.4% agreed they perceived online education as
contributing to the de-skilling and de-professionalization of faculty members in their
departments. Eight survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; one did not
answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).
Findings Question IX.4

A mean score of 3.09 (SD = .647) on Question IX.4 indicated that department chairs disagreed with the statement, “Educational consumers (learners) should dictate subject matter taught and course delivery mode.” While 60.8% disagreed and 24.7% strongly disagreed with this statement, 13.4% agreed they perceived educational consumers (learners) should dictate subject matter taught and course delivery mode. Seven survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Disagree” (3).

Findings Question IX.5

A mean score of 1.62 (SD = .614) on Question IX.5 indicated that department chairs agreed with the statement, “Students choose to earn their graduate education degree from my department primarily because we maintain high academic standards and value academic integrity.” While 48.0% agreed and 45.1% strongly agreed with this statement, 6.9% disagreed they perceived students choose to earn their graduate education degree from their departments primarily because they maintain high academic standards and value academic integrity. Two survey respondents selected a response of “Unsure”; two did not answer this question. The most frequently occurring response was “Agree” (2).

Findings for Survey Section X: Questions Regarding the Prevalence of Online Education in Department Chairs’ Respective Departments for the 2004-2005 Academic Year

Section X of the survey consisted of eight open-ended and two multiple-choice format questions that addressed the prevalence of online education in department chairs’ respective departments for the 2004-2005 academic year. Data obtained from the
analysis of Section X questions can be related to Sub-Question 1 that pertains to department chairs’ perceptions regarding their characterization of the prevalence of online education in their departments, colleges, and universities. Tables 11 and 12 summarize these findings and are referenced in the “Findings” paragraphs for each question below.

**Findings for Question X.1: How Many Fully Online Graduate-Level Courses Does Your Department Offer for the 2004-2005 Academic Year?**

Categories of responses, number of responses per category, and the responses per category expressed as a percentage of total valid survey responses given for Question X.1 are summarized in Table 11. 102 (out of 106 valid surveys completed and returned) survey respondents answered Question X.1. 48 (47.06%) indicated they offered no fully online graduate-level courses in their respective departments. 27 (26.47%) survey respondents indicated they offered between 1 and 4 fully online graduate-level courses; seven (6.86%) indicated they offered between 5 and 7; 9 (8.82%) indicated they offered between 8 and 12 courses; five (4.90%) indicated they offered between 15 and 20 courses, and four (3.92%) indicated they offered between 25 and 35 courses. One respondent (.98%) indicated 39 courses and one respondent (.98) indicated 56 fully online graduate-level courses.
Table 11

**Question X.1: How Many Fully Online Graduate-Level Courses Does Your Department Offer for the 2004-2005 Academic Year?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>Number of Fully Online Graduate-Level Courses Offered</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents for Question X.1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>96.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Survey Respondents:</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>1 to 4</th>
<th>5 to 7</th>
<th>8 to 12</th>
<th>15 to 20</th>
<th>25 to 35</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Respondents</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This column represents the frequency of survey responses per category, "Number of Fully Online Graduate-Level Courses Offered." Each survey respondent selected one category.
2. This column represents the frequency of fully online courses offered by each survey respondent as a percentage of the overall fully online courses reported by survey respondents.
Table 12

**Question X.2: Which Graduate-level Course Topic Areas are Most Amenable to Fully Online Delivery?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Fully Online Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced by Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced to Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance/Budgeting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Methods</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory/Survey Courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Content Courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Behavior/Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s-Level courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-two (out of 106) provided 122 responses as categorized in the “Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Fully Online Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed column” of Table 12. The total frequency of responses by category exceeds the total number of valid survey respondents because some respondents provided more than one category of response. Of the 72 survey respondents, 36 cited reasons for identifying a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to Web-facilitated delivery.
Table 12 (Continued)

Question X.2: Which Graduate-level Course Topic Areas are Most Amenable to Fully Online Delivery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Fully Online Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced by Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced to Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses That Do Not Require Demonstration of People Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas With Pre-Determined Objectives For Each Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Delivery is a Faculty Decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Program Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Issues and Trends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Education/Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Seventy two (out of 106) provided 122 responses as categorized in the “Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Fully Online Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed Column” of Table 12. The total frequency of responses by category exceeds the total number of valid survey respondents because some respondents provided more than one category of response. Of the 72 survey respondents, 36 cited reasons for identifying a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to Web-facilitated delivery.
Table 13

**Question X.2: Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses that are Amenable to Fully Online Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate-level Courses Identified by Survey Respondents as Being Amenable to Fully Online Delivery</th>
<th>Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Fully Online Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All are amenable because we have learned how to establish a collaborative-active learning process on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All of the program courses are amenable to online delivery. We have removed the &quot;bags&quot; after 6 years of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>Availability is the key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>Virtually all topics are appropriate. In fact, the &quot;early adopters&quot; teach courses in educational technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>We are a rural state. Bridges distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics of Education</td>
<td>Courses that can include significant integration of high-quality secondary resources and assessments that provide value-added learning opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Resource Mgt</td>
<td>Courses such as Education Resource Management that have some theory component are amenable to fully online delivery. Online courses are often &quot;efficient&quot; and can provide access to a lot of information in a limited time frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>We are a rural state. Bridges distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership (Master’s Level Courses in Higher Education Leadership)</td>
<td>The nature of these course offerings makes them amenable to fully online delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership (Master’s Level Courses in Adult Education Leadership)</td>
<td>The nature of these course offerings makes them amenable to fully online delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership (Master’s Level Courses in Community College Leadership)</td>
<td>The nature of these course offerings makes them amenable to fully online delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Content Courses</td>
<td>Class reinforcement (for high content courses) is not as important and effectiveness is not as relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Organizational Theory</td>
<td>Students can read texts and online readings and get most of the content they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education</td>
<td>Students are free to express opinions online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None is Amenable</td>
<td>It is too difficult to communicate effectively ONLY by distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None is Amenable</td>
<td>This course tends to be dependent on a lot of print material and true analysis of that print</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (Continued)

Question X.2: Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses that are Amenable to Fully Online Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate-level Courses Identified by Survey Respondents as Being Amenable to Fully Online Delivery</th>
<th>Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Fully Online Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None is Amenable</td>
<td>To prepare for school administration, discussions and problem solving scenarios should be monitored by the professors. Students need interaction between and among themselves with the professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None is Amenable</td>
<td>We are currently investigating which graduate-level courses may be amenable to fully online delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None is Amenable</td>
<td>We do not/will not offer &quot;fully online&quot; graduate courses in Educational Leadership at this time. Our faculty does not believe this is the best delivery model at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None is Amenable</td>
<td>We have a face-to-face profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None is Amenable</td>
<td>You must have mix of face-to-face and web-based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>This course, to a lesser degree, is amenable to fully online delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>This course allows professors to use opportunities for extended exchanges, e.g., discussion boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Methods</td>
<td>All info can be placed on website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Methods</td>
<td>We have had M.Ed. degree programs online for a while and have found numerous ways to achieve objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance/Budgeting</td>
<td>Little discussion is needed for this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance/Budgeting</td>
<td>Most online instruction is information transfer/acquisition with discussion board. These courses are correspondence courses on the Web. Knowledge and skills courses fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>Courses like School Law can include significant integration of high-quality secondary resources and assessments that provide value-added learning opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>Courses like School Law, with some theory component is &quot;efficient&quot; online and can provide access to a lot of info in a limited time frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>Little discussion needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>Most online is information transfer/acquisition with discussion board. They are correspondence courses on the Web. Knowledge and skills courses fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>This course tends to be dependent on a lot of print material and true analysis of that print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>We have had M.Ed. Programs online for awhile and have found numerous ways to achieve objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Master's Level Courses in K-12 Leadership</td>
<td>The nature of these course offerings makes them amenable to fully online delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Reasons Cited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings for Question X.2: Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to fully online delivery? Why?

Course topic areas deemed amenable to fully online delivery, the frequency with which survey respondents identified these course topic areas, and this frequency expressed as a percentage of the overall total number of responses given for Question X.2 are summarized in Table 12. The reasons provided by survey respondents for why they deemed these courses amenable to fully online delivery are summarized in Table 13. 72 survey respondents (out of 106) provided 122 responses to the question, “Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to fully online delivery?” Of the 72 survey respondents, 36 cited reasons for why they identified a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to fully online delivery.

Respondents cited school law and related courses (e.g. Special Education Law) 17 times (13.93%). Respondents noted that law courses tend to be very amenable to fully online delivery because they are generally content-laden, do not require a lot of discussion or student interaction, and can best utilize the online environment to provide a large volume of information in a short period of time. One respondent noted that fully online delivery of law courses enabled faculty members to integrate a significant number of high-quality secondary resources and assessments, thereby increasing the value-added learning opportunities for students.

17 (13.93%) respondents identified school finance, finance simulation, and budgeting courses. Respondents noted that finance and budgeting courses tend to be very amenable to fully online delivery because they are generally content-laden, do
not require a lot of discussion or student interaction, and information transfer/acquisition is easily facilitated with tools such as the online discussion board.

12 (9.84%) respondents identified research/methodology courses. Respondents noted that research/methodology courses are particularly amenable to fully-online delivery because all information needed by the students can be easily posted online.

12 (9.84%) identified Educational Leadership courses. Of these 12, six respondents identified a variety of program-based Master’s Degree-level courses including general Master’s Degree-level leadership/administration courses (2), Master’s in Adult Education (1), Community College Leadership (1), K-12 Leadership (1), and Higher Education Leadership (1). Respondents noted that the nature of these course offerings makes them amenable to fully online delivery.

Seven (5.74%) respondents identified instructional/educational technology courses as being amenable to fully online delivery. However, no reasons were provided. Four respondents identified Educational Administration, Educational Policy, and theory-based courses in Educational Leadership/Administration as being amenable to fully online delivery. Several respondents noted that fully online delivery of theory-based courses is very efficient because students can “read (their) texts and online readings and get most of the content they need (online).” Four (3.28%) respondents identified introductory or survey courses. Respondents noted that fully online delivery is efficient for the presentation of large volumes of print material and for providing opportunities for students to conduct true analyses of this
printed material. One survey respondent noted that fully online course delivery helps his or her institution bridge great geographic distances in a largely rural state.

Seven (5.74%) respondents indicated that all graduate-level courses in their respective programs were amenable to fully online delivery. One respondent noted that availability of online courses is his or her institution's key to online success; another noted that having learned how to establish a collaborative-active learning process on-line has been instrumental to his or her institution's online success, and another indicated that persistence or years of experience in having delivered online courses was instrumental to his or her institution's success in delivering fully online courses.

In sharp contrast, 12 (9.84%) respondents indicated that none of their respective graduate-level courses was amenable to fully online delivery. One respondent noted that we (the Educational Leadership/Administration profession) are a face-to-face profession; another noted, "Our faculty does not believe this is the best delivery model at this time."); another noted, "It is too difficult to communicate effectively ONLY by distance."); one noted that to be effective, "You must have a mix of face-to-face and Web-based (courses)", and one stated, "To prepare for school administration, discussions and problem solving scenarios should be monitored by the professors. Students need interaction between and among themselves with the professor."
Table 14

**Question X.3: How Many Web-facilitated Graduate-Level Courses Does Your Department Offer for the 2004-2005 Academic Year?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>Number of Web-facilitated Graduate-Level Courses Offered&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>This column represents the frequency of survey responses per category, “Number of Web-facilitated Graduate-Level Courses Offered.” Each survey respondent selected one category.

<sup>2</sup>This column represents the frequency of Web-facilitated courses offered by each survey respondent as a percentage of the overall Web-facilitated courses reported by survey respondents.
Findings for Question X.3: How Many Web-Facilitated Graduate-Level Courses Does Your Department Offer for the 2004-2005 Academic Year?

99 survey respondents (out of 106) responded to the question, "How many Web-facilitated graduate-level courses does your department offer for the 2004-2005 academic year?" Data pertaining to response category, frequency, and frequency expressed as a percentage of total responses is summarized in Table 14. 14 (14.14%) respondents reported offering no Web-facilitated graduate-level courses for the 2004-2005 academic year. 22 (22.22%) reported one to four courses; 19 (19.19%) reported five to seven courses; 13 (13.13%) reported eight to 12 courses; nine (9.09%) reported 14 to 20 courses; four (4.04%) reported between 25 and 35 courses; and one (1.01%) each, respectively reported 39, 40, 50, 60+, and 111 courses. In addition four (4.04%) reported offering all and most all, respectively, Web-facilitated courses; two (2.02%) reported offering many Web-facilitated courses. While three (3.03%) reported they did not know how many Web-facilitated courses their respective departments offered during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Findings for Question X.4: Which Graduate-Level Course Topic Areas Are Most Amenable to Web-Facilitated Course Delivery? Why?

Course topic areas deemed amenable to Web-facilitated online delivery, the frequency with which survey respondents identified these course topic areas, and this frequency expressed as a percentage of the overall total number of responses given for Question X.4 are summarized in Table 15. The reasons provided by survey respondents for why they deemed these courses amenable to Web-facilitated delivery are summarized in Table 16. 47 survey respondents (out of 106) provided
Table 15

Question X.4: Which Graduate-Level Courses are Most Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced by Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced to Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Methods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance and Budgeting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Behavior and Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most all</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory/Survey Courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses That Do Not Require Demonstration of People Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Delivery is a Faculty Decision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s and Doctoral-Level Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Forty-seven (out of 106) provided responses to the categories listed in Table 15. "Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed Column." The total frequency of responses by category exceeds the total number of valid survey respondents because some respondents provided more than one category of response. Of the 47 survey respondents, 27 cited reasons for identifying a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to Web-facilitated delivery.
Table 15 (Continued)

Question X.4: Which Graduate-Level Courses are Most Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Department Chairs who Answered Question X.4</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>44.34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-responses:</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total of Survey Respondents</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced by Survey Respondents(^1)</th>
<th>Number of Times Course Types Referenced to Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Content Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas With Pre-Determined Objectives Per Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Experience Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-Based Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Forty-seven (out of 106) provided responses to the categories listed in Table 15, "Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed Column". The total frequency of responses by category exceeds the total number of valid survey respondents because some respondents provided more than one category of response. Of the 47 survey respondents, 27 cited reasons for identifying a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to Web-facilitated delivery.
Question X.4: Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate-level Courses Identified by Survey Respondents as Being Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery</th>
<th>Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All courses are amenable to web-facilitated courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All benefit by posting syllabi, submitting assignments, etc. About 8 of 11 faculty members use Blackboard for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>(Web-facilitated courses) are a &quot;blended solution&quot; and provide flexibility and always pre-work for face-to-face time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All areas are amenable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All are enhanced, I believe - multi-modal approaches facilitate learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All are amenable. Web-facilitated delivery enhances flexibility of course for professor and student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All. Our program requires 80% face-to-face instruction and 20% web-facilitated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>(All) We all use Blackboard and other Internet assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>Use as a mechanism to facilitated access to research and communication among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All areas benefit from access to info and communication opportunities among faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Quantitative Methods; Introduction to Quantitative/Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>Not people oriented topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-Based Work/Research Courses</td>
<td>Allows interaction, case study work in effective ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Content Courses</td>
<td>High content courses intermixed with different methodologies and some affective courses, when taught appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s and Doctoral-Level Courses</td>
<td>Discussion board feature has extended the depth of understanding in all advanced master's and doctoral courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Courses</td>
<td>Most all. Easy way to make materials available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued)

Question X.4: Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate-level Courses Identified by Survey Respondents as Being Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery</th>
<th>Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Courses</td>
<td>Most courses would be, even advanced statistics. The problem is the time and energy needed to get faculty up-to-speed with these technologies. Web-enhanced courses can give a lot of resources to students (e.g. PDF files)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Courses</td>
<td>For our population of working students, web facilitation makes great sense. Our course readers are on e-reserves, syllabi and student information on line, and classes communicated via email/blackboard. We also have a number of courses taught simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Courses</td>
<td>Most courses would benefit from Web-facilitated course delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>We have rotated the four classes to see which are most amenable to Web-facilitated delivery. The jury is still out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Theory</td>
<td>Allows interaction, case study work in effective ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical/Conceptual Courses</td>
<td>Philosophical/conceptual course content with chat rooms and feedback discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>This course tends to be dependent on a lot of print material and true analysis of that print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance</td>
<td>Little discussion needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>This course tends to be dependent on a lot of print material and true analysis of that print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>Little discussion needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever Courses Faculty Member Believes is Amenable</td>
<td>This is a faculty decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Reasons Cited</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
98 responses to the question, “Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to Web-facilitated delivery?”

27 (27.55%) respondents reported that they deemed all graduate-level courses to be amenable to Web-facilitated delivery. Respondents noted that Web-facilitated courses offer a "blended solution" that provides flexibility for both professors and students, facilitates access to research, information, and communication among students and faculty, is an effective multi-modal approach that facilitates learning and information sharing (e.g. posting syllabi, course content, assignments), and provides students with pre-work opportunities prior to face-to-face learning time. Five (5.10%) deemed most all graduate-level courses to be amenable to Web-facilitated delivery. Respondents noted that most all graduate-courses were amenable to Web-facilitated delivery because the Internet/WWW facilitates easy access to course materials and resources (e.g., PDF files). One respondent noted that even an advanced statistics course could be delivered effectively in a Web-facilitated format. The respondent noted that the problem is the time and energy needed to get faculty up to speed with these (Web-based) technologies. Another respondent noted, “For our population of working students, Web facilitation makes great sense. Our course readers are on e-reserves; our course syllabi and student information are online, and (students and professors) in classes communicate via e-mail/Blackboard.” One respondent noted, “We have rotated four classes to see which is most amenable to Web-facilitated delivery” and noted, “The jury is still out.”
Nine (9.18%) respondents identified School Law. Respondents noted that School Law is amenable to Web-facilitated delivery because this course tends to be dependent on a large volume of print material and requires students to conduct true analyses of this printed material and because little discussion is needed.

Eight (8.16%) identified Research/Methods. A respondent noted that Research/Methods courses were more amenable to Web-facilitated delivery because the subject matter was not people-oriented. In addition, six (6.12%) identified Curriculum and Instruction; five (5.10%) identified Educational Administration; five (5.10%) identified School Finance/Budgeting; four (4.08%) Organizational Behavior and Management; five (5.10%) identified Educational Leadership, and four (4.08%) identified Introductory/Survey courses. Respondents noted the Internet/WWW allowed students and professors with access to course materials and resources and that chat rooms and bulletin boards provide students and professors access to feedback and interactive discussions. 2.04% of respondents identified Master’s and Doctoral-level courses, theory-based courses, policy, and instructional technology courses as being amenable to Web-facilitated delivery. Two (2.04) respondents indicated that the selection of course delivery mode was a faculty decision. 1.02% of respondents identified high-content courses, case-based courses, courses with pre-determined objectives, field experience courses, seminars, and adult and multicultural education courses as being most amenable to Web-facilitated delivery.
Findings Question X.5: How many traditional courses does your department offer?

Categories of responses, number of responses per category, and the responses per category expressed as a percentage of total valid survey responses given for Question X.5 are summarized in Table 17.
Table 17

Question X.5: How many traditional courses does your department offer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>Number of Traditional Graduate-Level Courses Offered</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents for Question X.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Survey Respondents:</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ to 20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 to 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+ to 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ to 60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ to 80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% to 15%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-two (out of 106) provided responses to the categories listed in Table 17, "Number of Traditional Graduate-Level Courses Offered Column".
92 survey respondents (out of 106) answered Question X.5. Five (5.49%) four to eight; seven (7.69%) 10 to 15; 23 (25.27%) 15+ to 20; 13 (14.29%) 25 to 30; 10 (10.99%) 32 to 40; four (4.40%) 40+ to 50; five (5.49%) 50+ to 60; five (5.49%) 60+ to 80; five (5.49%) more than 100; one (1.10%) 10% to 15%; one (1.10%) approximately 25%; three (3.30%) all; three (3.30%) many; one (1.10%) few; four (4.40%) none; one (1.10%) do not know.

Findings Question X.6: Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to traditional course delivery for the 2004-2005 academic year?

Course topic areas deemed amenable to traditional delivery, the frequency with which survey respondents identified these course topic areas, and this frequency expressed as a percentage of the overall total number of responses given for Question X.6 are summarized in Table 18. The reasons provided by survey respondents for why they deemed these courses amenable to traditional delivery are summarized in Table 19. 68 survey respondents (out of 106) provided 118 responses to the question, “Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to traditional delivery?” Of the 66 survey respondents, 25 cited reasons for why they identified a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to fully online delivery. 25 (21.19%) indicated courses that focus on interpersonal skills, group dynamics, and applied supervision are most amenable to traditional delivery. Respondents noted that traditional delivery of courses that focus on interpersonal skills permits students to work and exchange ideas in small groups; allows for face-to-face interaction and immediate, real-time interaction of emotions; allows for face-to-face exchange on matters likely to both stimulate new thinking and replicating real-world situations,
Table 18

Question X.6: Which Graduate-level Course Topic Areas are Most Amenable to Traditional Course Delivery for the 2004-2005 Academic Year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
<th>Number of times Category Referenced</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses that focus on interpersonal skills, group dynamics, and/or applied supervision</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Methods</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most All</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Behavior/Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Core</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance/Budgeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's-Level courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas With Pre-Determined Objectives Per Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Specific</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Project-Based Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Issues Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Thinking Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-eight (out of 106) provided 118 responses as categorized in the "Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Traditional Course Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed" column of Table 18. The total frequency of responses by category exceeds the total number of valid survey respondents because some respondents provided more than one category of response. Of the 68 survey respondents, 25 cited reasons for identifying a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to traditional course delivery.
Table 18 (Continued)

Question X.6: Which Graduate-level Course Topic Areas are Most Amenable to Traditional Course Delivery for the 2004-2005 Academic Year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
<th>Number of times Category Referenced</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort-Based Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Seminars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory – General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Education/Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving/Decision Making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any With an Instructor Unwilling or Unable to Use Web-Based Effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Sixty-eight (out of 106) provided 118 responses as categorized in the “Types of Courses Deemed Amenable to Traditional Course Delivery by Department Chairs Surveyed” column of Table 18. The total frequency of responses by category exceeds the total number of valid survey respondents because some respondents provided more than one category of response. Of the 68 survey respondents, 25 cited reasons for identifying a particular graduate-level course as being amenable to traditional course delivery.
Table 19

Question X.6: Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Traditional Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate-level Courses Identified by Survey Respondents as Being Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
<th>Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>Students have complained about the quality of the 2 courses that are presently offered online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>Some students prefer face-to-face classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are Amenable</td>
<td>All areas are amenable. The contact does not make a difference in face-to-face vs. Web.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All are amenable</td>
<td>All topics are appropriate. The key variable is not course topic but rather student access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>All group and collaborative learning courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>Applied social science, doctoral core, stats &amp; methods (which uses PC/Excel for problems and class submissions), concentration courses; allows for face-to-face exchange on matters likely to both stimulate new thinking and replicating real-world situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>All courses that require personal contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>Applied courses in supervision (e.g., clinical supervision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>Courses that require in-class discussion and oral presentation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>Conflict resolution through group interaction - face-to-face issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question X.6: Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Traditional Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate-level Courses Identified by Survey Respondents as Being Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
<th>Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>Group dynamics, teaching and learning (interpersonal aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Requiring Demonstration of People Skills; Most Applied Courses.</td>
<td>Supervision of instruction and other largely interactive courses that stress group process &amp; facilitate skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Courses on leadership development, with strong socializing emphasis-the development of a learning community and opportunity to change and develop core values is much better face-to-face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Curriculum administration; foundations leadership (discussion of issues for both courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Supervisor, leadership, maintenance of traditional delivery format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>All courses related to instructional leadership, and improving student achievement. These need focus on authentic problems of practice, and in-depth dialog with other students and with practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership courses, organizational change, writing thinking, cohort-based, relies on feedback and dialogue among students/faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Teaching of leadership styles - lots of inventories/meta-cognition, politics - lots of debates in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Some K-12 leadership because they need to go to sit and discuss (i.e. Building &amp; statistics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship and Field Experience Courses</td>
<td>Field experiences are required and cannot be effective if on-line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Quantitative Methods; Introduction to Quantitative/Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>Dissertation research, advanced research methods, advanced statistics Requires small classes and good face-to-face interaction. Almost impossible to do this kind of thing other than face-to-face.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 19 (Continued)**

**Question X.6: Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Traditional Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate-level Courses Identified by Survey Respondents as Being Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
<th>Reasons Cited by Survey Respondents for Identifying Graduate-Level Courses as Amenable to Traditional Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Quantitative Methods; Introduction to Quantitative/Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>Education statistics is confusing to students without face-to-face (interaction).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Quantitative Methods; Introduction to Quantitative/Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>Methods – Faculty need to be working with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Quantitative Methods; Introduction to Quantitative/Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>Practica, research courses where faculty teach students how to code their own data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral seminars</td>
<td>Ease of dialogue on topics of greater depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Reasons Cited</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and facilitates learning of conflict resolution through group interaction.

17 (14.41%) of respondents indicated all courses were amenable to traditional delivery and four (3.39%) indicated most all. One respondent noted, “Face-to-face contact is needed for most courses we offer at the present time.” One respondent noted, “Students have complained about the quality of the 2 courses that are presently offered online.” Others reported that some students prefer face-to-face classes; that contact does not make a difference in face-to-face vs. Web; and that the key variable is not course topic but student access.

13 (11.02%) indicated educational leadership courses. One respondent noted that these courses have a strong socializing emphasis. Another noted that “The development of a learning community and opportunity to change and develop core values is much better face-to-face” for leadership courses. Others noted that these courses depend on feedback and dialogue among students and faculty and that the traditional format is ideal for teaching topics such as leadership styles, leadership inventories, and school politics. Others noted that the traditional class format permits in-class debate and discussion that enhance learning.

11 (9.32%) indicated Statistics/Methods courses as most amenable to traditional delivery. Respondents noted that effective learning in statistics/methods courses is best facilitated by small classes and good face-to-face interaction. One stated that it is almost impossible to do this kind of thing (teach statistics/methods courses) other than face-to-face. While another noted that teaching statistics/methods courses is often confusing to students without face-to-face interaction. One reported that faculty members need to be working with students in methods classes.
Four (3.39%) indicated School Law. Four (3.39%) indicated internships. One reported that field experiences cannot be effective if taught online. Three respondents indicated one (.85%) each for educational administration; organizational behavior and management was reported. One respondent noted that these courses depend on feedback and dialogue among students and faculty. Three (2.54%) indicated seminars and three (2.54%) indicated doctoral core. Two (1.69%) indicated curriculum and instruction. Others indicated remaining categories at one (.85%) each as reported in Table 17. Three (2.54%) indicated no courses were amenable to traditional delivery.

Findings Question X.7: Do you offer a fully online degree program(s) for the 2004-2005 Academic Year? If so, what?

Of 106 survey respondents, 73 (68.86%) reported they did not offer fully online degree programs; 14 (13.21%) did not answer Question X.7, and 19 (17.92%) reported they did offer fully online degree programs. The types of fully online graduate degree programs offered by those who responded, “yes” to Question X.7 are summarized in Table 20.

Findings Question X.8: Do you offer a Web-facilitated degree program(s) for the 2004-2005 Academic Year? If so, what?

Of 106 survey respondents, 41 (38.68%) reported they did not offer Web-facilitated degree programs; 20 (18.87%) did not answer Question X.8, and 43 (40.57%) reported they did offer Web-facilitated degree programs. The types of
Table 20

Types and Count of Fully Online Graduate Degree Programs Offered for the 2004-2005 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Fully Online Graduate Degree Program Offered:</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Educational Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Adult Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Higher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Human Resource Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Reading and Language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Science Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Higher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS in Human Resource Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's of Ed Leadership School Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's of Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level not specified) One is being developed in Adult Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. - Preliminary Administration Credential</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. - Professional Administration Credential</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs For Career Switchers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have, until recently, offered a fully online (Master's) degree program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, teaching the second two &quot;Teacher as Researcher&quot; courses at the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's level is extremely difficult to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate in Educational Leadership Higher Education is combined with</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>web-facilitated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D. in Higher Education Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Ed Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following programs (level not specified) are fully online: Instructional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, Educational Leadership, Business Administration, Public</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, and Arts Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total:</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21

**Types and Count of Web-facilitated Graduate Degree Program(s) Offered for the 2004-2005 Academic Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Web-facilitated Graduate Degree Program Offered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Administration Certificate Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Certificate in Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Certificate in School Business Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D with superintendency certification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D in Educational Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D in Superintendent and Systems-level Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTC (Gifted, Talented, Creative)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Principal Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in FDED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in School Principalship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's in CD-12 Educational Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's of Arts in Educational Leadership, Management, and Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED in Educational Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D Adult Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of our advanced and specialty certifications after initial leadership certification is established (e.g. Superintendent Supervision)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total:</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
degree programs offered by those who responded “yes” to Question X.8 are summarized in Table 21.

Findings: Question X.9

The findings for Question X.9 pertain to the percentage of a department’s total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term that is attributable to fully online delivery. A frequency distribution is presented in Appendix A. One hundred six survey respondents answered Question X.9. 47 (44.3%) reported that none of the total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term was attributable to Web-facilitated delivery; eight (7.5%) reported less than 1%; 10 (9.4%) reported between one and three percent; 12 (11.3%) reported between four and 10 percent; 10 (9.4%) reported between 11 and 20 percent, and 10 (9.4%) reported more than 20 percent.

Findings: Question X.10

The findings for Question X.10 pertain to the percentage of a department’s total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term that is attributable to Web-facilitated delivery. A frequency distribution is presented in Appendix A. One hundred six survey respondents answered Question X.10. 18 (17.0%) reported that none of the total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term was attributable to Web-facilitated delivery; eight (7.5%) reported less than 1%; eight (7.5%) reported between 1% and 3%; 13 (12.3%) reported between 4% and 10%; 13 (12.3%) reported between 11% and 20%, and 36 (34.0%) reported more than 20%.
Findings for Survey Section XI: Technologies Used/Knowledge and Skill Level of Faculty Members and Department Chairs

Section XI of the survey consisted of three questions that addressed the technologies used by and knowledge and skill level of faculty members and department chairs. Data obtained from the analysis of Section XI questions can be related to Sub-Question 1 that pertains to department chairs’ perceptions regarding their characterization of the prevalence of online education in their departments, colleges, and universities.

Descriptive statistics are provided for each question in the “Findings” paragraphs for each question below. Frequency distribution tables are provided in Appendix A.

Findings: Question XI.1 Descriptive Statistics Regarding the Types of Instructional Technologies Employed by Faculty Members in Educational Administration/Leadership Departments in the United States.

One hundred four survey participants answered question XI.1. Participants selected types of instructional technologies employed by their faculty members from a list of 10 instructional technologies. An open-ended “Other” category was also provided so participants could include other instructional technologies used.

93 (89.4%) participants selected Internet/World Wide Web delivery; 99 (95.2%) selected e-mail interactions with remote students; 76 (73.1%) selected multi-person computer interactions (E.g., chat rooms, simulations, etc.); 43 (41.3%) selected fiber optic full motion video and two-way audio; 65 (62.5%) selected physically having instructor at off-campus venue; 58 (55.8%) selected
correspondence by mail; 68 (65.4%) selected telephone conference; 14 (13.2%) selected public television course delivery; 19 (18.3%) selected satellite up/downlink, and 8 (7.7%) selected satellite downlink only. Participants' "Other" responses to Question XI.1 are summarized in Table 22.

Findings: Question XI.2 Descriptive Statistics: Department Chair Perceptions of Faculty Members' Overall Knowledge and Skill Level Using Computer and Internet Technologies to Supplement or Replace Traditional Face-to-Face Instruction

One hundred (out of 106) survey respondents answered Question XI.2, "Please circle the response that best describes your faculty members' overall knowledge and skill level using computer and Internet technologies to supplement or replace traditional face-to-face instruction." Respondents were asked to select one numeric response. A selection of “0” indicated “No Knowledge/Skill.” A selection of “5” indicated “High Knowledge/Skill.” A selection of 1, 2, 3, or 4 could be made to indicate knowledge/skill between the two extremes given. One (1.0%) participant selected “0”; four (4.0%) selected “1”; 20 (20.0%) selected “2”; 38 (38.0%) selected “3”; 28 (28.0%) selected “4”, and eight (8.0%) selected “5”. The average knowledge/skill level was 3.10 (SD=1.07). The median and mode responses were 3.
### Question XI.1 Summary of "Other" Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Instructional Technologies Used by Faculty Members</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD plus Blackboard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Weblink</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning Lab That Facilitates Audiovisual Communication Between 2 Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Conferencing; Web-Conferencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Two-Way Television (ITV)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITV But Not Public</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTVN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Tape, Audio Bridge, Chatroom Combination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISTA, WebCT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebCT, CDROM Coursepaks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings: Question XI.3 Descriptive Statistics: Department Chair Perceptions of Their Own Overall Knowledge and Skill Level Using Computer and Internet Technologies to Supplement or Replace Traditional Face-to-Face Instruction

100 (out of 106) survey respondents answered Question XI.3, “Please circle the response that best describes your overall knowledge and skill level using computer and Internet technologies to supplement or replace traditional face-to-face instruction.” Respondents were asked to select one numeric response. A selection of “0” indicated “No Knowledge/Skill.” A selection of “5” indicated “High Knowledge/Skill.” A selection of 1, 2, 3, or 4 could be made to indicate knowledge/skill between the two extremes given. One (1.0%) participant selected “0”; nine (8.8%) selected “1”; 20 (19.6%) selected “2”; 31 (30.4%) selected “3”; 29 (28.4%) selected “4”, and 12 (11.3%) selected “5”. The average knowledge/skill level was 3.12 (SD=1.18). The median and mode responses were 3.

Summary

The data collected and analyzed in this study assessed department chair perceptions of online education in the field of educational administration at institutions in the United States offering Ph.D. and/or Ed.D. degrees in Educational Administration or Leadership and demographics.

Regarding the participant demographics of student body size, five (4.7%) selected a total student body size of “Under 5,000”; 20 (18.9%) selected a total student body size of between 5,000 and 10,000; 21 (19.8%), between 10,000 and 15,000; 16 (15.1%), between 15,000 and 20,000, and 42 (39.6%), “Over 20,000.” Regarding the participant demographic of size of the total number of faculty in their
selected a total faculty number of between 2 and 6; 21 (19.8%), between 7 and 10; 30 (28.3%), between 11 and 15; 25 (23.6%), between 16 and 25, and 9 (8.5%), "Over 25".

Regarding the geographic dispersion of participants, 10 (9.43%) responses were provided from participants whose institutions were categorized in the Northeast region of the United States; 40 (37.74%), South; 33 (31.13%), Midwest, and 23 (21.70%), West.

Regarding the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation, of online instruction, on average, department chairs indicated they do not perceive online education to be an instructional "fad." Most disagreed that online instruction is not appropriate for educating and training students in people-oriented, people-driven fields such as educational administration. Department chairs indicated they do not perceive online education to cannibalize existing courses, student enrollments, and faculty resources. On average, they agreed that a quality education can best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment and agreed that it is more difficult to succeed at online education than it is to fail. They further agreed that the strength of online education is not in the medium, but in the way it is used. They differed with regard to whether the benefits of using online instruction exceed the shortcomings. They further agreed that online education is easy to do badly.

On average department chairs believed that fully online instruction would not improve the educational processes in their departments and that Web-facilitated instruction would improve the educational processes in their departments.
Department chairs differed with regard to whether teaching effectiveness standards used to evaluate faculty members teaching fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be equivalent to those used to evaluate faculty members who teach face-to-face courses. Department chairs disagreed that assessment standards used to assess student learning outcomes be equivalent among fully online, Web-facilitated, and traditional, face-to-face courses. They agreed that faculty members in their departments could effectively supplement face-to-face instruction using both basic and advanced Web-based instructional technologies.

Regarding the characterization of their department’s philosophy of instruction and pedagogy, department chairs characterized their departments’ cultures as being receptive to instructional technology rather than technology averse. On average, department chairs did not believe their faculty members perceived online instruction to be a “fad.”

Regarding their faculty members’ and students’ readiness and interest in participating in online education, on average, department chairs differed with regard to whether their faculty members were ready and willing to embrace online education. Department chairs also agreed that it is important that faculty members’ scholarly activities support what they teach in the classroom, regardless of instructional delivery mode. Department chairs did not perceive educational administration students to show a stronger interest in completing their graduate degree programs online than in participating in programs largely delivered face-to-face. On average, department chairs also indicated that the majority of students
attending classes offered by their department are motivated to seek graduate degrees in education for career advancement and increased pay.

Regarding the manner in which fully online or computer-mediated instruction compares to traditional face-to-face instruction, department chairs differed with regard to whether fully online and Web-facilitated instruction, even when delivered best, can equate to face-to-face instruction. They, however, agreed that effective teaching is possible through online education and that students could develop higher order critical thinking and analytical skills by participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education.

Department chairs, on average, disagreed learning outcomes of online education were greater than traditional face-to-face learning outcomes. They disagreed that online students receive better grades than learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face instructional environment. They disagreed that online courses are less academically rigorous than face-to-face courses and disagreed that online students receive equivalent grades to learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face environment, but learn at a lower level. They differed with regard to whether assessing student integrity online is comparable to assessing student integrity in a face-to-face instructional environment.

Regarding the “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets, department chairs, on average, agreed that using Web-facilitated instruction supports the instructional mission of their departments more than using fully online instruction. They differed with respect to whether fully online education should be a major component of their
departments' curricula. Department chairs differed with respect to whether fully online education would play a significant role in their respective departments' strategic plans over the next 3 years and longer term. Department chairs, on average, highly valued recognizing faculty members who participate in online education. They differed with regard to whether they were able to identify funding opportunities that would allow them to adequately financially reward faculty members who participate in online education. Department chairs agreed that they highly valued being able to provide faculty members who participate in online education with timely, useful technical support. They differed with regard to whether they were able to provide funding for timely, useful technical support for faculty members who participate in online education. Department chairs agreed that they highly valued being able to provide funding for faculty members to participate in online education training and development opportunities needed to acquire and improve their skills in using online instructional technologies. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they could identify funding for these training and development opportunities.

Regarding the extent and from whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations, department chairs differed with regard to whether potential students are increasingly demanding online educational opportunities from their departments. Department chairs, on average, did not feel pressure from their deans or vice presidents of academic affairs or provosts to use fully online or Web-facilitated education to improve their departments’ or colleges’ financial bottom lines. They also did not feel pressure from their deans to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs to accommodate increasing graduate education student
enrollments. They differed with regard to whether they feel pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. They agreed they did not feel pressure from current or potential employers of graduate education students or accrediting bodies to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.

Department chairs differed with regard to the pressure they feel from for-profit, online institutions that offer graduate degrees in education, to shift the instructional focus of the department away from face-to-face delivery toward online delivery. They agreed that their departments compete for the same students enrolled in graduate programs of education offered by for-profit online institutions. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they perceived traditional institutions offering educational administration degrees online to be “selling out” to consumer-driven interests. They indicated they believed that online education does not contribute to the de-skilling and de-professionalization of faculty members in their respective departments. They further believed that educational consumers (learners) should not dictate subject matter taught and course delivery mode. Finally, department chairs, on average, agreed with the statement, “Students choose to earn their graduate education degree from my department primarily because we maintain high academic standards and value academic integrity.”

Regarding the extent to which upper-level administrators consider their opinions, feedback, and perceptions when selecting, designing, implementing, and evaluating instructional and curricular innovations such as online instruction, department chairs, on average, perceived that their deans offered strong support for
their efforts to supplement face-to-face instruction with Web-based or computer-
mediated technologies. They also strongly believed their deans valued their opinions
pertaining to curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy.

Department chairs agreed their deans understand the importance of helping
them identify funding for online faculty training, development, and rewards. They
further agreed that their deans would support their departments’ decision to offer fully
online courses and degree programs. Department chairs also agreed that their deans
actively seek their input in implementing online degree programs or online courses
and believed that their deans effectively communicate their departments’ ideas
regarding curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy to senior-
level university administration members.

Regarding the prevalence of fully online, Web-facilitated, and traditional
courses offered by departments for the 2004-2005 academic term, 47% reported they
offered no fully online graduate courses; 27% offered between 1 and 4 fully online
graduate courses; 13.40% offered no Web-facilitated courses; 22.68% offered
between 1 and 4 Web-facilitated courses; 19.59% offered between 5 and 7 Web-
facilitated courses, 13.40% offered between 8 and 12 Web-facilitated courses;
26.67% offered between 15 and 20 traditional, face-to-face courses; 14.44% offered
between 25 and 30 traditional courses, and 10.00% offered between 32 and 40
traditional courses.

Regarding the prevalence of fully online and Web-facilitated degree programs
offered by departments for the 2004-2005 academic term, 68.27% reported they did
not offer fully online degree programs; 18.27% reported they did offer fully online
degree programs; 40.38% reported they did not offer Web-facilitated degree programs, and 40.38% reported they did offer Web-facilitated degree programs.

Based on participants' responses to open-ended questions regarding the types of courses most amenable to fully online delivery, it appears that most perceive heavily content-laden courses (e.g., school law, finance, educational leadership theory, introductory or survey courses, research and methods courses) and courses not dependent upon people-skills or the development of group dynamics to be most amenable to fully online delivery. Interestingly, 10.17% indicated none of their graduate-level educational administration courses was amenable to fully online delivery, while 5.93% indicated all was amenable to fully online delivery.

Based on participants' responses to open-ended questions regarding the types of courses most amenable to Web-facilitated delivery, 28.72% reported that they deemed all graduate-level courses amenable to Web-facilitated delivery. Respondents noted that Web-facilitated courses offer a "blended solution" that provides flexibility for both professors and students, facilitates access to research, information, and communication among students and faculty, is an effective multimodal approach that facilitates learning and information sharing (e.g. posting syllabi, course content, assignments), and provides students with pre-work opportunities prior to face-to-face learning time.

Based on participants' responses to the multiple-choice format question in which they were asked to select the percentage of their departments' total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term that were attributable to fully-online delivery, 44.2% reported that none of the total graduate student credit hours for
the Fall 2004 academic term was attributable to fully online delivery; 6.7% reported less than 1%; 10.6% reported between 1% and 3%; 11.5% reported between 4% and 10%; 9.6% reported between 11% and 20%, and 9.6% reported more than 20%.

Based on participants' responses to the multiple-choice format question in which they were asked to select the percentage of their departments' total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term that were attributable to Web-facilitated delivery, 17.3% reported that none of the total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term was attributable to Web-facilitated delivery; 7.7% reported less than 1%; 7.7% reported between 1% and 3%; 12.5% reported between 4% and 10%, 12.5% reported between 11% and 20%, and 33.7% reported more than 20%.

Based on participants' selection of the types of instructional technologies used by faculty members in their departments, the majority of participants reported that the most frequently used were the Internet/WWW delivery, e-mail interactions with remote students, and multi-person computer interactions (e.g., chat rooms, discussion boards, simulations).

On average, department chairs perceived their faculty members to have an instructional technology knowledge and skill level of $3.102$ ($SD=1.079$) (with “0” equivalent to “no knowledge/skill” and “5” equivalent to “high knowledge/skill”). The median and mode responses were 3. On average, department chairs perceived themselves to have an instructional technology knowledge and skill level of $3.14$ ($SD=1.172$). The median and mode responses were 3.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The rapid global emergence of a multi-billion dollar electronic (e)-learning industry has forced department chairs in the field of educational leadership and administration in higher education institutions across the United States to assess the value, quality, and legitimacy of online instruction. For many, the concept of online education significantly challenges deeply held pedagogical beliefs and educational values such as academic freedom, protection of intellectual property rights, academic integrity and quality. For others, the “fit” of online education with existing departmental and institutional mission statements, cultures, budgets, reward systems, policies and procedures, is unclear or uncertain. In an age where “technology has expanded our ability to create, transfer, and apply knowledge by factors of 100 to 1,000 every decade” (Duderstadt, 2001, p.2), critics have labeled members of the traditional Academy as being slow and unresponsive to technological change and unresponsive to the demands of an increasingly diverse and technologically savvy customer base. The department chair as “academic leader” (Hecht, et al., 1999) is being called upon to lead his or her faculty body toward a more customer-responsive pedagogy that is either supplemented or replaced by digital technologies (Bergquist, 1992; Rowley, et al., 1998; Duderstadt, 1999; Duderstadt, 2001). For many, this means proactively leading and managing instructional change processes and “taking the time and trouble to learn and understand more than
anyone else in the department, the department’s overall instructional mission and goals” (Anderson, 1997, p. 2).

Summary

Participants in this study were selected from institutions of higher education in the United States that offer terminal degrees (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.) in the field of educational leadership or administration. Two hundred nine participants received survey packets containing a consent letter, a survey, and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. The consent letter included a statement of purpose of the study, instructions for completing the online or mailed version of the survey, and instructions regarding participant removal from the study. Data collection took place over an 8-week period beginning November 8, 2004. A survey response rate of 40% was obtained after 4 weeks of data collection. Non-respondents were identified and additional survey packets were mailed on December 8, 2004. Data collection ended January 8, 2005 and a response rate of 51% was obtained. Quantitative data collected was analyzed using SPSS Version 12.0. Frequency distributions, mean, standard deviation, median, and mode calculations were obtained from SPSS Version 12.0. Qualitative data was analyzed by finding recurring themes to open-ended survey questions answered by survey respondents.

Analysis of Research Findings

The major findings of this study may be summarized as follows:

1. Department chairs do not perceive online education to be an instructional “fad.”

2. Department chairs characterized their departments’ cultures as being receptive to instructional technology rather than technology averse.
3. Department chairs did not believe their faculty members perceived online instruction to be a “fad.”

4. Department chairs differed with regard to whether their faculty members were ready and willing to embrace online education.

5. Department chairs believed that online instruction is appropriate for educating and training students in people-oriented, people-driven fields such as educational administration.

6. Department chairs differed with regard to whether fully online and Web-facilitated instruction, when delivered at their best, could equate to face-to-face instruction.

7. Department chairs agreed a quality education could best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment. Department chairs agreed that effective teaching is possible through online education and that students could develop higher order critical thinking and analytical skills by participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education.

8. Department chairs disagreed that online courses are less academically rigorous than face-to-face courses.

9. Department chairs disagreed that online students receive equivalent grades to learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face environment, but learn at a lower level.

10. Department chairs differed with regard to whether assessing student integrity online is comparable to assessing student integrity in a face-to-face instructional environment.
11. Department chairs agreed that the strength of online education is not in the medium, but in the way it is used and agreed that the benefits of using online instruction exceed the shortcomings.

12. Department chairs believed that fully online instruction would not improve the educational processes in their departments and that Web-facilitated instruction would improve the educational processes in their departments.

13. Department chairs differed with respect to whether teaching effectiveness standards used to evaluate faculty members teaching fully online or Web-facilitated courses be equivalent to those used to evaluate faculty members who teach face-to-face courses.

14. Department chairs disagreed that assessment standards used to assess student learning outcomes should be equivalent among fully online, Web-facilitated, and traditional, face-to-face courses.

15. Department chairs agreed that faculty members in their departments could effectively supplement face-to-face instruction using both basic and advanced Web-based instructional technologies.

16. Department chairs did not perceive educational administration students to show a stronger interest in completing their graduate degree programs online than in participating in programs largely delivered face-to-face.

17. Department chairs agreed that using Web-facilitated instruction supports the instructional mission of their departments more than using fully online instruction.

18. Department chairs indicated that fully online education should not be a major component of their departments’ curricula.
19. Department chairs differed with regard to whether fully online education would play a significant role in their respective departments’ strategic plans over the next 3 years and longer term.

20. Department chairs highly valued recognizing faculty members who participate in online education.

21. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they were able to identify funding opportunities that would allow them to adequately financially reward faculty members who participate in online education.

22. Department chairs agreed that they highly valued being able to provide faculty members who participate in online education with timely, useful technical support.

23. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they were able to provide funding for timely, useful technical support for faculty members who participate in online education.

24. Department chairs agreed that they highly valued being able to provide funding for faculty members to participate in online education training and development opportunities needed to acquire and improve their skills in using online instructional technologies.

25. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they were able to provide funding for these training and development opportunities.

26. Department chairs did not feel pressure from their deans or vice presidents of academic affairs or provosts to use fully online or Web-facilitated education to improve their departments’ or colleges’ financial bottom lines.
27. Department chairs did not feel pressure from their deans to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs to accommodate increasing graduate education student enrollments.

28. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they felt pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.

29. Department chairs did not feel pressure from current or potential employers of graduate education students, or accrediting bodies to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.

30. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they felt pressure from for-profit, online institutions that offer graduate degrees in education, to shift the instructional focus of their department away from face-to-face delivery toward online delivery.

31. Department chairs agreed that their departments compete for the same students enrolled in graduate programs of education offered by for-profit online institutions.

32. Department chairs differed with regard to whether they perceived traditional institutions offering educational administration degrees online to be "selling out" to consumer-driven interests.

33. Department chairs believed that online education does not contribute to the de-skilling and de-professionalization of faculty members in their department.

34. Department chairs believed that educational consumers (learners) should not dictate subject matter taught and course delivery mode.
35. Department chairs strongly believed their deans valued their opinions pertaining to curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy; understand the importance of helping them identify funding for online faculty training, development, and rewards; support their departments’ decision to offer fully online courses and degree programs; actively seek their input in implementing online degree programs or online courses, and effectively communicate their departments’ ideas regarding curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy to senior-level university administration members.

36. There appears to be a greater prevalence of Web-facilitated and traditional course offerings in departments of educational administration than fully online course offerings for the 2004-2005 academic year. Forty-seven percent of participants reported they offered no fully online graduate courses.

37. There appears to be a greater prevalence of Web-facilitated and traditional degree programs offered by departments of educational administration than fully online degree programs for the 2004-2005 academic year. Approximately 68.27% of participants reported they offered no fully online graduate degree programs. Approximately 40.38% reported they offered Web-facilitated degree programs.

38. Department chairs indicated that heavily content-laden courses, (e.g., school law, finance, educational leadership theory, introductory or survey courses, research and methods courses), and courses not dependent upon people-skills or the development of group dynamics to be most amenable to fully online delivery.
39. Department chairs reported that Web-facilitated courses offer a "blended solution" that provides flexibility for both professors and students, facilitates access to research, information, and communication among students and faculty, is an effective multimodal approach that facilitates learning and information sharing (e.g. posting syllabi, course content, assignments), and provides students with pre-work opportunities prior to face-to-face learning time.

40. Based on participants' responses to the multiple-choice format question in which they were asked to select the percentage of their departments' total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term that were attributable to fully-online delivery, 44.2% reported that none of the total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term was attributable to fully online delivery; 6.7% reported less than 1%; 10.6% reported between 1% and 3%; 11.5% reported between 4% and 10%; 9.6% reported between 11% and 20%, and 9.6% reported more than 20%.

41. Based on participants' responses to the multiple-choice format question in which they were asked to select the percentage of their departments' total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term that were attributable to Web-facilitated delivery, 17.3% reported that none of the total graduate student credit hours for the Fall 2004 academic term was attributable to Web-facilitated delivery; 7.7% reported less than 1%; 7.7% reported between 1% and 3%; 12.5% reported between 4% and 10%; 12.5% reported between 11% and 20%, and 33.7% reported more than 20%.

42. Department chairs indicated that faculty members in their departments most frequently used the following instructional technologies: Internet/WWW delivery, e-
mail interactions with remote students, and multi-person computer interactions (e.g., chat rooms, discussion boards, simulations).

43. On average, department chairs rated both themselves and their faculty members as having a moderate knowledge of and skill level using instructional technology.

Discussion of the major findings and how they compare to the related literature in Chapter II appears in the next section. Findings that are both new and previously discussed in the literature review will be presented.

Discussion of Research Findings

Prevalence and Scope of Online Education

According to Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, and Schreck (2000), the proportion of a department’s full credit-hour usage attributable to distance learning is an effective measurement of the scope of distance learning. In like manner, this proportion was used to determine the scope of online instruction at institutions surveyed for this study. Schmidt, et al. reported that fewer than 5% of the reporting departments they surveyed indicated that 10% or more of the department’s total credit hours were generated by distance learning. They further reported that distance learning technologies were employed more frequently in undergraduate political science courses than in graduate or training courses. They concluded that the number of institutions that were uninvolved in distance education was very high among respondents. They also concluded that the scope of and interest in using online instruction in political science departments across the United States is small and low overall (Schmidt, et al.). In contrast, 19.2% of educational administration department chairs in this study indicated
that 10% or more of the department's total credit hours were generated by fully online instruction. And, 46.2% indicated that 10% or more of the department's total credit hours were generated by Web-facilitated instruction.

Allen and Seaman (2002) reported for the Fall 2002 academic term, 81% of all higher education institutions offered at least one fully online or blended course in Fall 2002 and 34% offered fully online degree programs. The results of this study indicated that 17.92% reported that they did offer fully online degree programs. 68.86% offered none. 40.57% reported they offered Web-facilitated degree programs. 38.68% reported they did not. The results of this study indicated that 26.47% of respondents offered between 1 and 4 fully online graduate-level courses for the 2004-2005 academic year and 47.06% offered none. The results of this study also indicated that 22.22% offered between 1 and 4 Web-facilitated graduate-level courses for the 2004-2005 academic year and 14.14 offered none. The results indicated that 25.27% reported that they offered between 15 and 20 traditional graduate-level courses for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Types of Instructional Technologies Used by Faculty Members in Departments of Educational Administration

Based on participants' selection of the types of instructional technologies used by faculty members in their departments, the majority of participants reported that the most frequently used were the Internet/WWW delivery, e-mail interactions with remote students, and multi-person computer interactions (e.g., chat rooms, discussion boards, simulations). Similarly, Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, and Schreck (2000), reported that political science department chairs who used distance learning technologies
reported the most frequently used technologies to be the Internet/WWW delivery, e-mail interactions with remote students, and multi-person computer interactions. Approximately 95% strongly agreed or agreed that basic Web-based technologies, (e.g. chat rooms, discussion boards, posting of online course content, grades, and assignments, and e-mail), could be used by their faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction. Approximately 87% strongly agreed or agreed that advanced Web-based technologies, (e.g. streaming video/audio lectures, field experience simulations, and IP conferencing), could be used by their faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction.

**Department Chair Perceptions of Instructional Technology Knowledge and Skill Level**

On average, educational administration department chairs surveyed in this study reported their faculty members as well as themselves to be moderately knowledgeable of and skilled in using instructional technology. These findings are consistent with those reported by Groves, Zemel, & Paula (2000). They reported faculty member self-ratings of good to expert in the use of the Internet/WWW, computer-aided instruction software, e-mail, and productivity software (e.g., spreadsheets, word processors). These findings are also consistent with those reported by Vodanovich and Piotrowski (2001). They conducted a follow-up study in 2001 and reported the level of faculty usage of the Internet as an educational tool to be higher than in 1999 (the date of their original study) and reported faculty members indicated a more positive attitude toward using computer technologies in instruction (Vodanovich & Piotrowski).
In contrast, Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, and Schreck (2000), reported that 75% of political science department chairs reported that the average faculty member had little or very little knowledge of distance learning on a 5-point Likert scale. They reported only 20% were moderately knowledgeable. The findings of this study also contrast with the findings of researchers who conducted earlier studies, who noted that, at the time of their research, many faculty members, by their own admission, felt that they lack the technical expertise and skills needed to deliver online instruction or use computer-assisted technologies (Daugherty and Funke, 1998; Betts, 1998; Vodanovich and Piotrowski, 1999; Schifter, 2000; O'Quinn and Corry, 2002). These findings further contrast with the findings of Jones, Lindner, Murphy, & Dooley (2002) who reported an overall neutral faculty attitude of competence with regard to using distance education technologies.

Perception of Online Education as an Instructional “Fad”

Approximately 94% of educational administration department chairs surveyed in this study strongly disagreed or disagreed with the assertion that online education is merely an instructional “fad.” In addition, approximately 84% reported that faculty members in their respective departments did not view online education as an instructional “fad.” In comparison, Schmidt, et al. (2000) found that 44.3% of political science department chairs surveyed strongly or moderately disagreed with the assertion that online education was an instructional “fad.”
Perception that Online Education Contributes to the De-skilling and De-professionalization of the Professoriate

Approximately 81% indicated they believed that online education does not contribute to the de-skilling and de-professionalization of faculty members in their department. This finding contrasts with the conclusions made by Novek (1996), Colley (2003), Feenberg (1999), and Noble (2001). For example, Novek reported that faculty fear that online instruction contributes to the devaluation of traditional face-to-face instruction (Novek). In addition, Colley noted that many faculty members fear being replaced by “virtual free-lancers not bound by geographic constraints” (p. 5). He further noted that such fears support many faculty members’ contention that as “distance education programs and courses proliferate, pressure on administrators to loosen hiring restrictions may likely increase” (p. 13). Feenberg and Noble have noted that faculty members fear that this loosening of hiring restrictions will result in a de-skilling or de-professionalization of the academy (Feenberg, 1999; Noble, 2001) in which instruction is delivered largely by part-timers or adjuncts that lack the proper academic degrees and credentials. Colley, Feenberg, and Noble have also noted that many faculty members have perceived administrators’ interest in online education to be motivated by their desire to achieve budget savings and stretch institutional human resources in instruction (Colley, Feenberg, Noble).
Belief that **Online Instruction is Appropriate for Educating and Training Students in People-oriented, People-driven Fields such as Educational Administration**

Approximately 72% of educational administration department chairs surveyed in this study believed that online instruction is appropriate for educating and training students in people-oriented, people-driven fields such as educational administration. In sharp contrast, Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, and Schreck (2000) found that nearly 75% of political science department chairs surveyed agreed that online education was generally not an appropriate way of teaching political science.

The findings of this study appear to be consistent with those presented by University of Illinois faculty seminar participants who contributed to the 1999 report, “Teaching at an Internet distance.” They reported that online course delivery may not be appropriate in all higher educational contexts. However, they stated, “Online delivery appears to be appropriate for professional training, continuing education, and undergraduate and graduate education of traditional and non-traditional students” (p. 2).

Though silent with respect to the appropriateness of online education for graduate course and degree program delivery, Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002) reported that 83% of nursing faculty surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that online courses are an effective approach to undergraduate education. Interestingly, they noted that even those instructors who were not sure online instruction was a good fit with their own personal teaching style still felt Web-based instruction was a legitimate method of delivering college coursework.
Belief that Web-facilitated Instruction Would Improve the Educational Processes in Their Departments More so than Fully Online Instruction

Approximately 55.1% of educational administration department chairs in this study indicated they believed that fully online instruction would not improve the educational processes in their departments. However, approximately 79% either strongly agreed or agreed that Web-facilitated instruction would improve the educational processes in their departments. The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of Schmidt, et al. (2000) who found that approximately 40% of political science department chair respondents felt that distance learning would diminish the quality of the educational process. They found that those who strongly felt distance learning would diminish the educational process outnumbered those who strongly felt it would enhance it by a 2-to-1 margin.

Perception of Faculty Readiness and Willingness to Embrace Online Education

Approximately 57% of educational administration department chair respondents in this study indicated their faculty members were ready to embrace online education and nearly 74% indicated their faculty members were willing to embrace online education. The findings of this study contrast with those reported by Allen and Seaman (2002). They reported that faculty at some institutions are seen as lagging behind relative to the student and institutional views of the value and legitimacy of online learning. They further reported that while 59.6% of academic leaders agreed that their faculty members accepted the value and legitimacy of online education, over 40% were neutral or disagreed with this assertion.
It further appears that these chairs have confidence that their faculty members can effectively use both basic and advanced Web-based technologies to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction. For example, approximately 95% perceived their faculty could use basic Web-based technologies (e.g. chat rooms, discussion boards, posting of online course content, grades, and assignments, e-mail) to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction and nearly 87% perceived their faculty could use advanced Web-based technologies (e.g. streaming video/audio lectures, field experience simulations, and IP conferencing) to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction.

Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002), who conducted a survey of 171 instructors of online, undergraduate nursing courses to evaluate perceptions of Web-based teaching experiences by nursing college faculty reported that faculty members indicated a slightly more enthusiastic support for online education. They reported that 47% preferred teaching online; 27% preferred teaching in a traditional face-to-face classroom, and 26% preferred to teach using a combination of online and face-to-face instruction. They further reported that 75% perceived online instruction to be a good fit with their personal teaching style.

Betts (1998), Lord and Bishop (2001), and Daugherty and Funke (1998) reported that the majority of faculty survey respondents held favorable views of using computer-mediated technology to supplement instruction. Vodanovich and Piotrowski conducted a follow-up study in 2001 and reported the level of faculty usage of the Internet as an educational tool to be higher than in 1999 and reported faculty members indicated a more positive attitude toward using computer technologies in instruction.
Characterization of Departmental Culture Regarding Technology

Rahman (2001) suggested that the department chair has the best shot at converting and recruiting “teaching professors who are technology averse but who are shy to, but interested, in exploring the unknown” (p. 6). He noted that generally, the department chair need only offer these faculty members encouragement, training, technology support, and rewards and recognition to bring them on board as online instructors (Rahman). Approximately 91% of educational administration department chair respondents in this study did not characterize their departmental culture as technology averse. This finding contrasts with that of Allen and Seaman (2001), who concluded that academic leaders perceived the majority of faculty members at their institutions to lag behind students and administrators in their willingness and readiness to embrace instructional innovation.

Perception of Student Interest in Completing Graduate Degree Programs Online

Approximately 72% of educational administration department chair respondents in this study strongly disagreed or disagreed that students show a stronger interest in completing their graduate degree programs online than in participating in programs largely delivered face-to-face. This finding contrasts with the findings by Allen and Seaman (2002) in the Sloan Consortium Report. They reported that when given an opportunity to enroll in courses or degree programs online, students will do so. They further reported that over 1.6 million students took at least one online course during Fall 2002; over one-third of these students (578,000) took all of their courses online; and among all U. S. higher education students in Fall 2002, 11 percent took at least one
online course. They projected that the number of students taking at least one online course would increase by 19.8 percent over the one-year period from Fall 2002 to Fall 2003, to include a total of 1.9 million students. This study, however, did not break the projected increases in online student enrollment down by discipline.

The finding of this study is also consistent with Young's (2004) summary of a preliminary report conducted by Educause researchers. He reported that Educause researchers provided strong evidence that the majority of students believe technology has little impact on teaching. These researchers reported that students indicated that technology was very effective in making education more convenient for them, but believed faculty members should limit their use of technology in the classroom.

Perception of Congruence of Online Education with Departmental Instructional Mission

Approximately 89% of educational administration department chair respondents in this study strongly agreed or agreed that Web-facilitated instruction supports the instructional mission of their respective departments more than fully online instruction. This finding is consistent with findings reported by several researchers.

For example, McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh (2000) reported that 25.8% of faculty members surveyed preferred to deliver instruction using a combination of online and face-to-face methods. They reported that 96.7% stated that face-to-face meetings effectively supplement online instruction by promoting social interaction, allowing students to make course project presentations face-to-face, take exams, and submit homework, and allowing instructors to more effectively assess student progress and answer student questions.
Vodanovich and Piotrowski (1999) reported that the majority of industrial organization psychology faculty surveyed reported that using computer technologies such as e-mail, the Internet, and other basic software could effectively supplement instruction. Researchers with the Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001) conducted a survey of 734 full-time, regular faculty teaching in the University of Tennessee statewide system of higher education in 2001, reported that approximately 90% of faculty surveyed expressed an interest in using technology to enhance teaching.

Similarly, Betts (1998), Lord and Bishop (2001), and Daugherty and Funke (1998) reported that the majority of faculty survey respondents held favorable views of using computer-mediated technology to supplement instruction, believed that Web-based technologies had the potential to be effective teaching and learning tools, and reported that they would continue to use these applications into their coursework.

Further, Carnevale (2002) reported that faculty members at Eastern University, an evangelical institution, reported that 96.7% stated that face-to-face meetings effectively supplement online instruction by promoting social interaction, allowing students to make course project presentations face-to-face, take exams, and submit homework, and allowing instructors to more effectively assess student progress and answer student questions. Finally, Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002), who conducted a survey of 171 instructors of online, undergraduate nursing courses to evaluate perceptions of Web-based teaching experiences by nursing college faculty reported that while 47% preferred
teaching online and 27% preferred teaching face-to-face, 26% preferred to teach using a combination of online and face-to-face instruction.

**Perception of Where Online Education Fits Into the Departmental Strategic and Curricular Plans**

Educational administration department chair respondents in this study appeared to perceive the role fully online education would play in their 3-year (short-term) and long-term departmental strategic plans differently. For example, while approximately 52% strongly agreed or agreed that fully online education will play a significant role in their respective departmental short-term strategic plans, nearly 48% strongly disagreed or disagreed with this assertion. And while, approximately 54% strongly agreed or agreed that fully online education will play a significant role in their respective departmental long-term strategic plans, nearly 46% strongly disagreed or disagreed with this assertion. Though the Sloan Consortium Report did not distinguish between fully online and Web-facilitated instruction, Allen and Seaman (2002) reported that 85.7% of public institutions, 52.9% of private non-profit institutions, and 54.6% of private for-profit institutions indicated that online learning is a critical long-term strategy for their respective institutions. They further reported that those institutions offering associates and doctoral degree programs expressed the strongest belief in online learning as a long-term strategy.

The findings of this study contrast with the findings presented by Schmidt, et al. (2000), who found that the majority of political science department chairs surveyed agreed that distance education was not currently and would not likely be a major
component of their curricula in the future. They reported that approximately 68% reported that their faculty members lacked a definite interest in using distance learning techniques in the near future (Schmidt, et al., 2000). They also reported that only 22% were either strongly or moderately inclined to agree that distance learning was a growing interest in their respective departments (Schmidt, et al., 2000).

Approximately 71% believed that fully online education should not be a major component of their respective departments' curricula and nearly 69% indicated they believed that fully online instruction would not improve the educational processes in their respective departments. The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of Schmidt, et al. (2000) who reported that three-quarters of political science department chairs surveyed strongly disagreed that distance learning was a major component of their curricula.

The findings of this study are also consistent with the findings of researchers who surveyed faculty members regarding the fit of online education or distance learning with departmental missions. For example, Giannoni and Tesone (2003) observed that many skeptical faculty members have expressed concern that online education denigrates pedagogical aspects of the institutional mission (p. 5). Further, Schmidt et al. (2001) stated that many faculty members perceive online education to be "a poor stepchild within the broader departmental curriculum" (p. 13) and perceive online course offerings as "watered-down versions of on-campus offerings" (p. 13). Seminar participants in the University of Illinois study (1999) also noted that many faculty members believe that
administrators are motivated to increase the number of online courses because of poor instructor performance in large face-to-face classrooms” (p. 3).

Approximately 79% strongly agreed or agreed that Web-facilitated instruction would improve the educational processes in their respective departments. The findings of this study contrast with those of Schmidt et al. (2000), who reported that approximately 40% of political science department chairs surveyed indicated they felt that engaging in distance education process would diminish their respective departments’ educational processes.

Perceptions of the Equivalency of Online Instruction with Face-to-Face Instruction

Approximately 87% of educational administration department chair respondents in this study strongly agreed or agreed that effective teaching is possible through online education. Approximately 61% strongly disagreed or disagreed and approximately 39% strongly agreed or agreed with the assertion that even when delivered at best, fully online and Web-facilitated instruction cannot equate to face-to-face instruction. These findings contrast with the findings of Schmidt, et al. (2000) who reported that only about 21% of political science department chairs surveyed strongly agreed and approximately 33% moderately agreed that distance learning could be as good or better than conventional (traditional, face-to-face) teaching. These findings of this study also contrast with their finding that nearly 46% indicated that distance learning was incapable of ever being as good as conventional teaching, even when delivered at its best.

Though convinced that online education could equate with traditional instruction, when delivered at its best, approximately 60% of educational administration department
chairs in this study strongly agreed and agreed that a quality education could best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment. These findings are consistent with the findings reported by Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002) who noted that while all nursing faculty survey participants agreed that any course could be taught online, most agreed that skills development was still best facilitated by hands-on activities in a face-to-face classroom setting.

Approximately 76% strongly disagreed or disagreed that online courses are less academically rigorous than traditional face-to-face courses. This finding contrasts with Ridley and Husband's (1998) assertion that for those (faculty members) who define educational quality in terms of academic rigor and integrity, online education fails to make the grade (Ridley & Husband).

Approximately 91% strongly disagreed or disagreed with the assertion that online students receive better grades than those receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face instructional environment. Ridley and Husband (1998) noted what is at stake for many faculty members who teach online is a suspicion that online students can receive better grades for equivalent learning or equivalent grades for learning at a lower level in online classes. The findings of this study indicated that educational administration faculty (approximately 66%) strongly disagreed or disagreed with the assertion that online students receive equivalent grades to face-to-face learners but learn at a lower level.

It appears that educational administration department chairs differ with regard to the comparability of assessing student integrity online versus face-to-face. Approximately 56% strongly disagreed or disagreed that assessing student integrity
online is comparable to assessing student integrity face-to-face, while approximately 42% strongly agreed or agreed with this assertion. Ridley and Husband (1998) noted that often times, faculty members’ suspicions of student academic dishonesty are unfounded. In their 1998 study, they disproved their research hypothesis that academic cheating is more prevalent in online courses than in traditional face-to-face courses. They tentatively concluded, “Concerns raised by some academics regarding academic rigor and integrity in online education, though legitimate, were exaggerated, if not unfounded” (p. 4).

Similarly, Luke noted, “Faculty fears over student dishonesty and indolence on the Web are real but unfounded given the fact that students in face-to-face classes often find clever means to evade professors' personal sovereignty in systems of corporal instruction” (p. 6).

In addition, approximately 76% of educational administration department chairs in this study strongly agreed or agreed that students can develop higher-order critical thinking and analytical skills by participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education. Further, approximately 90% strongly disagreed or disagreed with the assertion that learning outcomes of online education are greater than traditional face-to-face learning outcomes. These findings are consistent with the findings of Allen and Seaman (2002). They reported that 57% of academic leaders surveyed believed learning outcomes equal to or superior to face-to-face learning outcomes; nearly 1/3 of the same academic leaders expected online learning outcomes would be superior to face-to-face outcomes within 3 years, and nearly 3/4 of the same leaders expected online learning to be equal to or better than face-to-face outcomes within 3 years (Allen & Seaman).
These findings are also consistent with those reported by Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002), who stated that 67% of nursing faculty surveyed believed levels of intellectual engagement online to be comparable to traditional face-to-face courses. The findings in this study refute the assertion by Ridley and Husband (1998) who noted that many faculty members believe that online education promotes a poor work ethic.

Perceptions of Deans' Support of Department Chairs' Online Instructional Efforts

It appears that educational administration department chairs surveyed in this study strongly agree that they have the full support of their respective deans for their instructional efforts. The findings of this study strongly contrast with the findings of Noble (1999), Feenberg (1999), and Colley (2003) who appear to pit budget-slashing, student-credit-hour-raising administrators against faculty members who are fearful of being relegated to a role in which they use online education as a tool to mass produce graduates and package education into saleable, transferable commodities.

Approximately 95% of the educational administration department chairs in this study strongly agreed and agreed that their deans value their opinions with regard to curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy. Approximately 94% strongly agreed and agreed that their deans fully support their efforts to supplement face-to-face instruction with Web-based or computer-mediated technologies. Approximately 72% strongly agreed or agreed that their deans would support their departments' decision to offer fully online courses and degree programs. Approximately 81% strongly agreed or agreed that their deans understand the importance of helping them identify funding for online faculty training, development, and rewards. Approximately 69% strongly agreed
or agreed that their deans actively seek their input in implementing online degree programs and/or online courses. And, approximately 78% strongly agreed or agreed that their deans effectively communicate their departments’ ideas regarding curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy to members of the senior-level university administration.

Perceptions of Department Chair’s Ability to Fund and Support Online Education

Many researchers have reported that faculty members are not motivated to learn or use online instructional technologies because their institutions have failed to provide them with adequate technical training, support, or rewards and recognition (Daugherty and Funke, 1998; Matthew, Parker, and Wilkinson, 1998; Betts, 1998; Vodanovich and Piotrowski, 1999, Schifter, 2000; Rahman, 2001; Carnevale, 2002; O’Quinn and Corry, 2002). Carnevale (2002) has further reported that many faculty members have observed that administrators at their institutions have not made paying for elaborate online education programs a top strategic priority.

The findings of this study appear consistent with the literature in that department chairs highly value providing faculty with the needed resources to teach fully online and Web-facilitated courses/program, but are often unable to identify adequate funding to support these efforts. For example, approximately 82% of educational administration department chairs in this study strongly agreed and agreed that recognizing faculty members who participate in online education in their respective departments was important to them. However, approximately 62% strongly disagreed or disagreed that
they were able to identify funding opportunities that would allow them to adequately financially reward faculty members who participate in online education.

In addition, approximately 92% strongly agreed or agreed that they highly valued being able to provide faculty members who participate in online education with timely, useful technical support. However, department chairs appeared to differ with regard to their perceptions of their abilities to provide funding for these efforts. For example, approximately 54% strongly disagreed or disagreed that they were able to provide funding for timely, useful technical support for faculty members who participate in online education and approximately 46% strongly agreed or agreed that they were, in fact, able to provide funding for timely, useful technical support for faculty members who participate in online education.

Approximately 93% of educational administration department chairs surveyed in this study strongly agreed or agreed that they highly valued being able to provide funding for faculty members to participate in online education training and development opportunities needed to acquire and improve their skills in using online instructional technologies. However, department chairs appeared to differ with regard to their perceptions of their abilities to provide funding for these efforts. For example, approximately 51% strongly disagreed or disagreed that they were able to provide funding for these training and development opportunities and approximately 50% strongly agreed or agreed that they were, in fact, able to provide funding for these training and development opportunities.
Perceptions of Standards of Teaching Effectiveness and Student Learning

Outcomes of Online Education

Department chairs appeared to differ with regard to whether the same teaching effectiveness standards be applied to faculty members who teach fully online, Web-facilitated, and traditional face-to-face courses. For example, while 44% strongly agreed or agreed that teaching effectiveness standards be differentiated based on instructional mode, approximately 42% strongly disagreed or disagreed with this assertion. Interestingly, nearly 74% strongly agreed or agreed that student learning outcomes standards not be differentiated based on instructional mode.

Perceptions Concerning Pressures to Adopt Online Education

Many researchers have criticized members of the traditional academy for failing to adopt instructional innovations, lagging behind students and administrators in their interest in technological instructional innovations, and failing to adapt to an increasingly technology-driven educational culture (Anderson, 1997; Rowley, Lujan, & Dolence, 1998; Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999). They have observed that stakeholders such as employers of future graduates, students, parents, and others are increasingly putting pressure on faculty members and administrators to conform to a more technologically savvy, consumer-driven global culture (Duderstadt, 2001). However, the findings of this study appear to indicate that while educational administration department chairs recognize increasing student demand for online educational opportunities, they, on average, do not feel pressure to offer fully online or
Web-facilitated instruction because of pressure placed upon them by deans, vice presidents of academic affairs/provosts, employers, and accrediting bodies.

According to the findings of this study, it appears that educational administration department chairs differ with regard to the perceived pressure placed upon them by potential students to offer more online educational opportunities. While approximately 58% strongly agreed or agreed that potential students are increasingly demanding online educational opportunities from their departments, approximately 54% indicated they felt no pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. Interesting, approximately 41% strongly agreed or agreed that they did, in fact, feel pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.

In addition, approximately 86% indicated that they believed that educational consumers (learners) should not dictate subject matter taught and course delivery mode. This finding is consistent with the findings of Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998). They reported that faculty members whom they interviewed and surveyed had consistently stated, “Learners do not necessarily know what they really need to learn and, if (faculty members) simply give learners what they want, quality and rigor will suffer” (p. 22). They further stated, “Letting the educational customer (learner) dictate the subject matter will corrupt the very foundation of what has made the academy great” (p. 23).

Approximately 93% strongly agreed or agreed that students choose to earn their graduate education degree from their respective departments primarily because they maintain high academic standards and value academic integrity.
Additionally, approximately 71% indicated they did not feel pressure from their deans and approximately 69% indicated they did not feel pressure from their vice presidents of academic affairs or provosts to use fully online or Web-facilitated education to improve their departments’ or colleges’ financial bottom lines. These findings contrast with the conclusions made by Noble (1999) who stated many university administrators, “rather than trying to distinguish themselves from their commercial (education) rivals, are eagerly joining forces with them and lending their brand names to profit-making enterprise in exchange for a piece of the action” (p. 9). This finding also contrasts with the conclusions made by Noble (2001). He stated, “Faculty members represent the last line of defense against the wholesale commercialization of academia, of which the commodification of instruction is just the latest manifestation” (p. 32). He defined an educational commoditization as “the deliberate transformation (by administrators) of the educational process into commodity form for the purpose of commercial transaction” (p. 1).

Educational administration department chairs surveyed in this study appeared to differ with regard to the pressure felt from for-profit, online institutions to offer graduate degrees in education online. While approximately 57% indicated they felt no pressure from for-profit, online institutions that offer graduate degrees in education, to shift the instructional focus of their respective departments away from face-to-face delivery toward online delivery, approximately 43% indicated that they did, in fact, feel pressure. In fact, approximately 70% strongly agreed or agreed that their respective departments
compete for the same students enrolled in graduate programs of education offered by for-profit online institutions.

Approximately 63% indicated that they did not perceive traditional institutions that offered educational administration degrees online to be “selling out” to consumer-driven interests. The findings of this study contrast with those of Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998). They reported that faculty members believe online education to be a capitulation to a consumer- or market-driven, rather than provider-driven system of higher education.

Approximately 71% indicated they did not feel pressure from their deans to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs to accommodate increasing graduate education student enrollments. Approximately 82% indicated they felt no pressure from current or potential employers of graduate education students. This finding contrasts with the contention by Noble (1999, 2001) that there appears to be increasing pressure on institutions to quickly and conveniently “produce” trained skilled graduates for immediate “consumption” by today’s employers (Noble).

Finally, approximately 92% indicated they felt no pressure from accrediting bodies to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.

Perceptions of Courses Most Amenable to Fully Online Delivery

Based on participants’ responses to open-ended questions regarding the types of courses most amenable to fully online delivery, it appears that most perceive heavily content-laden courses (e.g., school law, finance, educational leadership theory, introductory or survey courses, research and methods courses) and courses not dependent
upon people-skills or the development of group dynamics to be most amenable to fully online delivery. These findings appear to be consistent with the findings reported by Christianson, Tiene, & Luft (2002), who reported that 82% of nursing faculty surveyed indicated that online instruction was best suited for teaching informatics and nursing research (80%). They also reported that while all nursing faculty survey participants agreed that any course could be taught online, most agreed that skills development was still best facilitated by hands-on activities in a face-to-face classroom setting.

Of further interest is the finding that 10.17% of educational administration department chairs surveyed in this study indicated none of their graduate-level educational administration courses was amenable to fully online delivery. Only 5.93% indicated all educational administration courses offered by their respective departments were amenable to fully online delivery.

**Perceptions of Courses Most Amenable to Web-facilitated Delivery**

Based on educational administration department chairs' responses to open-ended questions regarding the types of courses most amenable to Web-facilitated delivery, 28.72% reported that they deemed all graduate-level courses amenable to Web-facilitated delivery. Respondents reported that Web-facilitated courses offer a "blended solution" that provides flexibility for both professors and students, facilitates access to research, information, and communication among students and faculty, is an effective multi-modal approach that facilitates learning and information sharing (e.g. posting syllabi, course content, assignments), and provides students with pre-work opportunities prior to face-to-face learning time. These findings are consistent with the findings of researchers such as
Daugherty and Funke (1998), Vodanovich and Piotrowski (1999, 2001), researchers with the Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001), Lord and Bishop (2001), and Schmidt, et al. (2000), who found that faculty members are using a variety of instructional technologies to effectively supplement, but not completely replace traditional, face-to-face instruction.

**Conclusions**

The intent of this study was to assess department chair perceptions of online education in the field of educational leadership and administration in institutions of higher education across the United States.

The researcher concludes that a disconnect exists between perceived and actual prevalence of online education in departments of educational administration. While department chairs indicate they perceive online education as legitimate and appropriate for educating and training students in people-oriented, people-driven fields such as educational administration, approximately 47% reported that they offered no fully online courses and approximately 56% reported that they offered fewer than 7 Web-facilitated courses per academic term. In addition, approximately 68% reported that they offered no fully online degree programs and 40% reported that they offered no Web-facilitated programs and degree programs in their departments.

The researcher concludes that department chairs are failing to address fully online and Web-facilitated educational issues and considerations as they plan their departments’ short- and long-term instructional strategies. This conclusion is supported by evidence
provided by survey respondents who hold differing perceptions regarding whether fully online education will play a significant role in their short- and long-term strategic planning processes.

The researcher concludes that department chairs who lead departmental faculty in making curriculum content, implementation, and delivery decisions do not appear to possess sufficient knowledge of and skill using basic and advanced instructional technologies. This conclusion is supported by survey respondents’ self-rating of instructional technology knowledge and skill as average.

The researcher concludes that there is a disconnect between perceived level of faculty knowledge of and skill using basic and advanced instructional technologies and the prevalence of fully online and Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. As reported above, the actual prevalence of fully online and Web-facilitated courses and degree programs is not consistent with survey respondents’ reported enthusiasm for and support of online education. Survey respondents rate their faculty members’ knowledge of and skill using basic and advanced instructional technologies as merely average, a fact that supports their reported low actual prevalence of fully online and Web-facilitated courses and degree programs.

The researcher concludes that department chairs in the field of educational administration, though enthusiastic about the appropriateness and effectiveness of online education, express disagreement and uncertainty with respect to critical issues, indicating that they have not taken the time to systematically assess and weigh the benefits and disadvantages of online education for students. For example, survey respondents agree
that online education is an appropriate way of educating and training students in educational administration. They also agree that online education is an effective method of educational delivery. They further agree that students can develop higher order critical thinking and analytical skills by participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education and agree that online education is as academically rigorous as face-to-face education. Yet, they disagree that learning outcomes of online education are greater than traditional face-to-face learning outcomes. They also disagree or are uncertain with regard to whether online students receive better grades than learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face instructional environment. They further disagree or are uncertain with regard to whether online students receive equivalent grades to learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face environment, but learn at a lower level. They also differ with regard to whether assessing student integrity online is comparable to assessing student integrity in a face-to-face instructional environment.

Given the relatively low prevalence of fully online and Web-facilitated courses and degree programs reported by survey respondents, the researcher concludes that the rate of instructional innovation and adoption is low in the field of educational administration.

The researcher concludes that faculty reward and incentive systems, training and development opportunities, and technological and staff support of online graduate education in the field of educational administration are, at best, under-funded and not adequately supported by department chairs and members of upper administration. This conclusion is supported by findings in which survey respondents indicate that while they
seek to fully support the development of reward and incentive systems, training and development opportunities, and related support activities, they differ with respect to the extent to which they are able to do so.

The researcher concludes that today's department chair in educational administration maintains a stronger philosophical alliance with deans and members of upper administration than with faculty members and students. Survey respondents provide strong evidence of being strongly supported by and allied with their deans.

Implications

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that the apparent disconnect between perceptions of online education and actual implementation may be due to generational differences among department chairs. Given the current national trend of an aging and continuing workforce, it can readily be assumed that today's body of department chairs is comprised primarily of older members who are remaining in their positions and not retiring. It can also be assumed that as some of these older chairs retire or return to faculty status, younger chairs become their replacements. Older chairs, having grown up in an era of passive communications media (Duderstadt, 2001), may not be as technologically savvy as the younger members. While they may recognize the value and legitimacy of online education in theory, they may be less likely to make the implementation of online education a reality. In addition, it could be assumed that older department chairs may have had less personal exposure to online education. For example, they may not have enrolled in, taught, or developed online courses. Thus they may feel less "buy in" to the online educational process and perhaps be less likely to lead
their departments in keeping pace with instructional innovation. Further more, it could be assumed that older department chairs hold philosophies of education that are more deeply rooted in face-to-face traditional instruction and pedagogy than younger chairs, with broader technology exposure, who may tend to be more experimental and open to instructional and pedagogical change. Those who espouse a more traditional philosophy of education may feel that stakeholders, fellow academic leaders, and others have not been convinced of a need for change. That is they are not convinced that traditional face-to-face instruction no longer works, is no longer best for them, their students, and faculty members, or that online education is a preferable substitute.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that department chairs who do not take the time to systematically assess and weigh the benefits and disadvantages of online education for students, will lose the trust and confidence of both faculty members and students and severely diminish their role as faculty and student advocate, and endanger their departments’ role in preserving academic rigor and integrity.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that the apparent disconnect between the availability of funding for faculty rewards, training and development, and support of online educational efforts and the extent to which these chairs value providing such support, may be due to the fact that institutions are placing the majority of their financial and human resources in support of undergraduate courses and degree programs. Institutions, like Georgia Southern University, where teaching, rather than research, is the primary focus, financial and human resources are allocated first to undergraduate courses and programs. Often, graduate programs are awarded program enhancement dollars,
which must be spent immediately before the fiscal year-end, and are not sufficient in amount or in scope to provide the type of support needed for graduate online or Web-facilitated educational efforts.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that the timing of the identification of course and program funding needs, funding approval, and funding availability is often at odds with the "just-in-time" nature of online educational service provision. The hierarchical nature of institutional financial and curricular decision-making makes it nearly impossible for department chairs to approach online education proactively.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that the strong deans' support reported by respondents in this study, indicates that today's department chair in the field of educational administration is no longer an advocate of the faculty or faculty liaison to upper administration who serves at the pleasure of the faculty. The role of today's chair has evolved more into a role as department head or manager, appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the dean. Today's head appears to implement, oversee, and evaluate top-down policies and directives, serve at the pleasure of the dean, and maintain a symbolic, weak connection to the faculty body. As such, many department heads may well be completely out of touch with faculty members' perceptions of the value, quality, legitimacy, and amenability of online education to the field of educational administration. This disconnect was illuminated in the current study, when survey respondents, who overall, indicated support for the value, quality, and legitimacy of online education, reported differing perceptions of faculty members' readiness and willingness to embrace
online education. This disconnect was further illuminated as these survey respondents agreed that their graduate students were not, in fact, pressuring them to offer online courses and degree programs in educational administration and agreed that students should not dictate course content or delivery mode.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that many of today's department chairs are motivated to adopt online education for reasons other than those that may benefit faculty members and students. This is evident by survey respondents who indicated that they perceived traditional institutions offering educational administration degrees online to be "selling out" to consumer-driven interests. It could be that those who appear to be "selling out", though not technologically savvy, are in fact, market or business savvy (as are their deans and upper administration members). They could well understand the value of using today's vocabulary of "it" catch words or phrases (e.g., fully online courses and degree programs, online instruction, anytime, anywhere instruction, etc.) to attract students, extend the geographic reach of their programs, garner national and/or global recognition and prestige, and subsequently increase enrollment revenues and operational efficiency. The aforementioned values have indeed formed the basis for a business-oriented approach that many of today's department heads employ to manage financial, human, curricular, and instructional resources in today's institutions of higher education. Survey respondents differed with regard to whether it is more difficult to succeed at online education than it is to fail. Perhaps those who perceive that it is more difficult to succeed than fail are experiencing what it is like to be caught with one foot in the door of the traditional academy and one
foot in the door of today’s business-minded academy. There appears to be little that is being done to incorporate the best of both worlds and to preserve the well-worn, time-tested tenets of the traditional academy.

Given the disconnect between survey respondents’ perceptions of online education and actual prevalence of online courses and degree programs, the researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that department chairs may be feeling more pressure to adopt fully online and Web-facilitated education than indicated by their survey responses. For example, on the one hand, they indicate they do not feel pressure from graduate students to offer online courses and degree programs. Yet, on the other hand, they readily admit they compete for the same students as for-profit institutions that offer graduate education courses and degree programs. In addition, many also admit they feel pressure to shift their departmental instructional focus away from traditional face-to-face delivery toward online delivery.

If the majority of survey respondents agree that a quality education can best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment, why then, do they believe Web-facilitated instruction will improve the educational processes in their respective departments? It appears that while many survey respondents believe that they compete for the same students as for-profit online institutions and admit that they feel pressure to shift the instructional focus away from traditional instruction, the majority do not believe fully online education should be a major component of their departmental curricula and believe that fully online instruction will not improve the educational processes in their departments.
The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that department chairs and faculty members in departments of educational administration currently operate at a fairly rudimentary level of instructional technology and that the rate of technological diffusion within departments is very slow. It does not appear that the use of advanced instructional technologies has achieved the critical mass (Rogers, 1995) necessary to serve as a catalyst for widespread instructional change, in spite of many department chairs' enthusiastic protestations to the contrary.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that the evolution of the department chair role away from the traditional faculty advocacy/liaison role toward a more top-down, management role of department head will serve to drive a deeper wedge between the age old battle of "us" (the faculty body) versus "them" (middle- and upper-level administrators) in institutions of higher education. It is reasonable to assume that the interest and well being of students with whom we will be entrusting the future of our children will be pushed further and further on the back burner.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that the interests of graduate education in the field of educational administration will desperately need and require a strong infusion of financial and human resource support in order to maintain the continued viability of its courses, programs, and enrollment bases.

The researcher believes that it is reasonable to infer that technological change in instruction in the field of educational administration can only be diffused at a faster rate if both department chairs, faculty members, and students are convinced that fully online
and/or Web-facilitated instruction provides a better, richer, more comprehensive means of delivery instruction than traditional face-to-face instruction.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based on the findings, conclusions, and implications of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Conduct additional research to describe the demographic characteristics of department chairs in the field of educational administration, in particular their age, number of years experience as department chairs/heads, number of years in educational administration profession, gender, number of online courses in which they have enrolled as a student, and the number of online courses they have designed and/or taught.

2. Conduct a qualitative study of department chairs in the field of educational administration to describe their roles as department chairs or heads, their personal and departmental philosophies of education and pedagogy, their perceptions of online education, pressures to adopt online technologies, motivating and inhibiting factors or barriers to online education adoption, perceptions of market forces, and other relevant issues and concerns.

3. Conduct a study to determine what it would take to convince skeptical or philosophically opposed department chairs and faculty members in the field of educational administration to replace traditional face-to-face instruction with fully online instruction.
4. Consider the effect of other variables (e.g., institution type—public vs. private; for-profit vs. non-profit; research, regional, four-year, two-year; size of departmental budget; chair leadership style) on the degree of technological diffusion in instruction for departments of educational administration.

5. Conduct a qualitative comparative study of departmental short- and long-term technology implementation plans by institution.

6. Conduct a qualitative study to describe how educational administration faculty members perceive the role of their department chair—as chair (advocate/liaison) or as head (top-down, manager).

7. Conduct a study to describe the educational and instructional services and technologies preferred by current students enrolled in educational administration programs at non-profit institutions of higher education in the United States.

8. Find out whether online education and training is preferable or deemed acceptable or unacceptable by employers of educational administration students.

9. Investigate the extent to which national, regional, and local accrediting bodies of educational administration programs in the United States are modifying their evaluation criteria to include online education and training.

10. Conduct a comparative study of educational administration department chairs' and faculty members' philosophies of education and pedagogy.

11. Investigate the environment in which educational administration department chairs and faculty members work and determine if these environments or cultures promote or deter instructional technology adoption.
12. Investigate whether institutional financial approval and funding cycles can be changed to enable department chairs to be more responsive to just-in-time, market-driven instructional/educational environment and faculty members' instructional needs.

13. Investigate whether faculty evaluation assessments, rewards, and promotion and tenure policies and procedures have been modified, if at all, to keep pace with the changing nature of instructional content design and delivery.

14. Investigate whether department chairs in the field of educational administration have conducted departmental studies to assess faculty members' and students' interest in and readiness to participate in fully online and Web-facilitated instruction.

15. Investigate the extent to which educational administration department chairs and faculty members engage in cooperative dialogue to determine the type of role, if any, that fully online and/or Web-facilitated instruction should play in their departments' short- and long-term strategic plans.

16. Investigate the extent to which educational administration department chairs and faculty members engage in cooperative dialogue to determine which courses and/or degree programs are most amenable to fully online or Web-facilitated instructional delivery.

17. Investigate the extent to which instructional services and delivery methods mirror faculty members' and department chairs' educational and pedagogical philosophies.
18. Investigate the extent to which students’ learning outcomes, issues of online academic rigor and integrity, and issues of student/faculty member privacy and intellectual property rights are being addressed with regard to online educational delivery.

This study attempted to describe the perceptions of department chairs in the field of educational administration in the United States of online education. The analysis of data revealed several disconnects between what department chairs perceive the value, quality, legitimacy, and funding of fully online and Web-facilitated education to be and actual practice and prevalence within their respective departments. It appears that many educational administration department chairs are currently struggling to achieve a balance between tradition and technology-enhanced modernity as each relates to the design and delivery of instruction and instructional services. In order to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of educational administration stakeholders (e.g., department chairs, faculty members, members of institutions’ upper administration, students, employers, accrediting bodies, and others), the decision of whether to adopt instructional technological innovation will require cooperative dialogue and effort, a shared vision, a thoughtful analysis and consideration of the benefits and disadvantages of traditional, fully online, and Web-facilitated instruction, a re-envisioning of academic policies, procedures, funding structures, and missions, and efforts to include and value the feedback of all stakeholders in the decision-making processes. As these stakeholders engage in the dialogues and efforts needed to move the missions and goals of departments of educational administration forward, it is the hope of this researcher that all will carefully consider the rich history and traditions of educating educational leaders
as they determine the role technology will play in enriching their lives and educational experiences. For as Marcus Tullius Cicero stated, "To be ignorant of what happened before you were born is to be ever a child. For what is man's lifetime unless the memory of past events is woven with those of earlier times?"— Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC).
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APPENDIX A:

Data Analysis Matrix
## Data Analysis Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>Questions 1 through 14 regarding prevalence and scope of online education</td>
<td>Daugherty &amp; Funke, 1998; Schmidt, Shelley, Van Wart, Clayton, &amp; Schreck (2000); Allen &amp; Seaman (2002)</td>
<td>1 (Prevalence and scope of online education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 1, regarding perception of online education as a fad</td>
<td>Feenberg, 1999; Noble, 1999; Noble, 2001; Wallentine &amp; King, 2002; Young, 2004</td>
<td>2 (Value, quality, legitimacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 2, regarding strength of online education</td>
<td>Rahman, 2001</td>
<td>2 (Value, legitimacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 3, regarding belief that online education cannibalizes existing resources</td>
<td>Feenberg, 1999; Maloney, 1999; Noble, 1999, 2001; Rahman, 2001</td>
<td>2 (Value, legitimacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 4, regarding the appropriateness of online education</td>
<td>University of Illinois faculty seminar, 1999</td>
<td>2 (Value, legitimacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 5, regarding the benefits of using online instruction</td>
<td>Daugherty &amp; Funke, 1998; Duderstadt, 1999, 2001; Feenberg, 1999; Maloney, 1999; Noble, 1999, 2001; Rahman, 2001; Wallentine &amp; King 2002; Young, 2004</td>
<td>2 (Value, legitimacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 6, regarding ease of “doing online education badly”</td>
<td>Young, 2004</td>
<td>3 (Comparison of online with face-to-face instruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 7, regarding ease of faculty members’ belief that online instruction is a fad</td>
<td>Feenberg, 1999; Noble, 1999; Noble, 2001; Wallentine &amp; King, 2002; Young, 2004</td>
<td>5 (Fit of online education with faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 8, regarding student interest in online education</td>
<td>Daugherty &amp; Funke, 1998; University of Illinois faculty study, 1999; Allen &amp; Seaman 2002</td>
<td>5 (Fit of online education with students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Questions 9 &amp; 10, regarding faculty readiness, willingness to participate in online education</td>
<td>Luke, 1998; Feenberg, 1999; Maloney, 1999; Noble, 1999, 2001; Duderstadt, 1999, 2001; Senge (2000); Rahman, 2001; Christianson, Tiene, &amp; Luft, 2002.</td>
<td>5 (Fit of online education with faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Question 11 regarding technology-averse or supportive culture</td>
<td>Rahman, 2001</td>
<td>5 (Fit of online education with departmental culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item(s)</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12, regarding reasons students seek graduate education at traditional universities</td>
<td>Noble, 1999, 2001; University of Illinois faculty study 1999</td>
<td>5 (Fit of online education with students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 13 through 23, regarding fit of online education with departmental and university mission</td>
<td>University of Illinois faculty study, 1999; Rahman, 2001; Schmidt et al., 2001; Wallentine &amp; King, 2001; Giannoni &amp; Tesone, 2003</td>
<td>5 (Fit of online education with departmental and university mission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 24 and 25, regarding online education evaluation</td>
<td>University of Illinois faculty study, 1999; Schmidt, et al., 2000; Rahman, 2001; Wallentine &amp; King, 2001</td>
<td>2 (Evaluation of online education) 3 (Comparison of online with face-to-face instruction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 26 through 31, regarding chair’s perception of how dean views his or her contributions to online education</td>
<td>Wallentine &amp; King, 2001</td>
<td>7 (Administrators’ support for the department chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 32 through 38, regarding chair’s identification and allocation of resources to support faculty members and online education</td>
<td>Black, 1992; University of Illinois faculty report, 1999; Rahman, 2001; Wallentine &amp; King, 2001</td>
<td>5 (Institutional mission, budgets, structures, policies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 39 through 52, regarding quality, pedagogical and philosophical agreement with online education</td>
<td>Daugherty &amp; Funke, 1998; Ridley &amp; Husband, 1998; Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence, 1998; Vodanovich &amp; Piotrowski 1999, 2000; McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, &amp; Waugh, 2000; Schmidt, et al., 2000; Dillon, 2001; Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001); Allen &amp; Seaman, 2002; Carnevale, 2002; Christianson, Tiene, &amp; Luft, 2002</td>
<td>2 (Quality) 4 (Pedagogy, philosophy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Analysis Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Questions 56 through 68, regarding pressure to adopt online education</td>
<td>Bergquist, 1992; Anderson, 1997; Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence, 1998; Duderstadt, 1999, 2001; Feenberg, 1999; Hecht, Higgenson, Gmelch, &amp; Tucker, 1999; Katz, 1999; Noble, 1999, 2000; Weigel, 2000; Wallentine &amp; King, 2001</td>
<td>6 (Pressure to adopt online education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>Questions 1 through 3, regarding extent of use of specific technologies in the chair’s department</td>
<td>Daugherty &amp; Funke, 1999; Vodanovich &amp; Piotrowski 1999, 2000; Schmidt et al., 2000; Office of Information Technology and Research Division of Educational Technology, Innovative Technology Center, Knoxville Campus (2001); Rahman, 2001; Allen &amp; Seaman, 2002</td>
<td>1 (Prevalence of line educational technologies in chair’s department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Questions 1 and 2, regarding number of faculty in department and size of student body at institution</td>
<td>Schmidt et al., 2000</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

Survey Instrument
Department Chairs' Perceptions of Online Education in the Field of Educational Administration

This survey is a doctoral research study for a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Administration, Averitt College of Graduate Studies, in the College of Education at Georgia Southern University. It is structured to furnish information concerning department chairs’ perceptions of online education in the field of Educational Administration. It is important for you to know that your participation is essential to the validity of this study. Your thoughtful consideration to each question is greatly appreciated. Your responses will be kept confidential, and you will not be identified individually in any way in the final report. After completing the survey, please return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. Thank you for your participation.

Survey
For the purposes of this study, specific definitions of fully online, Web-facilitated, and traditional courses/degree programs are defined below. The general term “online education,” for the purpose of this survey, will refer to all forms of online education.

Definitions:
1. **Fully online course** - For the purpose of this study, a fully online course is one in which the content is delivered online with typically no face-to-face meetings.
2. **Web-facilitated course** - For the purpose of this study, a Web-facilitated course is typically conducted face-to-face uses Web-based technologies like WebCT or Blackboard to supplement face-to-face instruction, post syllabi, course content, assignments, student grades, or deliver online tests.
3. **Traditional course** - For the purpose of this study, a traditional course is one in which no online technology is used and content is delivered live, in person, and face-to-face.

Section I: Perceptions of the prevalence, value, and legitimacy of online instruction

Directions: Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA = Strongly Agree</th>
<th>A = Agree</th>
<th>D = Disagree</th>
<th>SD = Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>U = Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Online education is largely an instructional “fad.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The strength of online education is not in the medium, but in the way it is used.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Online instruction cannibalizes existing courses, student enrollments, and faculty resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Online instruction is not appropriate for educating and training students in people-oriented, people-driven fields such as educational administration.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Over Please) Numeric Code
The benefits of using online instruction exceed the shortcomings.

1 2 3 4 0

It is easy to do online education badly.

1 2 3 4 0

Section II: Perceptions of faculty member and student readiness and interest in participating in online education.

Directions: Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

1. Faculty members in my department generally believe online education to be an instructional "fad."
   
   SA A D SD U
   1 2 3 4 0

2. Students in my department show a stronger interest in completing their graduate degree programs online than in participating in programs largely delivered face-to-face.
   
   SA A D SD U
   1 2 3 4 0

3. Faculty members in my department are not ready to embrace online education.
   
   SA A D SD U
   1 2 3 4 0

4. Faculty members in my department are not willing to embrace online education.
   
   SA A D SD U
   1 2 3 4 0

5. I believe my department’s culture can best be described as technology averse.
   
   SA A D SD U
   1 2 3 4 0

6. The majority of students attending classes offered by my department are motivated to seek graduate degrees in education for career advancement and increased pay.
   
   SA A D SD U
   1 2 3 4 0

Section III: Perception of congruence of online education with department’s instructional mission

Directions: Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

1. Using Web-facilitated instruction supports the instructional mission of my department more than using fully online instruction.
   
   SA A D SD U
   1 2 3 4 0

2. I believe that fully online education will play a significant role in my department’s strategic plan over the next 3 years.
   (Over Please)
   
   Numeric Code
3. Fully online education should be a major component of my department's curricula.

4. I believe that fully online education will play a significant role in my department's strategic plan over the next 3 years.

5. I believe that fully online education will play a significant role in my department's long-term strategic plan.

Section IV: Perception equivalency of online instruction with face-to-face instruction. Directions: Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective teaching is possible through online education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can develop higher order critical thinking and analytical skills by participating in fully online and Web-facilitated education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe learning outcomes of online education to be greater than traditional face-to-face learning outcomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online students receive better grades than learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face instructional environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online courses are less academically rigorous than face-to-face courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online students receive equivalent grades to learners receiving the same instruction in a face-to-face environment, but learn at a lower level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing student integrity online is comparable to assessing student integrity in a face-to-face instructional environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully online, blended, and Web-facilitated instruction cannot equate to face-to-face instruction, even when delivered at its best.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that faculty members' scholarly activities support what they teach in the classroom, regardless of instructional delivery mode.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Over Please) Numeric Code
Section V: Perception quality of online instruction with face-to-face instruction.

Directions: Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA = Strongly Agree = 1</th>
<th>A = Agree = 2</th>
<th>D = Disagree = 3</th>
<th>SD = Strongly Disagree = 4</th>
<th>U = Unsure = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A quality education can best be delivered in a face-to-face instructional environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is more difficult to succeed at online education than it is to fail.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fully online instruction will improve the educational processes in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Web-facilitated instruction will improve the educational processes in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teaching effectiveness standards used to evaluate faculty members who teach fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from the standards used to evaluate faculty members who teach face-to-face courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standards used to evaluate student learning outcomes in fully online or Web-facilitated courses should be different from those used to evaluate student learning outcomes in face-to-face courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Basic Web-based technologies (e.g. chat rooms, discussion boards, posting of online course content, grades, and assignments, and e-mail) can be used by faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advanced Web-based technologies (e.g. streaming video/audio lectures, field experience simulations, and IP conferencing) can be used by faculty members to effectively supplement face-to-face instruction in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section VI: Perception of dean’s support of department chair

**Directions:** Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA = Strongly Agree</th>
<th>A = Agree</th>
<th>D = Disagree</th>
<th>SD = Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>U = Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My dean values my opinions pertaining to curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dean fully supports my efforts to supplement face-to-face instruction with Web-based or computer-mediated technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dean understands the importance of helping me identify funding for online faculty training, development, and rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dean would support my department’s decision to offer fully online courses and degree programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dean actively seeks my input in implementing online degree programs or online courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dean effectively communicates my department’s ideas regarding curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and pedagogy to senior-level university administration members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section VII: Perception of department chair’s ability to fund and support fully online or Web-facilitated instruction.

**Directions:** Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA = Strongly Agree</th>
<th>A = Agree</th>
<th>D = Disagree</th>
<th>SD = Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>U = Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to adequately financially reward faculty members in my department who participate in online education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to adequately financially reward faculty members in my department who participate in online education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing faculty members in my department who participate in online education is important to me (Over Please)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Providing faculty members in my department who participate in online education with timely, useful technical support is important to me

I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to fund the needed technical support for faculty members in my department who participate in fully online or Web-facilitated education

I am able to identify funding opportunities that allow me to fund training and development opportunities to develop my faculty members' technical skills using online or Web-based instructional technologies

Providing faculty members in my department who participate in online education with training and development opportunities they need to acquire and improve their skills in using online instructional technologies is important to me

Section VIII: Pressures to adopt fully online or Web-facilitated instruction.

Directions: Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential students increasingly are demanding online education from my department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pressure from my dean to improve the financial bottom line of my department or college by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pressure from the vice president of academic affairs or provost at my university to improve the financial bottom line of my department or college by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pressure from my dean to accommodate increasing graduate education student enrollments by offering fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pressure from graduate education students to offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IX: Perceptions of market forces and competition in higher education.

Directions: Please circle the response that best describes your agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty with respect to each statement below.

SA = Strongly Agree = 1  A = Agree = 2  D = Disagree = 3  SD = Strongly Disagree = 4  U = Unsure = 0

1. My department competes for the same students enrolled in graduate programs of education offered by for-profit online institutions.

2. I perceive traditional institutions offering educational administration degrees online to be "selling out" to consumer-driven interests.

3. Online education contributes to the de-skilling and de-professionalization of faculty members in my department.

4. Educational consumers (learners) should dictate subject matter taught and course delivery mode.

5. Students choose to earn their graduate education degree from my department primarily because we maintain high academic standards and value academic integrity.

Section X

Directions: Please answer the following questions regarding the prevalence of online education in your department for the 2004-2005 academic year.
Questions:
1. How many fully online graduate-level courses does your department offer?

2. Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to fully online delivery? Why?

3. How many Web-facilitated graduate-level courses does your department offer?

4. Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to Web-facilitated course delivery? Why?

5. How many traditional courses does your department offer?

6. Which graduate-level course topic areas are most amenable to traditional course delivery? Why?

7. Do you offer a fully online degree program(s)? If so, what?

8. Do you offer a Web-facilitated degree program(s)? If so, what?

9. What percentage of your department’s total graduate student credit hours for the fall 2004 academic term is attributable to fully online delivery?
   a. None
   b. Less than 1%
   c. 1-3%
   d. 4-10%
   e. 11-20%
   f. Above 20%

10. What percentage of your department’s total graduate student credit hours for the fall 2004 academic term is attributable to Web-facilitated delivery?
    a. None
    b. Less than 1%
    c. 1-3%
    d. 4-10%
    e. 11-20%
    f. Above 20%

(Over Please)
Section XI: Technologies used/Knowledge and skill level of faculty members and department chairs

1. Please place a check mark by each of the instructional technologies employed by faculty members in your department.
   - Internet/World Wide Web delivery
   - E-mail interactions with remote students
   - Multi-person computer interactions (e.g., chat rooms, simulations, etc.)
   - Fiber optic full motion video and two-way audio
   - By physically having instructor at off-campus venue
   - Correspondence by mail
   - Telephone conference
   - Public television course delivery
   - Satellite up/downlink
   - Satellite downlink only
   - Other (Please specify):

2. Please circle the response that best describes your faculty members' overall knowledge and skill level using computer and Internet technologies to supplement or replace traditional face-to-face instruction (0=No knowledge; 5=High knowledge):

   0 1 2 3 4 5
   No knowledge ➔ High Knowledge

3. Please circle the response that best describes your overall knowledge and skill level using computer and Internet technologies to supplement or replace traditional face-to-face instruction (0=No knowledge; 5=High knowledge):

   0 1 2 3 4 5
   No knowledge ➔ High Knowledge

(Over Please) Numeric Code
Part XII: Demographics
Directions: Please check the appropriate response.

1. Student body size at your university

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Number of faculty in your department.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
Please return your completed survey to Edna Lynn Levernier, College of Education, Georgia Southern University, P.O. Box 8131, Statesboro, GA 30460-8131.
APPENDIX C:

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter
To: Mrs. Edna L. Levernier  
106 Lakeland Drive  
Statesboro, GA 30404

cc: Dr. Michael Richardson, Faculty Advisor  
P. O. Box 8131

From: Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs  
Administrative Support Office for Research Oversight Committees  
(IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: October 28, 2004

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

After a review of your proposed research project numbered: H05041, and titled "An Analysis of Perceptions of On-line Instruction by Department Chairs in the Field of Higher Educational Administration in the United States", it appears that (1) the research subjects are at minimal risk, (2) appropriate safeguards are planned, and (3) the research activities involve only procedures which are allowable.

Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that the Institutional Review Board has approved your proposed research.

This IRB approval is in effect for one year from the date of this letter. If at the end of that time, there have been no changes to the research protocol, you may request an extension of the approval period for an additional year. In the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, whether or not it is believed to be related to the study, within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator prior to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, you are required to complete a Research Study Termination form to notify the IRB Coordinator, so your file may be closed.

Sincerely,

Julie B. Cole  
Director of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
APPENDIX D:

Letter Requesting Participation in Study
November 29, 2004

Dear Colleague:

My name is Edna Lynn Levernier. I am a doctoral candidate for the degree of Educational Administration at Georgia Southern University. I request your voluntary participation in a study of educational administration department chair perceptions of online education. You are one of 209 department chairs/heads/directors/program coordinators in the field of Educational Administration selected for participation in this study and completion of the enclosed paper or online survey. Participating institutions were selected from the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration directory. Each institution selected is located in the United States and offers either a Ph.D. or Ed.D degree program in the field of Educational Administration.

Through this study, I hope to assess how department chairs in the field of education administration characterize the prevalence of online education in their departments, colleges, and universities, how they perceive the legitimacy, value, quality, and evaluation, of online instruction, and how they compare face-to-face instruction with fully online or Web-facilitated instruction. I also seek to assess the extent to which department chairs perceive a “fit” between online instruction and their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets, and whether and from whom they feel pressure to develop and/or offer fully online or Web-facilitated courses and degree programs. Your participation is essential to the validity of this study. Your thoughtful consideration to each survey question is greatly appreciated.

There is no penalty should you elect not to participate in this study or later withdraw for this study. If you elect not to participate, please e-mail me at levernier@enia.net. Your name and linked numerical code, found at the bottom of each page of the enclosed survey, will be removed from the participant list and you will no longer receive correspondence regarding this study. This numerical code is used only to identify those who have and those who have not responded and is not used to identify survey item responses. However, if you elect to complete the survey, you may do so by completing the enclosed survey or by completing the survey online at http://www.southeasterntech.edu/elisten/surveys/Perceptions_of_Online_Education/Perceptions_of_online_education.html. Self-addressed stamped envelopes are enclosed. Online submissions will be forwarded via E-mail to levernier@enia.net. All data will be kept in a secure location. Only my dissertation chair and I will have access. The list linking numerical codes to individual participants will be destroyed immediately after data collection is completed.

Completion and return of the survey either by mail or online constitutes permission to use your responses in this study. Results will be summarized and depicted in tabular form within the dissertation. Should you have any questions regarding the study or if you would like to obtain the study results, please feel free to contact me at levernier@enia.net or (912) 764-8287. Alternatively, you may contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Michael D. Richardson, at mdrich@georgiasouthern.edu or (912) 486-7267. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Coordinator of Georgia Southern University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Office of Research Services at (912) 681-5465.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I realize that your time is valuable and limited.

Sincerely,

Edna Lynn Levernier, Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX E:

E-mails Granting Permission to Adapt Surveys
Good morning Dr. Steffen,

My name is Edna Levernier. I am a doctoral student at Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA in the field of educational leadership and administration (for higher education).

Would you grant permission for me to use (or purchase) the survey instrument you and your colleagues developed for your article, "The Challenges to Distance Education in an Academic Social Science Discipline: The Use of Political Science?" I will be defending my dissertation Prospectus in a couple of weeks and am currently working on my survey instrument.

The questions you posed to survey participants are the same questions that I feel that I need to pose to department chairs of educational leadership programs in the United States regarding their perceptions of online education. I also hope to assess and report how they perceive the value of online instruction, how they define their philosophy of instruction and pedagogy, and how they characterize their faculty members' philosophy of instruction and pedagogy. I hope to describe whether or not they perceive online instruction to be a "fit" with their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets and to describe whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations.

I would appreciate your attention and response.

Sincerely,

Edna Lynn Levernier
Doctoral Student

[Note: Dissertation chair is:]

ted for bill and edna levernier <levernier@enia.net>
I'm also delighted that you are interested in following up on these questions. Please go ahead, and feel to share results with us.

Thanks very much for your request.

1:05 PM 9/14/2004, Steffen W Schmidt wrote:
Edna: I've copied my lead co-author but I would be delighted if you replicate all or some of the questions used. It would make for a great longitudinal perspective on this issue!

Good morning Dr. Steffen,
My name is Edna Levernier. I am a doctoral student at Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA in the field of educational leadership and administration (for higher education).

Would you grant permission for me to use (or purchase) the survey instrument you and your colleagues used for your article, "The Challenges to Distance Education in an Academic Social Science Displine: the Case of Political Science?" I will be defending my dissertation Prospectus in a couple of weeks and am currently working on my survey instrument.

The questions you posed to survey participants are the same questions that I feel that I need to pose to department chairs of educational leadership programs in the United States regarding their perceptions of online education. I also hope to assess and report how they perceive the value of online instruction, how they define their philosophy of instruction and pedagogy, and how they characterize their faculty members' philosophy of instruction and pedagogy. I hope to describe whether or not they perceive online instruction to be a "fit" their departmental and institutional missions, cultures, structures, and budgets and to describe from whom they feel pressure to adopt online instructional innovations.
would appreciate your attention and response.

Sincerely,

Lynn Levernier
Doctoral Student

My dissertation chair is:

Michael D. Richardson
rich@georgiasouthern.edu

Levernier

Amos Schmidt, Ph.D.
University Professor of Political Science
Ross Hall
Iowa State University
 Ames, Iowa 50011
p 294 3825
e@iastate.edu

//www.public.iastate.edu/~sws/ professional home page
//129.186.46.105/ Coastal Areas Radio Network
//www.public.iastate.edu/~sws/ISUCoastalcourse.htm Coastal policy Class

C. Shelley, II
Iowa State University
Professor, Research Institute for Studies in Education, College of Education
Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, E005A Lagomarcino Hall, Ames, IA 50011-
p 515-294-9282/fax 515-294-9284
Professor of Statistics, 323 Snedecor Hall, Ames, IA 50011-1210/p 515-294-8346/fax 515-294-4040
Professor of Political Science
cley@iastate.edu Website: http://www.public.iastate.edu/~mshelley

for bill and edna levernier <levernier@enia.net>