
The Effect of Online Teaching on Faculty After Returning to the Traditional Classroom

D'Nita A. Andrews-Graham

Norfolk State University

dagraham@nsu.edu

Abstract

This phenomenological research was designed to learn and understand the transitioning experience of higher education faculty moving from online instruction to traditional face-to-face instruction. One of the most significant phenomenon occurring in higher education today is distance education. Technology and distance education are on the rise in community colleges, 4-year institutions, Ivy League colleges, research institutions, and technical colleges. Data were collected through face-to-face interviews and field notes. Three themes were identified: (a) faculty roles and teaching practices, (b) faculty communication strategies, and (c) faculty changes in instruction. This study analyzed the participants' attitudes, perspectives and practices, roles, communication strategies, and best practices that online teaching contribute to face-to-face instruction. This study supports transformative learning theory because participants critically reflected on their assumptions and beliefs, and implemented strategies that improved new approaches of defining their teaching and learning. It was determined from faculty members' response that their face-to-face teaching had benefited in some way from teaching online.

Introduction

There is plethora of literature about teaching face-to-face and at a distance in higher education. However, little research has examined how instructors who go from the classroom online tend to learn new approaches—techniques and philosophies—that they bring back to the classroom (in one way or another). Teaching online changes instructors' perceptions and their teaching practices when they return to the traditional classroom (Stone & Perumean-Chaney, 2011). Most higher education institutions provide some form of distance education. According to Allen and Seaman (2016), the number of students taking all of their courses online in 2014 were in excess of 2.8 million students. The percentage of college students taking at least one online course is at an all-time high of 33.5% (Allen & Seaman, 2015).

Faculty members at institutions of higher education who started their careers in the traditional face-to-face classroom tend to change their pedagogical approaches for use in online teaching (Baran, Correia, & Thompson, 2011; Duffy & Kirkley, 2004; McDonald, 2002). As they gain experience in the online environment, they often turn the approach around, changing methods that benefit the online environment to improve and enhance their face-to-face teaching (Scagnoli, Buki, & Johnson, 2009; Stone & Perumean-Chaney, 2011). Conceição (2006) stated that “experience is a valid source of knowledge and that one way to understand how faculty members experience online teaching is by studying situations using faculty members' reconstructed experiences and elaborating on the meanings they assign to those experience” (p. 27).

Few studies have examined the experiences of how teaching online changes higher education faculty perceptions and teaching practices when faculty return to the traditional face-to-face classroom. The gap in the literature includes lack of information about higher education faculty members'

experiences, attitudes and perceptions, and how teaching online has affected their role and teaching strategy when returning to the face-to-face classroom. Therefore, it is important to consider and understand how college faculty who teach online perceive and describe their teaching practices and roles when they return to the traditional face-to-face classroom.

Literature Review

In higher education institutions in the United States enrollment in online courses continues to exceed growth in face-to-face courses (Allen & Seaman, 2013, 2014, 2015). Online higher education, faculty are reviewing their perceptions towards the new culture of learning and teaching. This leads to challenges in teacher beliefs, judgments, interpretations, assumptions, and expectations (Coppola, Hiltz, & Rotter, 2002; Lee & Tsai, 2010). Kreber and Kanuka (2006) noted online teaching is different from face-to-face teaching; however, faculty who do not receive professional development have a habit of carrying face-to-face educational practices to the online environments. Teachers tend to transfer face-to-face approaches learned from their professors while in college to develop their expertise in the traditional classroom (Kreber & Kanuka, 2006).

According to Lokken and Mullins (2014), distance education administrators were asked to rank their greatest faculty challenges in the 2013 Instructional Technology Council (ITC) survey and it was discovered engaging in online pedagogy was a top concern for faculty. A major challenge is the “trial-and-error” of the new technology features and functions (Moore & Kearsley, 2012).

Sheridan (2006) and Van de Vord and Pogue (2012) suggest faculty are concerned that online instruction is more time-consuming than traditional face-to-face instruction. According to Van de Vord and Pogue (2012), online courses include more time in and out of the classroom for the instructor. Sheridan (2006) noted faculty members who teach online courses spend more time in preparing and administering online courses than traditional faculty members do. Higher education faculty indicate continuous individual email communication is another challenging factor (Sword, 2012). Lloyd, Byrne, and McCoy (2012) reported one of the most highly ranked concerns of faculty was time commitment.

Lack of comfort and/or proficiency with technology tools may have more to do with a lack of time and less to do with opposition (Thormann & Zimmerman, 2012). Building online learning community, facilitating discussion, netiquette, group work, peer monitoring, and the leadership role are crucial to effective communication and learning (Thormann & Zimmerman, 2012).

Conceptual Framework

To understand faculty’s attitudes and perceptions about education and instruction when they return to the face-to-face classroom Mezirow (1991) transformation learning theory was used. The transformative learning theory is based on the principle that personal experience is an important part of the learning process and the adult learner’s interpretation of the experience creates meaning which leads to change in the behavior, belief and assumptions, values, associations, feelings, and mindset. This leads to challenges in teacher beliefs, judgments, interpretations, assumptions, and expectations (Lee & Tsai, 2010).

Transformative learning allows us to understand faculty as learners as they transform the meaning of structures related to teaching online through an “ongoing process of critical reflection, discourse, and acting on one’s beliefs” (Taylor, 1998, p. 19). Kabachi et al. (2010) described transformative learning as “a process in which adults change their views and habits—which they have gained as a result of their experience” (p. 266).

Method

The phenomenological approach for this study was selected to understand the common and/or shared experiences (Creswell, 2013). The goal of this research was to explore the experiences of higher education faculty members who transition from the online classroom to the face-to-face classroom. The central research question of this study was: How does teaching at a distance affect the attitudes, perspectives, and practices of higher education faculty when they return to face-to-face teaching? Additionally, three sub-questions guided this study:

1. How are instructors' perceptions of their role and their teaching practices altered when they return to instruction in a face-to-face classroom?
2. What communication strategies do instructors transfer from online to face-to-face teaching?
3. What changes in face-to-face instruction can be attributed to the experience of online teaching?

Sampling

The participants for the study were selected using purposeful sampling of volunteers with face-to-face and online teaching experience, across different disciplines. Participants were full-time and adjunct faculty members who are engaged in the development and teaching of online courses at a 4-year Historically Black University in Virginia. The 2017 Fact Book shows a headcount of 5,305; 83% of its students are Black, 5.1% are white, and 11.9% are classified as other (includes international and unknown). Sixty-four per cent of the students are female, and 36% are male. The university offers 178 online courses. Participants were selected from the 112 faculty members who were certified to teach online courses. The university offers seven undergraduate online degree programs and five graduate online degree programs. The award of the Quality Standards Certification from the United States Distance Learning Association is a solid accomplishment for the university distance education programs, its faculty, staff, and students.

Data Collection

A semi-structured interview protocol (Appendix A) was utilized to uncover the underlying themes related to this phenomenological study (Merriam, 2009). A subject-matter expert in the field of distance education was asked to review the protocols to verify content validity. Two non-participating faculty members were asked to pilot test the questions for feedback and validity prior to use.

The interview consisted of open-ended questions with prompts to elicit responses from all participants. A digital recorder was used to collect data and field notes were taken. It was also important to maintain a balance between descriptive notes and reflective notes, such as hunches, impressions, and feelings (Groenewald, 2004). The memos (or field notes) were dated so they could be later correlate with the data (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Three types of field notes were utilized: (a) theoretical notes (TN)—attempts to derive meaning as the researcher thinks or reflects on experiences; (b) methodological notes (MN)—reminders, instructions, or critique on the process; and (c) analytical memos (AM)—end-of-a-field-day summary or progress reviews.

Data Analysis

The experience of 12 participants were investigated. According to Doyle (2006), when determining the sample size for a qualitative study, it is more important to identify participants who are more knowledgeable than to include a large population. A smaller sample size with a rigorous analysis was sufficient because the study was of an exploratory nature (Daniel, 2012). Saturation is the point of the data collection process where the information becomes redundant (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 69). Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) discovered saturation usually occurs within the first 12 participants. After 12 interviews, the answers to the questions become redundant and no new data are offered (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006).

An initial precoding process was used to identify repetitive terms, which was followed by

reviewing, analyzing, and classifying the themes according to the appropriate research questions (Saldana, 2013). The precoding process started with color-coding identified words and phrases that were “worthy of attention” (Saldana, 2013, p.19). The codes and code definition were determined and organized from selected terms, words, and phrases for comparison and contrast (Corbin & Strauss, 1998). The categories that began to emerge were reexamined, and a set of themes emerged. These themes were reviewed, analyzed, and classified according to the appropriate research questions with which they were associated.

The descriptive narratives, gathered during individual interviews, were essential, as they provided detailed phenomenological descriptions of the transition experience of faculty members. The common experiences, explaining the consistency of responses for each participant and the number of times the responses appeared in the transcriptions were tallied. Once the common experiences were determined, all the transcriptions were studied to determine the number of frequency responses related to each theme. Then, the number of times each common experiences appeared within the transcriptions was totaled.

To establish trustworthiness, triangulation was used to verify the findings (Yin, 2014) and to assure the validity of the research. The study used face-to-face interviews, field notes, interview transcripts, and recordings to increase the study’s credibility and help ensure that the findings were accurate (Creswell, 2012).

Participants were able to view the transcribed interviews and the established themes. This allowed participants the opportunity to correct any misunderstanding to ensure that the information accurately describes their viewpoints and to share their opinions on the accuracy of the findings (Creswell, 2012).

Findings

Based on the results relative to all four research questions three themes emerged from this study (a) faculty roles and teaching practices, (b) faculty communication strategies, and (c) faculty changes in instruction. There were similarities among the experiences of the participants in relation to their transition from online teaching to face-to-face teaching. In their transition, the majority of the participants noted their teaching role changed to more of a facilitator since teaching online. All the participants mentioned they changed from teaching in an instructor-focused environment to a learner-focused environment.

Findings for Central Research Question

The responses to the central research question served as a foundation in understanding how teaching at a distance affects the attitudes, perspectives, and practices of higher education faculty when they return to face-to-face teaching. All of the participants’ specified teaching online assisted them in thinking differently about their face-to-face teaching. Some mentioned that teaching online has increased their awareness of students’ needs and methods to create engaging activities.

Teaching online changed my attitude and perspectives when returning to face-to-face teaching because I can tell by students’ responses, expressions when they do not understand something right away. I can also see when the material is not interesting. This allows me to improve what material is essential and provide activities that are engaging and enhance student learning. (Participant C)

My interaction in my face-to-face class is greater now due to my online experience. I really feel like students are getting double for their money because they are getting the face-to-face experience and they are getting the online experience as well. They have

immediate access to me in class and they have access to all the resources. (Participant F)

One instructor noted it is easier to teach face-to-face after teaching online, while another instructor disagreed and faced challenges when returning to the face-to-face classroom.

It is so much easier to teach face-to-face after teaching online because I have mirrored my face-to-face class after my online course. My attitude and perspectives have changed since teaching online and returning to the face-to-face class. I am able to share the online resources with the face-to-face class. I use some of the same methods and I have structured my face-to-face course in the same format as my online course. (Participant I)

My attitude and perspective after teaching at a distance and transitioning to the face-to-face classroom was that I struggled with lecture present. I thought I could just jump back into the classroom but it was a huge challenge for me. I was trying to use the same material but I had to go back and completely redesign a lot of my material to be more entertaining. I felt like I had to entertain the students more in a face-to-face class than I do in an online class. (Participant H)

Finally, teaching online has helped the participants to integrate more technology into face-to-face classrooms.

I like the fact of using the technology because even in my face-to-face class I use Blackboard, Collaborate Ultra, and Adobe Connect. Many of my students are nontraditional students who work and have other responsibilities and are not able to come to class. It has been great to be able to speak with them virtually. I like the fact that my face-to-face students submit their work online also because this keeps clutter away from my office. (Participant B)

Since teaching online, I use more technology in my face-to-face class. I also use the document camera to capture 3D object and/or 2D images, create more discussion, interaction, and capture students' attention. Effective technology integration changes the dynamics of the classroom and promote student-centered. Students not only become engaged, but they also begin to take more control over their own learning. (Participant F)

I have taught face-to-face and fully online classes within the same semester and I have noticed that upon returning to my face-to-face classes from my online experience was the fact that I realized that I began to use more technology. (Participant K)

Findings for Research Sub-question One:

Sub-question One asked, How are instructors' perceptions of their role and their teaching practices altered when they returned to instruction in a face-to-face classroom? Faculty members indicated that, when they returned to the face-to-face classroom, they moved from being at the center of the interaction or the source of information to the "guide on the side." They noted they became less of a lecturer and more of a facilitator, which was the highest ranked role identified in this study. The second role identified was resource provider.

Two of the participants described their role as a manager/administrator because they supervise and moderate discussions, organize, plan, evaluate assignments, and maintain student records. This aligns with the findings of Baran et al. (2011) and Guasch et al. (2010), who suggested the

administrative manager role comprises carrying out the pedagogical tasks related with course management, including establishing rules and regulations, student registration, and recordkeeping.

I can honestly say I did lecture more, but now I am more of a facilitator and I have also altered my role with being a resource provider because my face-to-face students have access to the material 24/7. This is beneficial to the face-to-face students because they do not have to wait until the next class or office hours, they can simply go online and obtain what is required and if they need to contact me I am only an email or Collaborate [Ultra] away. Before I started teaching online I was definitely more of a lecturer and my courses were more teacher-centered but I have altered my role and teaching practices to be a One Stop Shop. (Participant B)

My courses were designed around more of me attempting to get students to understand the material. Now I am more of a manager and administrator because I plan, organize, supervise, and provide all the resources that are necessary and required for them to be successful and I observe their progress. (Participant C)

I have always desired to become more of a facilitator. I would say that online teaching moved me in the direction of being more multimodal in my approach. Working to become a facilitator and placing more of the ownership of the learning process on the student. The way I have structured my face-to-face course has allowed me to create a more student-centered environment. This has been great for me. The students were kind of like, "what is this?" I am responsible. I feel like I am still a relatively late adopter to some of the more innovative things I can do with the resources that we have at our disposal, but I definitely see myself as managing the learning process. (Participant J)

A paradigm shift occurred within the participants teaching practices. All 12 participants reported they changed from teaching in an instructor-centered or lecture-centered environment to a student-centered learning environment. Six of the participants explained the similarities between teaching online and of face-to-face teaching included direct eye contact, seeing students' nonverbal cues, provide immediate feedback, respond directly to questions and assist with problems. Eight of the participants indicated teaching online has made them more aware of the needs of their students and how to engage them to understand the content.

Findings for Research Sub-question Two

Sub-question Two asked, What communication strategies do instructors transfer from online to face-to-face teaching? Eight of the participants indicate they utilized both synchronous and asynchronous formats. Four of the participants indicated that they used asynchronous format such as discussion forums, blogs, and wikis. All 12 participants stated they used email to communicate with students. Nine of the 12 participants also stated they use Collaborate Ultra as a communication strategy that was transferred from online to the face-to-face classroom. These participants explained that they now allow their face-to-face students to view pre-recorded lectures, access material online, and collaborate with them and their peers on their own schedule.

When my father-in-law passed, I was out of town and I could not meet my face-to-face class in the physical classroom, but we still had class virtually. I used Blackboard Collaborate for my virtual classroom meeting. Therefore, there was no class time missed due to the virtual meetings that we were able to have. I had the ability to communicate and engage with my students in real-time discussion. They were able to view the content and I recorded the presentation and posted for students who did not show for virtual face-to-face class. I also had virtual office hours utilizing Collaborate Ultra. (Participant B)

I transferred from online to face-to-face teaching was using Collaborate Ultra with my face-to-face students. Whenever I am unable to come to campus to hold regular class periods or when the campus is closed due to bad weather or an emergency, I use Ultra. I expanded my office hours by scheduling online time to answer questions about assignments or the course in general, to provide instruction, or to give feedback. In my opinion, web conferencing is the ideal tool to bridge the communication gap between face-to-face students and online students. (Participant I)

Students like Collaborate Ultra because they can use their mobile devices, especially their phones. It's like FaceTime for the Apple users. (Participant A)

The participant who used Collaborate Ultra had a positive experience. Findings indicated that Collaborate Ultra is efficient in terms of promoting flexibility, interaction, learning community, and engaging the student and instructor. Students were able to see the instructor and hear him/her through video and audio. This was important to simulate face-to-face class experiences and provide various interaction opportunities between the instructor and the student.

All 12 of the participants specified they transferred video material from online to the face-to-face classroom. Seven of the 12 participants specified they also transferred audio material from their online to face-to-face classroom. Seven of the participants mentioned another communication strategy that helped increase and enhance their face-to-face classroom was the online discussion board.

Prior to teaching online, I made very little use of discussion boards for my face-to-face classes. I was more familiar with reflection papers. Having seen the benefits of online discussion boards, I began to use them for my face-to-face class. These discussions have helped to enrich my classroom discussions. They have improved learning by allowing students to reflect on assigned readings, offer conversation, and assist them with articulating their thoughts prior to the discussion. The students actively participate without feeling the overwhelming discomfort they may feel with many eyes on them in a face-to-face class. (Participant L)

The discussion forum was one of the most popular features that transferred from my online teaching to face-to-face teaching. The discussion forum helped enhanced students to talk more with me. I would provide some guiding questions to foster a habit of critical thinking, reflection and articulating online. The discussion became student-centered and more students participated and shared their ideas and experiences. (Participant G)

I use the discussion board to continue an in-class discussion. I have discovered that some students are not confident and prefer not to speak in class but are willing to contribute to the discussion boards. It also allows students time to reflect on their thoughts before contributing, practice their writing skills, and offer peer-learning opportunities. The discussion board has been a positive experience. (Participant I)

Five of the participants indicated that the discussion board did not transfer from their online course to their face-to-face course.

My students were not engaged in a true, back-and-forth dialogue but just typed something for contributing purposes. It seemed like it was more of an exchange of information than a true discussion. (Participant E)

Online discussion decreases social interaction. The discussions can become complicated and students go off-topic and wish they could retract their threads and then they become

more argumentative instead of collaborative. (Participant D)

The discussion forums were not beneficial in my face-to-face class because I had to use a lot of time moderating and monitoring students' inappropriate postings. Some students wanted to dominate the conversation and this caused negative postings. (Participant C)

Findings for Research Sub-question Three

Sub-question Three asked, What changes in face-to-face instruction can be attributed to the experience of online teaching? Ten participants reported having implemented online tests and quizzes in their face-to-face instruction. One of the most common strategies to be incorporated into classroom instruction was the use of technology. All participants indicated that since teaching online, they have incorporated some type of technology into their face-to-face classroom. Most of the participants changed their perceptions regarding the role of technology.

Technology has transformed the teaching and learning experience in my classroom. My students are able to access the information quicker and easier than ever before. I have become the facilitator, coach, adviser, and encourager with utilizing technology in my face-to-face classroom. I do not think you should just use technology because you can or let technology take over your class. You must understand how to use it, train students in using it, and learn what benefits the technology brings to your class. (Participant B)

Technology has totally changed the dynamics of how I teach. I am learning how to teach with emerging technologies (computers, smartphones, iPads, Google cardboards, smart boards, tablets, digital cameras, virtual reality headsets) while my students are using advanced technology to shape how they learn. My goal is to set my students up for a successful life outside of the classroom by developing technological skills so they will be prepared to enter the workforce once they complete their degree. (Participant G)

I integrate technology into my face-to-face class since transitioning from online teaching to connect with students of all learning styles and to help develop students' digital citizenship skills. It has helped my students in my face-to-face class to be more engaged, creative, and connected. (Participant J)

Several participants found technology changed their practices in teaching and learning because the classroom became more student-centered rather than teacher-centered. All participants reported that, since returning to the face-to-face classroom they have continue to use Blackboard, PowerPoints, and multimedia. Four of the participants indicated they used proctored assessments for their face-to-face classrooms since teaching online. All participants indicated they use Respondus LockDown Monitor when requiring proctored assessments

Online proctoring is easier than face-to-face proctoring because I am the only instructor in the room and it is harder to catch students cheating. I want students to be familiar with and knowledgeable of the online proctoring process. (Participant F)

Many high-tech companies offer certification exams and do not always require applicants to travel to a brick-and-mortar test center but instead utilize online proctoring. Being familiar with the online proctoring process could be a benefit for the student, helping reduce the fear of new technology. (Participant G)

It was reported by two participants online proctoring for their face-to-face course was beneficial

when they had to attend conferences or miss a class. Six of the participants reported they use rubrics to make expectations and criteria explicit and to facilitate feedback and self-assessment. Nine of the participants indicated that they have incorporated electronic resources into their face-to-face teaching instruction since teaching online.

Most participants had an appreciation of using technology in their online course, and it extended to their traditional face-to-face course. Upon their return to the face-to-face classroom, they provided students with new, authentic, and meaningful learning experiences through the implementation and integration of emerging technologies. By providing video and audio content students are able to learn at their own pace and to go back and relearn material whenever they want. This could be especially important for students with learning disabilities. All participants benefited from using an LMS by uploading, updating course material, submitting grades, and providing feedback.

All participants realize the changes in face-to-face instruction that could be attributed to the experience of online teaching as most of the same methods used in online classes can benefit the face-to-face classroom. Many participants indicated their online courses are designed to utilize weekly modules, and they transferred this to the face-to-face classroom. For all of the participants, the experience of teaching online improved teaching practices when they returned to face-to-face teaching.

Discussion

This study investigated the experiences of 12 participants: three professors, four associate professors, one assistant professor, three instructors, and one adjunct. The data were thematically analyzed and interpreted as a means of explaining the findings. Three themes were identified: (a) faculty roles and teaching practices, (b) faculty communication strategies, and (c) faculty changes in instructions. The participants in this study recognized their transition from lecturer to facilitator, knowledge dispenser to resource provider, and authority figure to advisor. The transforming roles of the participants varied. They described themselves as facilitator, guide on the side, coach, cheerleader, content provider, and course designer. The four categories that described the faculty roles were facilitator, resource provider, advisor, and manager/administrator. The participants modified their teaching practices from a traditional teacher-centered to a student-centered environment. The study indicated that since participants have transitioned from online teaching to face-to-face teaching they have reduced their traditional instruction of the usual lecture-centric assignments and assessment model to peer-based learning techniques and online assignments that force independent thinking and information gathering.

As reported by Burgess (2015) and Simonson et al. (2014) successful interactive learning experiences that work in one learning environment may be adaptable for another one. The study's results are also consistent with several meta-analyses that have shown technology can enhance learning (Schmid et al. 2014), and multiple studies have shown that video, specifically, can be a highly effective educational tool (Hsin & Cigas, 2013; Kay, 2012; Rackaway, 2012).

Limitation

One limitation was that the data collection methods were limited to interviewing 12 participants. The study was conducted at only one institution, which may not be representative of all institutions. As with all qualitative research, the ability to generalize from this study is limited. However, with a phenomenological study, a small sample size with a rigorous analysis is adequate (Daniel, 2012) and saturation usually occurs within the first 12 participants (Guest et al., 2006). Therefore, the quality of the study is not dependent on the size of the sample (Krueger & Casey, 2015). Nevertheless, a random selection of a larger group of subjects may have enhanced the study.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should extend these findings by replicating this study with quantitative research, with a larger sample and different types of higher education institutions—comprehensive, research, baccalaureate, and doctoral granting universities. Insights and experiences from higher education faculty members from other higher education institutions could complement and expand the results of the study. Future research should examine whether faculty members who teach online receive effective professional development prior to teaching online.

Studies that examine higher education faculty members who have been exposed to online instruction as students and what relevant skill sets they bring to their teaching in comparison with the current generation of online teachers should be investigated. Higher education faculty members who were online learners are in the leading position to guide the rest of the higher education faculty members through the transition.

Conclusion

This study provided insights that may assist in the transfer of successful online pedagogical strategies that can benefit the traditional face-to-face classroom. Higher education faculty members were provided an opportunity to share their perceptions, attitudes, and practices about their transitioning from online teaching to traditional face-to-face teaching. It would be beneficial for all stakeholders in education to join efforts and build bridges by sharing success stories and best practices to enhance the educational outcomes for all instructors, students, and higher education institutions.

References

- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J., Lederman, D., & Jaschik, S. (2012). *Conflicted: Faculty and online education*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/IHE-BSRG-Conflict.pdf
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2014). *Grade change: Tracking online education in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.onlinelearningurvey.com/reports/gradechange.pdf>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2015). *Grade level: Tracking online education in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.onlinelearningurvey.com/reports/gradelevel.pdf>
- Baran, E., Correia, A. P., & Thompson, A. (2013). Tracing successful online teaching in higher education: Voices of exemplary online teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-41.
- Burgess, O. (2015). Cyborg teaching: The transferable benefits of teaching online for the face-to-face classroom. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 11(1), 136-144.
- Cho, K., & Berge, Z. L. (2002). Overcoming barriers to distance training and education. *USDLA Journal*, 16.
- Conceicao, S. (2006). Faculty lived experiences in the online environment. *Adult Education Quarterly* 57, 26-45.
- Conrad, D. (2004). University instructors' reflections on their first online teaching experience. *Journal of the Asynchronous Learning Network* 8(2), 31-44.
- Coppola, N., Hiltz, S., & Rotter, N. (2002). Becoming a virtual professor: Pedagogical roles and asynchronous learning networks. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(4), 169-189.

- Cranton, P. (2006). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daniel, J. (2012). *Sampling essentials: Practical guidelines for making sampling choices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Duffy, T. M., & Kirkley, J. R. (2004). Introduction: Theory and practice in distance education Learner-centered theory and practice in distance education. In M. G. Moore & W. G. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 3-13). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fetzner, M. (2003). Institutional support for online faculty: Expanding the model. In J. Bourne & J. C. Moore (Eds.), *Elements of quality in online education: Practice and direction* (pp. 229-243). Needham, MA: Sloan-C.
- Fish, W., & Wickersham, L. (2010). Best practices for online instructors. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 10(3), 279-284.
- Gilbert, J. L. (2003, April). *Transformative learning process of one teacher*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference, Chicago, IL.
- Guasch, T., Alvarez, I., & Espasa, A. (2010). University teacher competencies in a virtual teaching/learning environment: Analysis of a teacher training experience. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 199-206.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82.
- Hsin, W. J., & Cigas, J. (2013). Short videos improve student learning in online education. *Journal of Computing Sciences in Colleges* 28, 253-259.
- Kay, R. H. (2012). Exploring the use of video podcasts in education: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior* 28, 820-83.
- Lee, M.-H., & Tsai, C.-C. (2010). Exploring teachers' perceived self-efficacy and technological pedagogical content knowledge with respect to educational use of the World Wide Web. *Instructional Science*, 38(1), 1-21.
- Lloyd, S. A., Byrne, M. M., & McCoy, T. S. (2012). Faculty perceived barriers of online education. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 1-12.
- Lokken, F., & Mullins, C. (2014). *Trends in elearning: Tracking the impact of elearning at community colleges*. Retrieved from <http://www.itcnetwork.org/membership/itc-distance-education-survey-results.html>
- McDonald, J. (2002). Is as good as face-to-face as good as it gets? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 6(2), 10-23.

McQuiggan, C.A. (2012, June). *Teaching with new eyes: Transformative faculty professional development for online teaching*. Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, Harrisburg, PA.

Merriam, S. (2009) *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1991a). *Transformative dimensions in adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Moore, M. G., & Kearsley, G. (2012). *Distance education: A systematic view of online learning* (3rd ed.). Belmont, VA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Murphy, M. J., Levant, R. F., Hall, J. E., & Glueckauf, R. L. (2007). Distance education in professional training in psychology. *Professional Psychology, 38*(1), 97-103.

Newman, M. (1994). Responses to understanding transformation theory. *Adult Education Quarterly, 44*(4), 236-242.

Parker, K., Lenhart, A., & Moore, K. (2001). The digital revolution and higher education: College presidents, public differ on value of online learning. *Education Journal, 202*, 29.

Rackaway, C. (2012). Video killed the textbook star? Use of multimedia supplements to enhance student learning. *Journal of Political Science Education 8*, 189-200.

Ryan, J., Scott, A., & Walsh, M. (2010). Pedagogy in the multimodal classroom: An analysis of the challenges and opportunities for teachers. *Teachers & Teaching, 16*(4), 477-489.

Scagnoli, N. I., Buki, L. P., & Johnson, S. D. (2009). The influence of online teaching on face-to-face teaching practices. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 13*(2), 115-128.

Schmid, R. F., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Tamim, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Surkes, M. A., Wade, C. A., & Woods, J. (2014). The effects of technology use in postsecondary education: A meta-analysis of classroom applications. *Computers & Education, 72*, 271-291.

Sheridan, R. (2006). Reducing the online instructor's workload. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly, 29*(3), 65-67.

Simonson, M., Smaldino, S. E., Albright, M. J., & Zvacek, S. (2012). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Sword, T. S. (2012). The transition to online teaching as experienced by nurse educators. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 33*(4), 269-71.

Thormann, J., & Zimmerman, I. K. (2012). *The complete step-by-step guide to designing and teaching online courses*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (2nd ed.). London, UK: The Althouse.

Van de Vord, R., & Pogue, K. (2012). Teaching time investment: Does on-line really take more time than face-to-face? *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 13*(3), 132-146.

Whitelaw, C., Sears, M., & Campbell, K. (2004). Transformative learning in a faculty professional development context. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 2, 9-27.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix A

Part I: Demographic Information

In this study, you will be identified by an alias. I will ask you nine questions about your demographic information.

Alias Name:

1. What is your gender? Male Female
2. What is your age range? Under 20 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70+
3. What is your faculty rank? Adjunct Professor Instructor Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor
4. How many years of teaching experience do you have at a Historically Black University?
5. How many years of teaching experience do you have total?
6. How many years of online teaching experience do you have?
7. What is your discipline and equivalent course taught?
8. What is your level of teaching? Undergraduate Graduate Mixed
9. Do you use Synchronous Asynchronous Both as a communication method?

Part II: Experience Narrative

Please describe in detail your experience based on questions 10-18:

10. Describe how teaching online changed your attitude and perspectives when you returned to face-to-face teaching?
11. Describe how your role and teaching practices altered when you returned to instruction in a face-to-face classroom?
12. Did you change your content in any way when you returned to the face-to-face classroom?
13. What teaching methods and/or changes did you return to the face-to-face classroom with?
14. What communication strategies did you transfer from online to face-to-face teaching?
15. Has your Student-to-Faculty interaction and Student-to-Student interaction changed from online to face-to-face teaching? If yes, can you explain how?
16. What changes in face-to-face instructions can be attributed to the experience of online teaching?
17. Describe how professional development can assist online instructors, what topic would you include to improve the transitioning process for new instructors, and what additional training do you think you still need to assist with continuous improvement?
18. Do you have additional comments that you think would be beneficial to this study?

Thank you for your time. You will receive a transcript of the interview in about three weeks and you will have one week to review the transcript. When the study is complete, you will be given a copy of the results upon request.