

Theses and Dissertations

2011

Uncovering and analyzing potential gaps in teaching graduate programs in leadership by way of online education

Joseph E. Craig

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Craig, Joseph E., "Uncovering and analyzing potential gaps in teaching graduate programs in leadership by way of online education" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations*. 179.
<https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/179>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact bailey.berry@pepperdine.edu.

Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology

UNCOVERING AND ANALYZING POTENTIAL GAPS IN TEACHING
GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN LEADERSHIP BY WAY OF ONLINE EDUCATION

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Joseph E. Craig

October, 2011

Monica Goodale, Ed.D. — Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation, written by

Joseph E. Craig

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral Committee:

Monica Goodale, Ed.D. Chairperson

Diana Hiatt-Michael, Ed.D.

June Schmieder-Ramirez, Ph.D.

Copyright by Joseph E. Craig (2011)

All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
VITA	x
ABSTRACT	xi
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Introduction to the Problem	1
Background of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Goal of the Study	4
Online Versus Traditional Learning	4
Research Questions	8
Theoretical Perspectives	8
Summary	10
Chapter Two: Literature Review	12
Definition of Terms	12
Definition of Distance Education	13
Overview of Distance Education	20
Marketing Efforts, Students of For-Profit Institutions Questioned	27
Teaching Leadership	29
Limitations of Online Leadership Programs	33
Adapting Programs for Learners	36
Incorporating Online Education	38
Development of Technological Skills	41
Importance of Communication to Online Education	42
Developing Online Teaching Skills	45
Hiring Educators for Online Education	46
Accreditation	54
Student Requirements in an Online Environment	55
Summary	57
Chapter Three: Methodology	61
Research Purpose	61

	Page
Research Design.....	61
Research Methods.....	62
Selection of Recipients	65
Selection of Contacts	66
Receiving and Usage of Information	67
Sources of Data.....	69
Interview Process	69
Survey Questions	70
Open-Ended Questions	78
Validity and Reliability.....	80
Summary.....	83
 Chapter Four: Results	 86
Analysis of Data.....	86
Description of Participants.....	88
Presentation of the Results—Likert Scale Data.....	89
Presentation of the Results—Open-Ended Question Responses	102
Conclusion	108
 Chapter Five: Recommendations.....	 110
Communication.....	110
Technological Barriers.....	115
Quality of the Degree.....	121
Theme Conclusions.....	126
Summary	128
Recommendations.....	130
Recommendations for Future Research	132
Final Conclusions	133
 REFERENCES	 135
 APPENDIX A: Sample Survey	 154
 APPENDIX B: Informed Consent.....	 157
 APPENDIX C: Likert Scale Responses.....	 159
Table C1.....	159
Table C2.....	159
Table C3.....	160
Table C4.....	160
Table C5.....	160

	Page
Table C6.....	161
Table C7.....	161
Table C8.....	161
Table C9.....	162
Table C10.....	162
Table C11.....	162
Table C12.....	1623
Table C13.....	163
Table C14.....	163
Table C15.....	1644
Table C16.....	164
APPENDIX D: Open-Ended Responses.....	165

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Survey Questions and Related Researchers	70
Table 2. E-Mail Communication.....	89
Table 3. Communication Barriers	90
Table 4. Technological Skills	91
Table 5. Technically Savvy	91
Table 6. Online Lurkers.....	92
Table 7. Career Advancement	92
Table 8. Schedule Issues.....	93
Table 9. Online Chat.....	93
Table 10. Working Students	94
Table 11. Critical Thinking	95
Table 12. Student Interaction	95
Table 13. Online Communication	96
Table 14. Hybrid Format	97
Table 15. Preferred Method.....	97
Table 16. Online Versus Traditional	98
Table 17. Program Recommendation	98
Table 18. Survey Questions and Related Researchers	100

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my beautiful wife, Kristy. Your love and support has made all of this possible. Each of those times I couldn't make it out to dinner with our family and friends or we couldn't take a vacation because I had to save up my pennies to pay off my education have finally paid off. We did it!

I'd also like to dedicate this dissertation to my mother Kathleen. Mom, I barely made it through high school and I didn't have plans beyond college, yet somehow, I was able to stand on the lawn at Pepperdine and graduate with a doctorate. Somehow, you conjured up the patience and ability to raise a son who had every reason not to succeed and push him to get the first doctorate in our small family.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to my father Donald. I wish you were still around to see your oldest son graduate from the school we used to drive by and marvel at when you would take me on one of our numerous camping trips. I know you're looking down and letting out one of your trademark laughs in astonishment that your son who refused to do homework or schoolwork has been bestowed with such a prestigious educational mark.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people have had a huge impact on the road leading up to this momentous accomplishment. I wish to express appreciation to my chair, Monica Goodale, who put up with an endless number of e-mails and phone calls as I worked to complete this dissertation. I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of Dr. Diana Hiatt-Michael, who stepped up and went out of her way to help me out with every question I had about my dissertation.

I would also like to give a special thanks to Christie Dailo, who was always there to help me out with seemingly each and every question I had from the day I first sent in an inquiry asking about Pepperdine's EDOL program to the day I walked in to take part in the final oral defense of dissertation. I'd also like to send a thank you to the entire EDOL program at Pepperdine, for allowing me the chance to take part in such an illustrious program that has ultimately changed every aspect of my life in so many ways.

I'd also like to thank my mother-in-law, Mimi Chin. Your understanding during all those times I was too busy to help with the dishes and doing the laundry while working through this program and financial help has helped make all of this possible. And finally, I'd like to thank all of my family and friends who have watched me make my way through this journey.

VITA

Joseph E. Craig

EDUCATION

Doctoral Candidate, Organizational Leadership, July 2011
Pepperdine University, Malibu, California

Master of Business Administration, July 2006
Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, California

Bachelor of Arts, Government-Journalism, May 2003
California State University, Sacramento, Sacramento, California
Dean's List, Spring 2003

WORK EXPERIENCE

Internet Marketing Manager, February 2010–Current
Tours4Fun, Arcadia, California

Associate Professor, October 2009–Current
Trinity College

Writer, December 2004–March 2011
Pacific Citizen, Los Angeles, California

Search Marketing Analyst (Contract), October 2009–December 2009
LampsPlus.com, Chatsworth, California

Online Marketing Manager, December 2008–October 2009
Starving Students, Los Angeles, California

Associate Producer (Contract), August 2008–December 2008
Walt Disney Internet Group, North Hollywood, California

Associate Product Manager, July 2007–May 2008
DestinationRx, Los Angeles, California

Content Specialist, October 2005–July 2007
Yahoo! Search Marketing, Burbank, California

ABSTRACT

With online education becoming a more viable option to students around the globe, the ongoing problem of optimal ways of teaching leadership in this format has become an issue to be investigated. The design of teaching leadership at a graduate level in which the format is conducted at least 60% online has been the focus of this study. In investigating this, the research has centered on a quantitative and qualitative study, which came about as the result of responses from 27 professors out of 78 across the nation whom were sent requests from schools that met the aforementioned criteria. In some instances, respondents were quick to point out reasons why they were unable to participate in the research, including one professor who had retired and another who noted that the school's leadership department had had a meeting to discuss participation resulting in only 1 of the 8 in the department taking part in the study on behalf of the entire department.

Likert scale and open-ended questions were available for respondents to answer on the SurveyMonkey Web site, which could be accessed via a link sent from the researcher. Results from the Likert scale and open-ended questions were used to determine consistencies and identify common themes among the respondents' answers. These themes were determined to be Communication, Technological Barriers, and the Perceived Quality of the Degree.

The results of this study is designed to help provide guidelines on how to teach leadership in a format that is at least 60% online while also providing the groundwork for future research in this field. It is the recommendation of the researcher that further research can be conducted that will further analyze the issues set forth in this study and

further refinement can be made to help fortify the teaching of leadership online. And finally, it is the recommendation of the researcher that the information in this study be used to help train teachers and administrators in how to provide optimal environments for students in these programs to learn the craft of leadership.

Chapter One: Introduction

Introduction to the Problem

Distance education is an area of education that has been open to scrutiny since the early days of its use as a means to deliver messages from educators to students. However, early on, distance education mainly consisted of phone calls, traditional mail services, nontraditional class schedules or some combination of these in order to provide educational services to those choosing distance education as a means of being educated. More recently, the advent of the Internet has altered the landscape of distance education with this medium providing yet another means of delivering education to a broader audience in a more timely fashion.

At the same time, researchers often disagree on best methods when it comes to teaching leadership—if it can be taught at all. Some researchers feel as though leadership is something that cannot be taught by way of education and instead can only be developed in the workplace over time. Still other researchers feel as though leadership is neither taught nor developed in a workplace, but arises depending on the situation at hand, providing yet another viewpoint into the difficulties of teaching leadership.

Combined together, the issue of teaching leadership by way of distance education becomes a difficult one to dissect. While distance education and the teaching of leadership have both undergone heavy scrutiny individually, researchers have yet to intertwine the two in order to ascertain best practices to teaching leadership in a distance education format. This paper will conduct research upon the two areas and attempt to ascertain any potential best practices for teaching leadership in an online or distance education format, if possible.

Background of the Study

The advent of distance education is not a new development. Holmberg (1986) said that distance learning:

Includes the various forms of study at all levels which are not under the continuous, immediate supervision of tutors present with their students in lecture rooms or on the same premises, but which, nevertheless, benefit from the planning, guidance and tuition of a tutorial organization. (p. 2)

Moore and Kearsley (1996) defined distance education as including any type of education “that normally occurs in a different place from teaching and as a result requires special techniques of course design, special instructional techniques, special methods of communication by electronic and other technology, as well as special organizational and administrative arrangements” (p. 2). Moore (2003) defined “traditional distance education,” stating that the distance between the teacher and learner is not only geographic, but also educational and psychological. This shows that the concept applies to the distance between the two partners—learner and teacher (Saba, 2003). Keegan (1990) proposed six elements of distance education. These elements are (a) the separation of teacher and learner, (b) the influence of an educational organization, (c) use of technical media, (d) two-way communication, (e) the possibility of occasional meetings for both didactic and socialization purposes, and (f) “participation in an industrialized form of education which, if accepted, contains the genus of radical separation of distance education from other forms within the educational spectrum” (Keegan, 1990, p. 39). The South Central Regional Library Council (n.d) described distance learning as:

An instructional delivery system that connects learners, regardless of their location, with educational resources. Because distance learning normally occurs in a different place from teaching, it requires special techniques of course design, instructional design, and communication. Distance learning uses technology to provide new approaches to the learning process, rather than simply the addition of technology to instruction. (para. 11)

Statement of the Problem

Edelson and Pittman (2001) said that distance learning represents the most dynamic sector of adult education, particularly in the United States where the increasing-popularity of the Internet's usage as a primary distance education tool has made it the primary mode of instruction. It is this increase in popularity and the subsequent increase in popularity of distance education that makes the research of this field particularly important and timely.

At the same time, leadership remains a field of great interest to those who have decided to tackle the topic due in large part to its dynamic nature that can change from person to person. Meanwhile, several institutions have taken on the task of teaching leadership programs over the World Wide Web, taking on several challenges at the same time. Germain and Quinn (2005) said that this presents a unique dilemma, as there is a shortage of highly-technologically trained leaders in higher education, and that in itself has been the driving force behind countless institutions attempting to incorporate technology and online education into their traditional institutions of academia with little to no success in doing so. Bates (2000), Fullan (2001) and Portugal (2006) said that distance education leadership could be comprised of a multitude of characteristics with

individuals possessing more than one notion of what it takes to be an effective leader.

Jung, Chow, and Wu (2004) and Kouzes and Posner (2002) said that people's perceptions of leadership can change with people believing simultaneously considering leadership to be an attribute one can learn as an exchange between peers, subordinates, and superiors, and as an authority wielding power. However, distance education presents a different avenue of interaction between classmates, which adds a new dynamic to the teaching of leadership. This study will attempt to ascertain the most effective ways to teach and manage leadership through the use of distance education via the Internet.

Goal of the Study

In reviewing Beaudoin's book entitled *Research, Faculty, and Leadership in Higher Education*, Olcott (2005) noted that there were three main conclusions in regard to distance education: (a) The field of distance education does not know where it's going, (b) visionary leadership is absent from the field, and (c) today's researchers in the field need to seriously get back to basics and read the literature. Furthermore, Olcott wondered if any literature on leadership in distance education exists, stating that not much is known about effective leadership in distance education. And this is one of the main areas of concern when it comes to uncovering best practices in teaching the field of leadership by way of the Internet.

Online Versus Traditional Learning

Many traditional institutions have been hesitant to implement online education as a part of their curriculum. This reluctance has changed with the advancements and profits that schools offering online education have exhibited. Thomason noted that several online colleges abandoned hope in sustaining online universities including E-Cornell, Virtual

Temple NYU Online, Fathom, E-MBA and California Virtual University. However, Land and Bright (2004) noted that the success of the University of Phoenix has led many other institutions to enter the online education arena, with profits of online education expected to grow to \$212 billion by 2011. Traditional universities can no longer shun this shocking total and many have decided that taking on this challenge is a necessary evolution in the growth of their respective educational institutions. Lee and Nguyen (2007) pinpointed a specific period of time that online education experienced perhaps its greatest growth when they noted this growth in online education when they reported that growth of E-Learning courses nearly tripled from 33% in 1995 to 90% in 2003. Allen and Seaman (2007) found that much of the growth of online learning occurred at new institutions and that, “approximately one-third of higher education institutions account for three-quarters of all online enrollments” (p. 2). This growth has led to a bevy of problems that have had to be addressed by university leaders and faculty members including effective management and education by use of the Internet. Rumble (2001) said that while distance education was once an ugly duckling in the world of education, it is growing quickly and because of this growth, educators and leaders have had to work together so that it now has the potential to grow into a beautiful swan, one whose usefulness in traditional educations needs to be addressed.

Allen and Seaman (2003) conducted a survey of college administrators and found that one-third of academic leaders expect that learning outcomes for online education will actually be superior to face-to-face instruction in a short time, and nearly 75% of those queried expect learning outcomes for online education to be equal or even superior when it comes to face-to-face communication, a vital component of teaching leadership both

in-person and online. Calvert (2003) said that there is an overall belief in the world of academia that there is an absolute separation between instructions delivered via courses that take place online versus a traditional, face-to-face format. Calvert noted that online education is referred to as “disruptive technology,” and that very few on-campus students use online environments for resources and communication. Sarasin (1999) said that the expansion of online education has led to the customization of distance education to a broader audience when he noted, “As higher education becomes more accessible, our students are more representative of the general population, which means greater diversity of styles” (p. 2). The teaching of leadership depends on this customization, as many theories have leadership involving a coping of different learning styles, as Kouzes and Posner (2002) noted when they came up with proposals for what leaders can do to assist others in fostering accomplishment among peers in their organization. They then came up with five key propositions to encourage growth and creativity:

1. Model the way
2. Inspire a shared vision
3. Challenge the process
4. Enable others to act
5. Encourage the heart (p. 22).

Determining a way to share this method effectively with students and have them effectively implement this in the various aspects of their lives will be instrumental in teaching leadership online. The transferring of ideals, methods and practices while using online platforms in order to teach students will all be obstacles that will have to be

addressed in order to determine best-practices for teaching leadership through online channels.

In addition to being astute as teachers, educators distributing education on leadership through online channels have other challenges that await them. As opposed to their traditional education teachers that can rely on traditional teaching methods, online educators have a whole new slew of challenges that come along with teaching online. Palloff and Pratt (2005) said that early online teachers experienced both success and failure as they experimented with course designs and techniques to engage learners and now a new wave of educators have taken up the challenge, which includes focusing on best practices and interactivity. Kagima and Hausafus (2001) said that educators often received little support when it came to being educated themselves on the uses of technology in distance education, which oftentimes resulted in minor integration of new educational technologies into the teaching of distance education.

The use of new technology is a vital component of what could be considered the most important aspect of online education—communication. Effective facilitator-learner communication is particularly crucial when teaching leadership and even more so when doing so in a virtual world. The personality, motivation, enthusiasm, and communication style of the facilitator is the key to engaging learners in transparent and honest discussions that will build cohesiveness within a collaborative community atmosphere (Bangert, 2005; Mancuso-Murphy, 2007; Posey & Pintz, 2006; Ryan, Hodson-Carlton, & Ali, 2005; Schell, 2006). This community effort across all whose interest lies in education is what ultimately is needed in order to establish online education as having a role in the world of education that has for so long been dominated by traditional universities.

Research Questions

1. How, if at all, are online educators hampered by the need to develop technological skills in order to teach leadership skills online?
2. What are the most important means of communication, available by way of online education, to teach leadership?
3. How can teachers who have previously taught in a traditional classroom become or stay motivated enough to develop skills necessary to teach in an online teaching and learning environment?
4. How does the support that online educators receive from their institution allow them to maintain an effective online teaching and learning environment in distributing leadership practices?
5. What are the best methods to teach leadership by way of distance education?

Theoretical Perspectives

In analyzing a theoretical perspective to take a look at teaching leadership in an environment that is both at a graduate school level as well as taking place 60% online, the researcher identified Kouzes and Posner. In reviewing the issue of teaching leadership in this environment, it was the work of Kouzes and Posner (2002) who identified five ways that leaders can encourage growth and creativity by having leaders who:

1. Model the Way
2. Inspire a shared vision
3. Challenge the process
4. Enable others to act
5. Encourage the heart.

Because teaching leadership in a mostly online environment presents a growing issue because of its potential limitations to be addressed in this research, the challenge of implementing Kouzes and Posner's five ways to encourage growth and leadership lie at the heart of this research project.

Identifying this theoretical perspective brings up an issue that can be addressed by the three major themes that were identified and outlined in this paper. These themes were:

- Communication: Finding ways to master the uses of teaching online to communicate in a way that encourages students to become better leaders by using Kouzes and Posner's method will continue to be a challenge in teaching in this format.
- Technological barriers: Utilizing and mastering technology to communicate with students and properly convey all messages and anything needing to be taught to students creates a challenge for teachers looking to master Kouzes and Posner's ways of inspiring better leaders in these classes.
- Perception of the Degree: Perhaps the trickiest to master the five ways to encourage growth and creativity in students looking to hone leadership skills. Several researchers have noted a perceived difference in degrees attained via online schools versus traditional colleges and/or universities. Overcoming perceived differences in the minds of not online students, but even the professors themselves in an effort to remove perceived barriers to inspire leadership is a problem that exists for those taking part in either learning or teaching leadership in an environment of this nature.

Summary

Distance education has long been a staple in the world of education and now with the usage of the Internet as the main vehicle of this form of education, it continues to grow. Whereas traditional educational institutions once had to compete with one another for students, the realm of online education has opened the door for new competition with which traditional universities now have to compete. Online institutions have created an entirely new marketplace that increase the competition in the global education marketplace and with the desire for more individualized education plans and growing diversity of learners (Berge, 2001; Cornford & Pollock, 2003; Salmon, 2000; Vrasidas & Zembylas, 2003) have created more challenges than ever for traditional universities. These challenges come not only from developing distance education programs, but also creating new programs in general to compete with the growing number of programs available to students who are looking to take classes at any place and any time online.

With the development of online programs come the various programs, including leadership, which has proven to be a popular option for distance education institutions to offer to perspective students. While researchers continue to debate whether leadership can be taught and if so, how to do so, distance education programs continue to offer degrees in leadership programs that are conducted primarily online.

The development of these online institutions offering leadership programs leads to a need to determine whether leadership can be taught online and if so, determining best practices for doing so by way of distance education. The remaining chapters of this paper will try to answer the question of how to teach leadership online by reviewing the answers that respondents gave. While the answers were limited to those available on the

multiple choice answers available on Likert scale questions in the questionnaire and to the limited number of open-ended questions, the responses were analyzed to provide recommendations on the research topic.

Chapter Two of this paper will break down distance education and the further development of programs that use the Internet as a primary vehicle of delivering instruction for those providing leadership programs by way of this medium. This chapter will also discuss the development of faculty and the challenges they will face when teaching leadership by way of the World Wide Web, the creation of an effective curriculum when it comes to leadership programs and the obstacles that faculty face in implementing leadership's finer points by way of Internet courses.

Chapter Three will tackle the methodology that will be used in this study including the development of leadership programs, the methods of teaching leadership online and data analysis methods. Because of the emerging nature of leadership programs in online education, these methods will be mostly explorative with various authorities giving different types of feedback on the questions posed.

Chapter Four will present findings from the research composed on this topic with results from the studies and interviews conducted in this study.

Chapter Five will include a summary of key findings, a conclusion, implications of the research and the findings, recommendations for online leadership programs and recommendations for future research in this field of study.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of definitions for terms that were used in conjunction with this study:

1. Educators: A teacher at a traditional or distance institution of higher education. AuBuchon (2010) identifies an educator as anyone whose profession it is to teach others. For the purpose of this study, the term related strictly to those educators whose job it is to teach in an online school of higher education.
2. Learners: A student in a higher education institution. Simanek (1997) said that being a learner means being one who attends something to learn or study. For the purposes of this research, the definition was limited to higher education institutions because of the nature of the study that was conducted.
3. Leadership: Any individual or combination of transactional, transformational, situational or any other established type of leadership. Beaudoin (2004) noted that various types of leadership have all been applied within the realm of higher education. The definition noted here was taken into account and its application within higher education for the purposes of this study.
4. Online Education: Any form of education that does not occur on the campus of a traditional higher education facility and that takes place by means of instant message chat, e-mail, chat room, forum postings, Skype contact or some other medium by way of the World Wide Web. This definition is based

upon Garrison and Shale's (1987) definition, which defined distance education as:

- The majority of educational communication between teacher and student occurs non contiguously
- Involves two-way communication between teacher and student for the purpose of facilitating and supporting the educational process
- Uses technology to mediate the necessary two-way communication (pp. 10-11).

Definition of Distance Education

Throughout history, examples of correspondence can be given where instructional materials were delivered through some form of distance education. Tifflin and Rajasingham (1995) have described scenarios where the written instructional work of Paul the Apostle were delivered as a form of religious correspondence education in biblical times. These letters were written on papyrus and were delivered by messengers to Christian communities as a method to explain the learnings of Christ and spread Christianity. Not surprisingly, many consider this to be the first example of distance education. A debate about the genesis of the first distance education programs continues. Holmberg (1986) said that the first distance education program began in the 1830s in Sweden, Germany and France. However, Phillips (1998) and Picciano (2001) both wrote that the first truly successful distance education programs began as early as 1840 in England, when Sir Isaac Pitman came up with the idea to deliver entire instructional correspondence courses through the mail, an idea that Curran (1997) says quickly gained steam as within a few decades, similar programs were being offered in the United

Kingdom, Germany and Japan. In 1833, an ad appeared in a Sweden newspaper, *Lunds Weckoblad*, which offered the opportunity for “ladies and gentlemen” (p. 161) to study composition through the “medium of the Post” (p. 161) In 1843, the Phonographic Correspondence Society was formed in England, taking over the shorthand schools that were founded years earlier by Sir Isaac Pitman. Later, these schools became known as the Sir Isaac Pittman Correspondence Colleges (Holmberg, 1986; Simonson, Smaldino, Albright, & Zvacek, 2003). In 1939, the French government, realizing that the developments of what would be become World War II could stunt the educational development of their youth, set up a government college, which is now called Centre National de Tele-Eseignement, which offered distance education courses (Holmberg, 1986). In 1969, the Open University (OU) in Great Britain made several advancements that changed distance education, using an innovative approach in teaching that used a mixed-media approach to teaching, with materials being sent out via text, audio and television while also being supplemented by broadcast radio and television. Students were also assigned a tutor that could be reached via telephone while also being assigned into study groups that were to meet in evenings and/or weekends (Normile, 1997).

More domestically, Willis (1993) said that mail and correspondence courses in the United States could be traced back as far as the early 1700s when mail and correspondence courses were being used to supplement public lectures in lyceum halls that existed in colonial America. Schrum and Luetkehans (1997) wrote that correspondence education actually began in the United States in 1728, when materials were mailed to students who would complete assignments and return them for evaluation. This type of mail-delivery correspondence education continued to be the primary form of

correspondence education within the United States until the 20th century (Moore, 2003; Schlosser & Simonson, 2002). Holmberg (1986) said that in 1728, Caleb Phillips, a teacher of shorthand, put out a notice in *The Boston Gazette* offering to send weekly courses to whoever was interested.

In the 1880s, the United States began to see the birth of distance education degrees being granted by institutions and the armed forces began utilizing correspondence education by the early 20th century. By the 1950s, 60 universities had some form of correspondence study with combined enrollment reaching approximately 100,000 college-level students. With this boon in popularity, research began to decipher the impact of distance education and its effectiveness compared to traditional teaching methods. It was soon determined that distance education provided a less-than optimal delivery as certain hurdles could not be avoided, such as the separation of resources and a lack of contact between teacher and learner (Moore, 2003).

With technological advances also came the advancing of distance education and with the innovations of the Internet and other forms of media, the implementation of distance education have changed significantly (Simonson et al., 2003). Simonson and Schlosser (2003) also noted that within the United States, distance education in the United States has quickly moved into a new arena thanks to the innovation of advanced telecommunication devices, such as communication satellites and personal computing technology. Following up on this point, the United States in particular, has seen change in the delivery of distance education. In the window of just the past 25 years, computer-based online distance education has had a large impact on higher education institutions (Nasseh, 1997). Moore and Kearsley (2004) noted that this development has greatly

impacted the way in which Americans are educated. According to Gunawardena and McIsaac (2002) and Taylor (2001), this recent change has satisfied a need that Americans have had in delivering easily-accessible distance education, giving them an opportunity to be educated at campuses far from their home at set days and times. By the 1997–1998 school year, 62% of 2-year colleges in the United States offered some type of distance learning course, with 9.6% of the community college students taking at least one distance education class (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). In May 2003, the expansion of distance education was approved across the 108 California Community Colleges, at which time a report of status of distance education was issued. This report covered a seven-year period from 1995 to 2002 and revealed that there was a 288% increase in the number of students enrolled in those courses. The report revealed the most commonly given reasons for enrollment in these courses was the convenience these distance education classes offered and the need to fulfill requirements for associate degrees or transfer (California Community Colleges Board of Governors, 2003). During the 1999-2000 academic year, 7.6% of the undergraduate students were participating in distance education, with 60.1% of those students participation in Internet classes, 37.3% in live TV/audio courses, and 39.3% enrolled in prerecorded audio/TV classes (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2002).

Russell (2001) compiled results from 355 studies on education conducted over the past 20 years that showed that applying technology to the education process had no impact on the educational outcomes of students that relied upon them for their education. Russell's compilation resulted in a conclusion that the use of technology had no impact on the outcome of the learning process.

Interestingly enough, the development of distance education technologies is also impacting traditional learning classrooms, according to Matkin (2007). Allen and Seaman (2003) reported that 3.5 million students are taking courses via distance education programs while Caplan (2004), Du Mont (2002) and Harley (2001) stated that institutions of higher education and consortia are emerging to offer courses that were once only available to institutions of higher learning. Harley (2001) noted:

The nearly exponential growth of information, coupled with the ability to exchange it more rapidly among more people than ever before, is creating a new environment for education, in which the university have to negotiate its standing as the de facto source of scholarly knowledge. (para. 1)

Since the days of Paul the Apostle, distance education has gone through changes that have been expedited with the tremendous rise in usage of the Internet. While correspondence courses can also exist via traditional mail, and classes that utilizes the use of television to deliver coursework, also known as TeleCourses. According to Simonson et al. (2003), Western Reserve University was the first to offer a continuous series of TeleCourses, which was followed by New York University, which offered a televised series on CBS that ran from 1957 until 1982. TeleCourse, also known as instructional television (ITV), is available for anyone interested. The most common form of this programming is Public Broadcasting Service. While the production standards for this type of programming is high, large budgets are not necessary allowing these programs to be aired free of charge for anyone interested in watching this form of educational programming (Bates, 1995). The advantages of this form of delivery are that it is low cost, standardized and is broadly available to a large audience (Bates, 1995). However,

students were more likely to complete traditional, face-to-face instruction courses than they were to complete distance-learning courses, Internet, TeleCourse classes (Carey, 2002; Carr, 2000; Hogan, 1997; Russell, 2001).

Following the letter delivery services that served as distance education, Moore (2003) wrote that distance education went through several generations. The second generation of distance learning came through the usage relied primarily on audio and visual methods of instructional delivery. In the 1910s and 1920s, radio broadcasting provided the newest form of instructional delivery system and in 1934 the State University of Iowa began to broadcast educational television. These instructional methods later evolved to radio, audio and videotapes.

A third generation evolved in the 1960s, Moore (2003) wrote, where a wider range of media was used in instructional delivery called “multimedia”. This form of distance education emphasized the media as well as the learning process focusing on correspondence materials, radio and television programs, audio and video tapes, computers, telephone conferencing, library resources, tutors and study groups (Moore, 2003). During this time, geographic separation remained a part of the process of distance education.

During the 1990s, Moore (2003) wrote that distance education began to implement the Internet as a primary method of delivery. This period of time was marked by advancements in the evolution of the distance education arena and resulted in advancement in instructional delivery systems, which were the product of advancements in computers, the availability of the Internet and ICT (Information Communication Technologies). It was during this time that the Internet’s ability to link multiple users to

information through the World Wide Web and greatly improve education was recognized and appreciated, accelerating the popularity of online education (Galbreath, 1997; Maddux & Johnson, 1997). The advancement of the use of the Internet in distance education greatly enhanced the education and interaction that takes place through the use of distance education and has made distance education more effective, efficient and popular than at any other point in history (Anderson, 2004). The usage of the Internet in distance education has made it so that delivery of instruction can be nearly instantaneous occurring anytime and anywhere and more accessible than traditional face-to-face education.

The development of the Internet in furthering distance education has proven to be a monumental step in the development of distance education. Where telephones and television were at one time primary vehicles in the delivery of distance education as a result of their being readily available in most homes, the availability of computers has lent itself to the next step in the evolution of distance education. Rumble (2001) wrote that most would agree that the availability of computers and the widespread availability of the Internet and electronic technologies have revolutionized society in many ways. Rumble wrote that the field of education benefitted perhaps as much as any other with this advancement with these new technologies greatly enhancing higher education in particular.

Gordon (2000) said that distance learning is the process of distance education, which emphasizes the experience of the student and in which the student is separated from the instructor in and/or place during 75% or more of the instruction. Picciano (2001) wrote that distance education is a generic, all-inclusive term used to refer to the physical

separation of teacher and learners. Finally, the NCES (n.d.) noted that distance education has become comprehensive, incorporating any form of education that occurs when student and teacher are separated by time and space. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (2003) defines distance education as education provided through instruction delivered other than face-to-face on a student's home campus that may be delivered through electronic modes of distance education including television, interactive video conferencing, or computer networks, or it may be delivered off-campus by faculty travel to distant sites including the student's home or another designated location.

Overview of Distance Education

While there are no exact figures as to how many online leadership programs are currently being offered, a simple Google search of "online leadership programs" yields more than 43 million results. Among the more prominent and recognizable programs offering online leadership programs include schools such as Gonzaga, which offers a Master's Degree in Leadership, Penn State, which offers an online Bachelor of Science in Organizational Leadership and Azusa Pacific University, which offers a Master of Arts in Leadership and Organizational Studies. All of these programs can primarily be completed online and as is the norm for programs of this sort, are available to students from all over the world if accepted into the school's program. Each of these programs was offered through the school's traditional method of teaching in a face-to-face format but were later developed to be available online to reach a wider array of students. While no figures are available to determine neither the number of online leadership programs nor the number of degrees issued by these universities, an Internet search does reveal quite a number of these universities offering such programs.

Early on, most distance education programs were provided by only a select handful of institutions, which specialized in providing education to students not in a classroom setting. However, the education world has recently seen developments that have changed distance education as a whole. Karsenti (1998) wrote that at the beginning of the 21st century, universities faced numerous challenges: the diversity of student profiles, the arrival of new technologies, the multiplicity of university programs, as well as students' lack of motivation. As a result, universities as a whole realized that a change had to be made. And Bates (2000) wrote that there are three main fundamental reasons for the broad changes that had to be made. First, the number of students being served by institutions of higher education is increasing while the funding to educate this increase in students has largely remained static or even decreased in some scenarios. Secondly, society is forcing higher education to change. More careers are requiring employees to have a higher education degree, which is forcing older students to return to school while also performing the duties that their careers demand. This is forcing older students to return to school to acquire a first, second or even third degrees to advance in a world that requires more and more education. And lastly, Bates wrote that students, particularly the older students that also work, require more flexibility in their degree program and welcome the varying times and locations that online education can offer to them as they pursue their degree. Simonson et al. (2003) wrote that "the Internet was the medium of choice for most institutions providing distance education" (p.14) and that this hasn't changed since "The original target groups of distance education efforts were adults with occupational, social, and family commitments. This remains the primary target group today" (p. 33). However, many reports have indicated that in addition to older adult

students who are making up a large number of online college enrollees, other students are looking to distance education as a primary option. O'Banion (1997) wrote that student demographics are changing because students now have a very good technological understanding and that they "are the products of schools that have been stressing critical thinking, collaborative problem solving, and consumerism as part of the last wave of educational reforms" (p. 37). O'Banion writes that students now no longer desire to sit in a classroom with experts lecturing to them. As a result, students wish to be treated more like customers whose needs are catered to (Black, 2003; Beaudoin, 2003). The adult learners who are taking advantage of the convenience also alter student demographics that distance education has to offer if they are technologically savvy. These students are looking to return to school in order to improve job skills and utilize distance education to also have the opportunity to spend with their families and jobs.

With a target audience of adults that are looking to head back to school in an effort to build up their value in the workplace, many colleges and universities have taken on the challenge of exactly which courses were necessary to offer via distance education and/or the Internet. Martinez (2002) wrote that universities should be careful when choosing which academic programs to offer via distance education and should not attempt to offer all programs and/or courses via an online format. However, the sheer number of students that are enrolling in these online courses has presented leaders at traditional brick-and-mortar colleges and universities with a dilemma—how to swing the growing tide of students looking to online education as an alternative to traditional schooling. According to the NCES (2003), in the United States, more than three million students a year enroll in Distance Education at the college level. Potashnick and Capper

(1998) wrote that during the past 20 years, megauniversities (that enroll more than 100,000 students) offering distance education degrees have been established. These mega universities have a combined enrollment of more than 2.8 million students and graduate 255,000 students each year. The enrollment in these distance education universities and colleges has presented traditional schools with a dilemma as to how to withstand the loss in students and the income each student represents to the school. In an effort to stem the tide that an increase of enrollment in online colleges represented, leaders at traditional brick-and-mortar schools have begun working to introduce distance education to their school. A report conducted by the State Education Technology Directors Association, the International Society of Technology in Education and the Partnership for 21st Century (2007) concluded, “no industry or organization can remain competitive today without making comprehensive use of technology as a matter of course in all of its operations” (p. 2).

Allen and Seaman (2003) wrote that leading institutions of higher education are looking to enhance their institution’s learning capability by turning to online education in addition to their traditional, brick-and-mortar format. Owen and Demb (2004) wrote that these institutions are making these changes to meet the ever-changing needs and demands of their students, and the surrounding communities. This recent development has had an interesting effect on distance education. For many years, distance education as a whole was largely seen as being a niche, with only a handful of institutions providing distance education learnings and courses. However, now more and more traditional schools are also providing online education as an option for students, giving them a much broader reach than they would otherwise have. According to Tham and Werner (2005), this

development is vital for these traditional institutions, which were losing too many students to schools offering the convenience that online education has to offer. Tham and Werner wrote that for traditional institutions to keep pace with their online counterparts, they had to investigate whether online education fit into their institutional culture of academics and consider implementing online education in order to supplement their traditional format of offering degree programs on-campus, during the daytime hours. Bitler (2001) agreed with this sentiment by noting that in order to gain and maintain a competitive advantage in the highly competitive market for higher education students, traditional universities are finding it necessary to explore the use of online education as a method of offering courses and entire degree programs.

Tham and Werner (2005) referred to online education as the “invisible classroom” that provides two significant advantages for students that onsite education can’t replace. First, the “invisible classroom” of online education allows any student to learn from a reputable university anywhere in their state, country or even anywhere in the world. Students do not have to change their entire lives in order to attend the college that they desire to attend and seek out their education. Second, in theory, each student has an equal opportunity to his or her education. Being able to attend courses online removes any social or physical boundaries from attending school, leaving everyone on a more equal footing for learning. This sentiment was echoed, in part, by Moore (2003) who wrote that at its core, a fundamental tenet of distance education is to provide adult learners access to formal education and that it shares three distinctive and often interlocking views of purpose and direction including “vocational, equity of individual opportunity, and social change” (p. 9).

Traditional schools have slowly come to the realization that online education is sought after by students that could potentially be attending their universities. This call to duty has been heard by traditional institutions, which are now offering more online courses, and in many cases degrees that can be earned either primarily or entirely online, than ever before. According to the United States Department of Education (NCES, 2003), about one-third of U.S. institutions that offer distance education courses also offer degrees that students could complete by taking distance education courses exclusively (Lewis, Farris, & Alexander, 1997). This statistic shows a relenting of schools to accept online education as a necessary component to offer to their students. Melody Thompson (1998) suggested that distance education is simply another type of education and should be seen as such. This view differs from many others who feel that any form of distance education involves a decrease in standards from those that traditional institutions offer.

Lee and Dziuban (2002) noted that Internet technology has enabled universities to offer courses in an anywhere, anytime environment and has opened new possibilities for both students and faculty. Galusha (1997) echoed this sentiment by stating that the advent of computers, telecommunications and the World Wide Web has provided and unprecedented opportunity of faculty and students to learn in a cooperative environment and Olcott (2005) said that the fastest growing segment of learners in higher education is the online student. However, several researchers have taken issue with this development in distance education. Whereas teachings were distributed previously by way of mail, telephone or television, the World Wide Web has created issues that need to be addressed.

Pyle and Dziuban (2001) said that one of the dangers that the recent developments of distance technology focusing on the Internet is that instructional technology is forcing instruction and instructors to be driven by technology rather than the needs of technology meeting the needs of technology. In fact, the usage of the Internet for distance education has forced teachers and learners to develop skills in order to take part in these classes and the communication methods that take part by way of the Internet. Barker (2004) and McNeil et al. (2003) said that learners participating in an online environment require basic computer word processing skills, the ability to send and receive e-mail with attachments, and the ability to use and understand Internet protocols. In addition, learners will also need to develop hardware competency skills such as troubleshooting computers and becoming synonymous with discussion groups, chats and online learning programs. Even if these skills are developed, some researchers are not convinced that online learning will appease all that partake in this journey. Arguello et al. (2006), Quan-Haase (2005), and Scheiderman and Plaisant (2005) all wrote that developing a successful online community can be an arduous task and that there is no guarantee that the technology that is built will result in a successful online learning community nor that all the participants will be satisfied with their learning experience as a whole.

And whereas textbooks and curriculum were often the primary concern for teachers, their online counterparts have other concerns that they must address. Educators as well must tackle challenges that they might not have had to previously face in order to teach in an online environment in addition to actually teaching the curriculum that they had planned on educating their students on. Besides what could be described as the social needs of online members and tailoring the learning needs of each member and aside from

the actual development and implementation of the program itself, educators must also consider the need for support systems, services, and resources (Mueller & Billings, 2006). While attempting to pinpoint which characteristics are crucial to a high-quality distance education program, Moore (1990) noted that the interaction between learner and instructor is vital to a distance education program's success and should be the focus of online educators. So while distance education is a developing field with a great deal of potential, several issues need to be addressed when it comes to not only developing education by way of the Internet. These developments come not only from the teaching curriculum implemented and the style, but also the technological aspects, too, which may be new to many of the educators entering into the realm of online education. This paper will look to ascertain methods of teaching leadership online by first looking at the fields of distance education and leadership separately before attempting to combine the two fields in a series of studies to determine best practices of teaching the field of leadership by way of distance education.

Marketing Efforts, Students of For-Profit Institutions Questioned

Among the many questions being leveled at for-profit institutions offering leadership are those of whether the education students get at these universities is the equivalent or even higher quality than one garnered at a traditional institution. A Harkin (2010) article noted that many for-profit institutions, including the University of Phoenix, which has a student body of more than 440,000 students, are enrolling students largely as a result of the financial gains of the university as opposed to working with students to ensure that the education they garner will help propel them in their careers. Harkin continues by noting that students in general need to make sure they understand the risks

associated with pursuing a degree by means of distance education before ultimately choosing that route. He noted that many of the students that attend for-profit institutions end up tens of thousands of dollars in debt with what he refers to as “largely worthless degrees”.

Fabel (2010) said there is an increasing fear within the federal government as for-profit colleges collected more than \$24 billion in financial aid in 2008–2009. This total accounts for nearly 25% of all financial aid awarded, which went to a mere 10% of higher education students because of higher fees associated with for-profit education. Fabel noted that this statistic is concerning because 1st-year students at Kaplan University, a for-profit institution, have a graduation rate of only 23% while Strayer University, another popular for-profit institution, only boasts a graduation of 14% for 1st-year students.

Raising further scrutiny was a Carter (2010) report in which investigators from the Government Accountability Office posed as college students and discovered that four out of 15 for-profit institutions encouraged students to engage in fraudulent practices in order to secure private loans to the undercover students. In addition, the Government Accountability Office (2010) report noted that each of the 15 for-profit institutions engaged in fraudulent, deceptive and questionable marketing practices and that the for-profit institutions investigated made deceptive or questionable statements to the undercover students. Carter continues by noting that this investigation comes as enrollment for The University of Phoenix has seen its enrollment raise from 365,000 to 1.8 million students in the past few years.

While Saba (1999) noted that there are no significant differences in the measures of learning between students at distance and traditional universities, a number of researchers have indicated that the decrease in graduation rate for students pursuing their college education by way of for-profit education is a result of the lack of interaction between faculty and students (Jasper, 1995; Palloff and Pratt, 1999). Kerka (1996) noted that this factor, along with student dissatisfaction with course structure and learning environment is resulting in lower retention rates for for-profit universities compared to traditional colleges. While no conclusive studies have been conducted on this topic, the belief that environment and lack of interaction contributes heavily was echoed by other researchers who believe that these factors lead to a lower completion rate for undergraduate students in an online school (Carr, 2000; Crabtree, 2000; Dexter, 1995; Sutton, 2003) while Carr (2000) noted that completion rates for undergraduate students are lower than 50%. Kirby (1999) and Kruger (2000) also contend that the lack of face-to-face physical interaction is the largest contributor to the dropout rates that plague distance education institutions.

Teaching Leadership

Educating any would-be learners in an online environment can be challenging, and this can be especially true when it comes to teaching leadership. One of the greatest challenges in teaching leadership is the wide array of definitions of leadership. Goffee and Jones (2006) said that leadership is relational and that, “Effective leadership is built on relationships between leaders and those they aspire to lead” (p. 14). At the same time, Goffee and Jones cautioned leaders to avoid seeking a recipe for leadership, noting that there is not a universal set of leadership characteristics. In noting this, they said, “what

works for one leader may not work for another” (p. 11). In researching the traits of teaching leadership, Sternberg (2005) concluded that many leadership models were not, “a set of fixed traits or behaviors, but how leaders go about defining, making and implementing decisions” (p. 360). Bennis (2000) said that over the years, leadership theorists have been searching for a universal theoretical panacea that makes exceptional leadership possible.

It is this variety in defining leadership that can make it difficult for educators to teach leadership in either traditional or distance education formats. Many researchers have noted that leadership style differs by individual. In an attempt to decipher what leadership is and how to teach it, Bass (2008) said that variations in leadership exist because the understanding of what leadership is embedded in humans from the beginning of our lives, resulting in everyone having a different idea of what the concept of leadership entails. Yukl (1989) mirrored this sentiment when noting that the term of leadership continues to go through various definitions by various researchers since the inception of the term. And Bennis (2007) said that we, as babies, experience various forms of leadership through our nurturing sources from the day we are born. This development of leadership from birth is consistent with the idea that each individual has his or her own form of leadership based upon various factors that influence each individual. Blanchard and Hersey (1981) defined leadership style as:

Leadership style is the consistent patterns of behavior, which you exhibit, as perceived by others, when you are attempting to influence the activities of people. This behavior has been developed over time and is what others learn to recognize as you the leader, your style or leader personality. (p. 34)

This definition further fortifies the idea that each person's leadership style is his or her own and presents unique challenges to educators looking to teach learners in any environment and raises questions as to whether leadership can be taught in an educational environment.

Cohen and March (1974) said leadership as a constantly evolving attribute and is fluid where goals are not designed in advance, but are actually discovered as needs change. Because of this, the participants continually change and principals must learn by trial and error and adjust their decisions as they go. In addition, leaders need followers in order to adjust and hone their burgeoning leadership skills. McGregor (2006) believed that human behavior affects the work of the organization and that leadership should be developed that consider the workers' needs. These theories make a strong case that leadership skills are best developed not by learning them in a classroom or online, but rather by trial-and-error within the context of an organization. Blanchard and Hersey (1981) echoed this sentiment when they defined leadership style as a consistent behavior that is developed over time and that is something that a leader exhibits when trying to influence followers. This style is then recognizable by followers as a leadership style or personality. Furthering this idea is the definition of leadership as a whole by Blanchard and Hersey in which they assert that leadership is an ability to influence followers to adjust their behavior as they encounter receptiveness or opposition in various situations. Kouzes and Posner (1990) determined that a reciprocal process must occur between leaders and followers to perceive the person as a leader while Backhouse, Burns, and Masood (2006) said, "Organizational variables such as size organizational environment, type of strategy, technology and organizational forms are likely to impose different

demands on leaders and thus require specific leader behaviours” (p. 941). Bass (2008) said that research has shown that the situation of a company dictates a need for certain types of leadership and because situations change within the business environment, a need exists for various types of leadership for companies to be successful. These theories all seem to indicate that while leadership is something that is developed over a period of time while working within an organization and is recognized by followers as opposed to something that is developed within the confines of a classroom or virtual classroom and is brought to an organization. In addition, these researchers have noted that leadership styles vary depending on the needs of an organization and the demands of the individual, each of which can require different demands on the would-be leader.

While these theorists assert that leadership is developed through the workplace, other researchers do make amends to this sentiment. Goleman (1998) noted that there are a number of steps to developing leadership skills:

- Concrete Experience: Having an experience that allows them to see and feel what it is like;
- Reflection: Thinking about their own and others’ experiences;
- Model Building: Coming up with a theory that makes sense of what they observe;
- Trial-and-Error Learning: Trying something out by actively experimenting with a new approach (pp. 150–151).

According to Goleman (1998), learning leadership skills happens best in combinations of two or three of the models above. This idea from Goleman is significant in determining whether leadership can be taught as not only does it provide a researcher who feels as

though leadership can be taught, but it also outlines a method for doing so. Ready (2002) said that when teaching leadership, there are two essential criteria for developing potential leadership: the belief that leadership is most appropriately learned within the context it will be practiced, and leadership lessons are best learned from trusted and well respected individuals. In the outline Ready provides, the belief is that leadership can be taught in any context as long as the educator is well trusted and respected, whether that be in a school or at an organization. Ready's belief would seem to entail that leadership can be taught effectively at any type of institution as long as the educator of the subject matter was competent and respected in his or her field of expertise.

Many researchers realize that the development of leadership programs and the effectiveness of how this subject is taught is a concern for many in higher education (Irlbeck, 2001). While some researchers feel as though leadership is a skill that is developed through the workplace and is constantly evolving, others have a different viewpoint. These researchers believe that leadership can be taught in the realm of higher education and that there are best methods for doing so. This belief will form the foundation as to whether leadership can be taught online and if so, what are the best practices for doing so.

Limitations of Online Leadership Programs

Brown and Posner (2001) wrote, "leadership is closely connected with the concept of change and change, in turn...is as the essence of the learning process," (p. 275). The change that is seeing programs which were once limited exclusively to traditional classrooms being moved into the virtual arena with classes and programs being offered online or in a hybrid format with classes being split between an online and

classroom format. Allen and Seaman (2003) and Harley and Lawrence (2006) wrote that distance education is changing the delivery of education in the classroom as well with many programs offering hybrid and blended courses that continue to provide opportunities for curricula to be presented using a combination of distance education and traditional classroom settings. In addition, universities have seen the advent of smart classrooms, which include a variety of multimedia that are used for instructional purposes and are growing in popularity (Stacey & Gerbic, 2007; Zhao, 2006). This popularity is part of the boon in popularity that has now encompassed online programs and their increase in popularity among the traditional universities that continue to incorporate them into their offerings.

This fate has lent itself to leadership programs, which are now finding themselves available online. The teaching of leadership can be seen as different than other programs, with communication and other essentials providing a challenge with the implementation of distance education. Doug Shale (1990) wrote that interaction in education is essential, and that the more interaction or dialog between instructor and learner the better. Shale proposed that there is a direct correlation between dialog and distance and thus lowering the distance between instructor and student, there is an increase in dialog between the student and the educator. With distance education comes the separation of teacher and educator, creating a dilemma when it comes to the institution of distance education and of course, the teaching of leadership. The questions that can arise from this distance include the challenges of communication and the usage of leadership skills that can come from the development of leadership skills for students who are in front of an educator in a traditional classroom setting.

The nature of leadership is such that while many lay claims to being leaders, the actual field of leadership is a science that very few are capable of effectively teaching. This field of available teachers becomes even smaller when taking into consideration the realm of distance education. Distance education takes a field that was already lacking experts and narrows this field to those who are capable of distributing this knowledge through the use of the Internet. Ms. Carol Cartwright, president of Kent State University, (as cited in McGovern, Foster, & Ward, 2002), assessed distance education when she noted:

We need only look to the realm of technology for proof that changes sweeping through society have reached higher education with full force. Distributed learning technologies have altered the very concept of “classroom” and the Internet has led to an amazing metamorphosis. (p. 32)

This change in classroom and distributed learning technologies has changed the programs that are taught in this manner. Fittingly, leadership programs, which are being moved into the distance education arena, are now facing that metamorphosis into the virtual realm and have to tackle the challenges that come along with these transformations. Edwards (1993) wrote, “Technology can make life-long learning a reality. With electronic tools, people can learn virtually any time and place they choose without obstacles such as poor transportation, fear of street crime, or lack of expert teachers” (p. 76). The importance of this comes from the availability of leadership to those who might not have otherwise had the opportunity to study this program because of a lack of availability in their region.

While many experts note that leadership skills require students to attend traditional classrooms and be face-to-face with an educator, Krentler and Willis-Flurry

(2005) noted that online education proved to be beneficial in research conducted when dealing with certain programs:

Further research has supported the value of Internet technology in producing learning outcomes. Alon (2003) found that Internet-based experiential exercises produced increased international business skills and abilities among students, even though the students found the exercises only mildly enjoyable. (p. 317)

This research is indicative of the fact that online programs can be effective when teaching international business programs, but the question remains as to their effectiveness when teaching leadership programs. Lee and Hirumi (2004) and Moursund (1984) wrote that as new technologies such as distance education and distance education technologies are being developed, it becomes more and more important for each profession to examine its usefulness in developing students looking to that field of education.

This self-evaluation is just vital to the field of leadership, which many still view as a burgeoning field that continues to be developed. However, while distance education can make leadership programs available to a larger audience of would-be leaders, challenges in teaching this skill to students arise with this increase in distance. The main areas of concern in teaching leadership by way of distance education are how the programs themselves are implemented in traditional universities, the training and development of the faculty that will serve as educators in leadership programs and the communication that takes place in these online leadership programs.

Adapting Programs for Learners

The task of integrating leadership programs into the online world can be seen as a great challenge by the leaders who have decided this task is worth taking on. Altbach,

Berdahl, and Gumport (2005) wrote that there is a level of accountability to the public when offering a program online and that this is something leaders must consider when implementing such programs. Beaudoin (2004) noted that distance education must see this challenge as an exciting opportunity and must convince faculty of the excitement that this opportunity presents. This influence will motivate faculty to take on these innovative challenges and therefore shake up the status quo.

Leadership as a course of study has several guidelines that are widely thought to be necessary to properly distribute skills necessary for learners to develop leadership skills. The planning of any leadership program or even class involves research and planning to properly create a learning environment to foster leadership skills. While most leaders have grown accustomed to creating leadership programs within the confines of a traditional classroom, these same leaders may never have had to develop a similar program that utilizes the Internet to accomplish these same goals. One of the issues with distance education and the incorporation of this method of education is the lack of knowledge that many universities have when it comes to distributing knowledge through this means. While most educators have experience in dealing with learners in a traditional classroom, many of these same educators lack experience in teaching via an online classroom. At the same time, administrators lack experience in creating programs and curriculum that deals with an online environment. Holt and Thompson (1998) reported that institutions of higher education must truly become learning organizations in response to implementing information technology in the form of distance education. Holt and Thompson are referring to the fact that in order to become efficient at online education, universities must in fact be willing to learn how to do so and adapt in the methods they

use when adjustments need to be made. From there, changes will need to be made as they are deemed necessary by the leaders at universities who must take into consideration the needs of students and faculty when making decisions on any potential changes

Implementing an online education program requires a complete overhaul of a university's values when developing their online programs. In creating distance programs, Palloff and Pratt (1999) wrote that leaders must take into consideration seven characteristics or attributes of online programs that need to be met to meet the needs of distance learners. These characteristics include engaging diverse learners, promoting effective leadership from within and allowing students to resolve their own conflicts in order to encourage participants to assume leadership roles within the program. Thompson (1998) reinforced this list when noting that universities developing online education programs need to engage students with diverse needs and learning styles.

Incorporating Online Education

Mavrillac (2005) wrote that by determining that online education fits the mission and vision of the university, the university community provides a greater buy-in to the online education project through its entire life cycle. Training, mentoring, and support are key aspects to successful online education projects. This commitment to online education and the steps necessary to develop successful online programs is a delicate measure to undertake as many leaders of universities have little to no experience in developing a program of this nature.

In addition to developing the technology necessary to handle the rigors of an online program, many leaders neglect the very foundation necessary to teach the students who enroll in their online programs—the educators. Kagima and Hausafus (2001) and

Kowch (2004) wrote that institutions are often too focused on the technology aspect of developing their programs and thus forget about a key element to its success—the training of faculty that will be instructing in their online education programs. Faculty members of the institution are the key stakeholders in the online education project and because of this, faculty members should be included in the entire change management process whereby online education is implemented into a traditional institution (Kagima & Hausafus, 2001; Schraeder, Swamidass, & Morrison, 2006). Schraeder et al. (2006) wrote that faculty members at traditional universities are a key component to implementing technology via online education onto traditional academia noting that they are perhaps the most important element of this monumental change with traditional universities integrating distance education.

However, all of these points illustrate the fact that in a rush to implement online technology into their traditional academia, leaders at universities fail to consider the dangers they face in working too fast without considering the ramifications of doing so. Leaders without experience in conducting or developing online programs are thrust into the role of developing these programs because of the decreasing enrollment they face while witnessing the increase in enrollment in distance education programs often offering similar or identical programs. This problem is sometimes alleviated by some leaders who fully-educate themselves on the concept of online education before rolling out the initiative, but is furthered by other university leaders who insist on using a push-down strategy with little or even no knowledge of the whole concept of online education (Holt & Thompson, 1998; Martinez, 2002). This insistence in rolling out online programs

before faculty are prepared leads to several problems not only in education programs as a whole, but in leadership programs in particular. Robbins (2003) wrote:

If members of an organization have different assumptions about the nature of work activity and its relative importance to other activities, those differences will manifest themselves in frustration and communication breakdowns. (p. 143)

While this is a popular theory in the teaching of leadership, its ideals also hold true in the implementation of online education. The failure of leaders of universities to address the needs of the faculty who will be instructing students at their universities could potentially lead to frustration and dismay amongst educators in online education. The drawback of this frustration could be immense with the chance that many faculty members will ultimately give up on teaching leadership online leaving online leadership programs with a dearth of experienced faculty and only inexperienced faculty to distribute their learnings to students taking courses through distance education.

At the same time, this failure of university leaders to take into consideration the various needs that online schools need as opposed to traditional universities. As mentioned previously, some leaders fail to take into consideration the needs of faculty when developing online programs while others place an overemphasis on the technological needs, according to Ally and Coldeway (1999) and Harris (1999) who wrote that advancements in distance education technologies have been so wide sweeping that it has been masking the very nature of distance education as an instructional tool, which is leading to an overemphasis on technology without considering on its uses as an educational tool. Together with the consideration of the faculty's role in distance education presents the two largest problems leadership in universities must consider

when developing online leadership programs in traditional universities at a graduate school level.

Development of Technological Skills

Teachers' ability to develop technological skills that are pertinent to online studies is crucial to the success of any online program. Tompkins, Perry, and Lippincott (1998) noted, "The Internet seems to be changing the awareness of faculty about the role technology can play in their curriculum and in their students' professional lives" (p. 103). Because the majority of teachers at brick-and-mortar institutions are experienced in teaching in a traditional classroom setting, faculty must be informed of the importance of the usage of the Internet and its properties in conducting classrooms in a virtual world. Goddard (2002) wrote:

Because teachers are the key to their students' success in the classroom, teacher requirements for mastering new methods, knowledge, and techniques with regard to technology deserve particular attention. Integrating technology into the curriculum is only part of education reform. (p. 21)

A large part of the development of effectively teaching leadership via the World Wide Web is in developing a curriculum in order to do so. The development of a curriculum involves the leadership of those in charge of online education at their institutions, making their leadership integral to the effectiveness of teaching leadership online. Bates (2000) said that strong leadership and careful planning are critical to implementing technology and online education campus-wide. Bates also noted that incorporating online education into the academic experience is an essential part of becoming more responsive to the needs of higher education's diverse constituencies.

Bassi and Polifroni (2005) said that fundamental elements of a learning community include supportive and shared leadership, collective creativity, shared values and vision, shared personal practice, and supportive conditions. These features are among those that this paper will attempt to dissect in determining whether leadership skills can be transferred or taught to students online and if so, what the best methods for doing so are.

Teachers' willingness and ability to develop technological skills necessary to teach online is necessary for their success using this platform. The skills that teachers have developed and honed throughout their years of schooling and teaching must now meet an intersection where their technological skills must be a strong component in their teaching in online schools. In addition to developing these technological skills, they must find ways to utilize them in a manner that will make them effective leadership educators in online universities.

Importance of Communication to Online Education

Molenda and Robinson (2004) and Spotts and Bowman (1995) wrote that the evolution of distance education and the technologies used to support it represent a complex instructional delivery system that is both a delivery method and a form of instruction. This complex balance of technology and communication represents a new challenge for educators as they deal with ways to effectively communicate with students who are not likely to be in their presence. Moore (1998) argued that when developing distance education, universities must develop mechanisms by which learners can get continuous feedback from instructors. Moore said he believes that whatever technology is used, distance-learning systems must provide efficient learner-to-teacher communication channels for student advice and help. This includes not just the ability for students to

engage with educators, but also other students as well. This represents a vital component in the field of leadership where communication with others is a valuable learning tool for students in those programs and other programs as well. The Sloan Consortium (2002) emphasizes this same engagement between learners in distance programs noting that it promotes good practices for timely, supportive interaction, which promotes shared teaching, learning, discovery and growth. If valid in the case of online leadership programs, this detail could prove to be one of the keys to developing an effective online leadership program.

Take for instance the idea and education of transformational leadership. Leithwood (1994) said that in order for transformational leadership to be effective, there are six dimensions that need to take place: articulating a vision, fostering group goals, conveying high-performance expectations, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, and modeling best practices and values. The challenge that faculty members that are teaching online face is being able to work to develop those six dimensions and educate their students on those by way of communicating online. This effort will obviously include a two-way communication between the educator and learner and active communication that will need to take place among team members within the virtual classroom. Being able to reinforce the importance of the six dimensions of transformational leadership or whichever leadership method is being taught through online communication means will be a challenge for any online educator in a leadership program as leadership skills are developed in part, by way of interactions with classmates and educators whose ideas and values are a key component of building leadership skills.

Masood, Dani, Burns, and Backhouse (2006) noted, “Leadership is a stream of evolving interrelationships in which leaders are continuously evoking motivational responses from followers and modifying their behaviours as they meet responsiveness or resistance, in a ceaseless process of flow and counter flow” (p. 943). This interaction is particularly important and utilizes one of the primary skills necessary to develop leadership skills. According to Thomas (2004), being a great communicator is an important characteristic of being a leader. Robbins (2003) wrote, “Communication fosters motivation by clarifying for employees what is to be done, how well they are doing and what can be done to improve performance if it’s subpar” (p. 137). And teaching learners how to become leaders becomes an even greater challenge with educators who are not proficient in their usage of the Internet as a way to distribute leadership education. Olliges, Wernet, and Delicath (1999) wrote that there are several areas that educators must become proficient in using as a platform of communication to be successful in online education. Included in those are Web course tools, including static and dynamic Web pages, threaded discussion groups, email, chat, instant messaging, streaming media/video, animations, applications sharing and Internet Protocol audio-video conferencing to optimize delivery of instructional materials. So in addition to the primary leadership skills that an educator must distribute by way of distance education, an online educator must master the aforementioned methods of communication to effectively communicate through the use of distance education. No longer can they rely on educating by way of vocally explaining the importance of leadership and the theories that need to be exhibited. Instead, they will need to find ways to exhibit these same theories by way of a number of online communication platforms. However, one of the issues with the

communication via online platforms is the technical aspect that can go far beyond the capabilities of the average faculty member. Using the Internet to communicate with students can be complex, involving a vast team to integrate the technological aspects of distance education including technicians, support staff, faculty, trainers, facilities, and instructional tools (Anderson, 2004; Bates, 1995; Christo-Baker, 2004; DuMont, 2002; Moore & Kearsley, 1996). Should this requirement go beyond an educator's abilities, training and/or development may need to take place in order to develop this set of skills.

Developing Online Teaching Skills

Ultimately, it is up to faculty members to take on the challenge of developing skills necessary to teach using the Internet. Maddux and Johnson (1997) noted:

Of all the things we have learned in educational technology, the most certain is that any technology is only as good as the skills and the attitudes of the people who use it and the educational methods and strategies they devise and implement.
(p. 5)

While leadership faculty may not always have the technical skills necessary to effectively teach leadership, it is ultimately up to them to develop and hone these skills effectively in order to properly teach leadership to their students. Without this dedication, professors at a distance education institution are likely to struggle to communicate effectively with their students who are as dependent on the Internet to learn, as the faculty is to educate from a distance by use of the technology made available through the institution and the World Wide Web.

Goleman (2002) said that learning often happens best when using two or three types of the following learning models:

- Concrete experience: Having an experience that allows them to see and feel what it is like;
- Reflection: Thinking about their own and others' experience;
- Model Building: Coming up with a theory that makes sense of what they observe;
- Trial-and-Error Learning: Trying something out actively experimenting with a new approach (pp. 150–151).

Hiring Educators for Online Education

The challenge in hiring a faculty in distance education is finding educators who can deliver the above learning models by way of the Internet and its often less-than-ideal environment for educators. In looking to hire a faculty member, determining whether he or she can utilize online technologies in teaching using the six learning models proposed by Goleman can be a very strong gauge.

In addition, hiring the right faculty members to educate students looking to take on distance education programs, leaders at universities have to make sure to address the needs and wants of these registering students. Moskal and Dziuban (2001) found that the top three reasons that students enroll in online courses were flexibility, curiosity about or desire to try online courses, and the avoidance of scheduling conflicts associated with traditional classes. Because distance education takes place primarily online, two of the three reasons students taking online courses are addressed primarily by creating an online program. However, the third need is a main point leaders need to address when hiring faculty members for positions within leadership programs.

Traditional universities have long-held on to the ideal setting and faculty members. Bates (2000) wrote that many in higher education cling to the ideal that includes soft-focus images of professors wearing academia regalia, students reading on grassy quadrangles, and venerable, ivy-covered buildings. This ideal is one of several that will have to be hurdled as leaders work to develop a leadership faculty in an online university. Jaffee (1998) said that there is a mythology associated with technology in an attempt to explain faculty resistance to distance learning when he noted that whether faculty use technology depends on how well it modifies the faculty's rationalized myths, most notably the belief that classroom instruction is the best means for student learning. This belief confirms a deep, long-standing tradition and belief that potential educators will have to overcome in order to embrace teaching online. This motivation to succeed at online education is important for leaders to remember when hiring faculty, according to Freiberg and Freiberg (2004) who wrote that hiring is a two-way street and that when leaders are hiring educators, they need to ask themselves, "Will someone of this caliber find our culture attractive?" If the answer is no, figure out why. Is he or she just a mismatch for you, or do you need to work toward changing this culture? If the latter, perhaps this hire would be a first step" (p. 113). This viewpoint is particularly important as a result of the different culture of the online educator. The aforementioned traditional ideal of traditional classroom settings with grassy quadrangles and professors wearing academic regalia gives way to a new culture in the online world. Instead of making their way to a classroom and delivering lectures to a classroom full of students, the online educator must be accustomed to or be able to acclimate themselves to logging on to a computer at a set time and lecturing using one of the handful of tools that are available to

communicate with. Relan and Gilliani (1997) said that because online learning is more flexible in terms of time, students should expect more flexibility in instructional methods than they would receive in classroom instruction. As opposed to office hours or appointments, teaching in an online world demands much flexibility of the online educator to be available through e-mail and/or chat at various times to accommodate students with various schedules or even who are located in different parts of the world in different time zones. This requires availability on a much broader scale than most educators may be used to in a traditional learning environment.

Kowch (2004) wrote that faculty members are the key to the success of online education programs and that once the faculty has embraced the change from a traditional university and have accepted the technical and instructional training to be successful, a key factor for the success of online education programs will be set in place. Once faculty has accepted their place in the online world and the development needed to take place in order to satisfy students who have taken to distance education because of the flexibility it offers over a traditional classroom setting, then an online education program has the settings in place to be successful. The key for leaders in a university setting is to find the right faculty members for this unique teaching challenge.

Ultimately, finding the right educators to teach leadership comes down to finding faculty whose background provides him or her with the skill set and education to teach leadership, but also one that can utilize the Internet's capability to encourage thought and exchange amongst the students within the distance education group, often known as a cohort. Lewis and Farrell (2005) produced a study that indicated that perhaps the best methods of teaching leadership might be to include the know-how of more than one

faculty member when teaching leadership. Lewis and Farrell showed this when studying nursing leadership programs that were conducted online when they said that a distance education model that focuses on collaboration and learning rather than the presentation of knowledge may be beneficial for leadership development. Lewis and Farrell recommended that a network of educational leaders be formed for exchanging information, resources, and strategies for the purpose of pooling resources in order to develop a distance education program for nursing leadership. While the duo produced these results by studying nursing programs, the report is interesting and could be applicable to all leadership programs. Maloney-Krichmar and Preece (2005) found that in a 2.5-year study of a thriving online health community that the reasons for success included members having a sense of community and stability with members being linked to resources both within and outside the group, and members' offline lives were positively influenced by their online participation. Both of these studies reflect a feeling that learners in an online arena may receive the most benefit in receiving learning from numerous sources, both within their learning group and outside of it.

Saba (1990) said that distance education's constantly evolving manner and technology requires teachers to maximize critical dialog because it enables a balance between "dialog" and the structure of the program. In other words, what determines the quality of an online program and student growth and satisfaction is the attention they receive from their teachers and the interactive network they learn in. While many traditional and online leadership programs utilize communication within cohorts as a teaching tool, the studies shown here may reveal that the best way for students in an online environment to learn in is having multiple teachers from whom they can receive

guidance. So while hiring individual faculty to teach leadership may be important, of equal or even greater importance is to develop an entire group of teachers that can work together to develop a rapport with students as a whole to improve the quality of learning and ultimately the satisfaction of the program that students will get from an online leadership program.

In a traditional teaching classroom, students show up for class while a teacher instructs his or her students on whatever lessons make up the day's curriculum. Teaching online requires educators to employ that they will need to become familiar with new tactics in order to instruct students and that distance-learning programs need to provide systematic, over, conscious, and institutionalized conditions that are learner-friendly. These programs need to be strategically placed and well tested with feedback mechanisms to provide efficient communication channels between students and instructors while also having support mechanisms in place to provide advice to students on learning related problems. These problems can include communication problems as well as technical problems, which can require support systems outside of the faculty's immediate control. At the same time, Mohammed and Fahy (2002) said that each distance educator must be capable of using different types of online platforms including chat and e-mail to allow students to use the method that best fits their own learning styles. This represents a change from a traditional learning environment where a teacher was most often responsible for showing up to class and delivering a lecture while also being responsible for office hours or other meeting times. Harris (1999) said that while there have been several technological advancements in distance education, there has been a dearth of development in the area where it may be of the greatest benefit—as an

instructional tool. Many would argue this point, noting instead that the tools are in place as an instructional tool; however, the training of faculty, which was mentioned previously, is lacking to the point that teachers are having trouble utilizing tools necessary for online education. Rogers (2003) said that lack of faculty adoption may be because of differences in faculty perceptions regarding technology and that faculty members' willingness to accept changes in technology have them ranging from what he refers to as early adopters, early majority, late majority and finally, laggards. These categories, established by Rogers, indicate the timing at which faculty members accept the changes in technology and adopt them in teaching learners within their online classrooms. Vadanovich and Piotroski (2001) said, "It would be fruitful for future research to investigate why faculty in the behavioral sciences do not incorporate complex Internet functions to identify methods to help increase instructional technology usage in the university level teaching" (p. 255). If a solution to this issue can be resolved, perhaps we will see an increase in the number of faculty becoming comfortable using online technologies in teaching learners online.

In the meantime, Bishop (2007) said, "An online community can have the right tools, the right chat platform, and the right ethos, but if community members are not participating, the community will not flourish" (p. 1887). In fact, Bishop notes that a new type of student known as a lurker can take an online course but not participate. In order for a student to participate in an activity such as posting a message in an online forum, the person needs to have a desire to post a message, and that this desire needs to be consistent with the person's goals, plans, values, beliefs, and interests and the person needs to have the tools and abilities to post the message. In addition to ensuring students

have the right tools on their end of the learning spectrum to actively participate in an online education arena; educators also must address ways to get students to engage in the process as well. Knowlton (2005) said that these passive participants are referred to as lurkers who read discussion contributions, but do not participate in the discussion. Passive participants tend to lack knowledge of environmental logistics, and are uncomfortable with text-based discussions. Unfortunately for these lurkers, online education is made up almost entirely of discussion-based learning, resulting in these students lacking a full grasp and understanding of the courses they are taking because of their lack of participation. Faculty members teaching online must not only grasp the technology of teaching online, but also find ways to engage these students by way of the limited means available to them online. Barker (2004) said that this shift in paradigms is a difficult one and identified that educators as well as learners struggle with the shift from traditional learning that is engaging, deep, long lasting, and achieved in an online format. At the same time, learners must accept the active and engaging learning model that is different from a traditional passive model of listening to lectures. Learners looking to make his transition need to be self-directed, self-disciplined and have good time management skills (Barker, 2004; Kozlowski, 2004; Rovai, 2003). Still, it remains up to educators to make sure that students enrolled in their programs are engaging with faculty and one another in online classes.

Maloney-Krichmar and Preece (2005) said that facilitators should keep a low profile in online communities to encourage self-moderation that will help develop group norms. Garrison (2006) said that a facilitator fulfills numerous roles in an online environment including being responsible for establishing trust and a level of comfort

within the learning community while Ali, Hodson-Carlton, and Ryan (2004), Diekelmann and Mendias (2005) said that facilitators need to create a supportive presence while attending to and facilitating participants' knowing and connecting with one another. Palloff and Pratt (2005) noted that in addition to all of the aforementioned ideals, educators should develop nurturing relationships to promote self-organizations and empowerment. The trick for faculty is finding ways to do so using the tools that are available to them online. More than any other component of online education, the ability to develop and facilitate online teaching skills impacts the success of all online programs. Despite the potential of distance education, integration has not kept pace with the potential of distance education programs (Bichelmeyer & Molenda, 2005; Green, 2000). Faculty members' knowledge of technology and ability or willingness to integrate this technology into their instruction remains the most critical challenge that instructors teaching at distance education face (Tabata & Johnsrud, 2008).

The integration of technology into the curriculum that educators in leadership programs design is the most challenging aspect of all distance education programs and most notably that of leadership programs. Leadership programs place a heavy reliance on communication and engagement of team members with each other that is often restricted by the online realm. Instead of being able to engage students in discussions in a classroom setting, educators instead have to rely on a series of online tools such as chat, e-mail, message boards and other tools in order to engage students to develop leadership skills. At the same time, educators need to find a way to ensure that all learners are in fact participating in discussion without being able to work with them in a traditional setting. Pierson (2001) argued that educators making their way into the online world need to have

a certain level of technological knowledge and those faculty members who had mastered the necessary technology found that technology did not compete with teaching online. This revelation shows that if faculty develops online tools and skills, online programs can be taught effectively. While challenges will continue to arise regarding teaching online, if tools are mastered, these obstacles can be overcome and teaching online can be as effective as teaching in a traditional classroom.

Accreditation

Singh and Means (2000) wrote that with the ever-increasing demands for accountability and standardization, the function of technology in education in the United States stands to be affected greatly by educational reform and organizational changes. Chief amongst these changes seems to be those by government agencies to determine the reputability of online programs offering distance education within the United States. According to the NCES (2004), there are more than 4,200 higher education institutions that utilize distance education programs. This number is up from 1,100 that were reported in *Peterson's* (2005) *Guide to Distance Learning Programs*. In 2004–2005, 86% of 4-year, public degree granting higher education institutions offered distance education courses, compared to 78% in 1997–1998 (NCES, 2004, 2006b).

This rapid growth of distance education program and the questionability of the quality of some of these programs bring with it the question of reputability. This growth and popularity has made it necessary to have accrediting bodies responsible solely to watch over these programs to ensure their reputability. A number of researchers have noted that the rapid growth may pose challenges for accrediting agencies, which may affect quality (Harley & Lawrence, 2006; Lee & Hirumi, 2004; Ruth, Sammons, &

Poulin, 2007). This issue represents a sizable hurdle for distance education institutions looking to secure accreditation and credentials. Of particular note, many researchers point to the fact that many institutions develop the infrastructure of distance education without a clear vision as to how they will utilize distance education and its technologies (Lao & Gonzales, 2005; Levine & Sun, 2002).

These developments have come about as a result of several issues that have been brought up, including criticism of accreditation, students' motivation, student retention, and student isolation, which have resulted in online education leaders being placed under an increased amount of scrutiny (Ertl, Winkler, & Mandl 2007). These questions about the credibility of distance education and the institutions which make up this division of education will continue to be an issue for all distance education programs as they look to develop further into this area.

Student Requirements in an Online Environment

Moore and Kearsley (1996) said that retention rates for distance education have ranged from 20% to 50%, something that Fisher (2003) says is partially a result of the students' inability to become invested in their own learning. Fisher said that rather than students being told what to do, they should be guided in how to accomplish something that they have decided upon in collaboration with their cohorts. An inability or lack of desire to do so could result in students becoming disenchanted with the program as a whole and leaving the program. This could be a large part of why student retention rates for distance education is so poor.

This notion holds true for distance education leadership programs as well. Students enrolled in an online leadership program need to be proactive in their learning.

While some of this responsibility lies on the educator and the manner in which the coursework is conducted, learners also must bear the majority of the responsibility in the education that they garner from an online leadership course. Typically, traditional and online leadership courses are conducted in a manner in which class members remain in the same group or cohort throughout their education, which fits within the confines that some researchers found when determining best practices for learners to develop skills when enrolled in an online program. Ku, Cheng, and Lohr (2006) studied 94 graduate students who were enrolled in an online instructional-design course and found that for students to work well in an online collaborative setting, members need to practice what they termed the five Cs: communicate, cooperate, compromise, complement and commitment.

When it comes to communication, team members are required to communicate not only with educators, but also other members of their cohort as well. Anderson (2004) explained the significance in interaction in distance education programs when he stated, “the greatest affordance of the Web for educational use is the profound and multifaceted increase in communication and interaction capability that it provides” (p. 45). Students in distance education programs need to utilize this interaction capability in their leadership program to benefit fully from their experience in online courses.

Cooperation pertains to teams in a cohort working together on strategies within the program. Fisher (2003) said that this is an important component of online education, as this format will nurture and strengthen learning communities by having all of the students working together throughout the program. This will develop strong intra- and

interrelationships and a strong sense of collaboration, interactivity and mutual support between all participants in the program—including the faculty.

Compromise, the third C that Ku et al. (2006) noted, is a product of the work that team members must do in brainstorming ideas and reaching agreements to finalize project topics, set reasonable deadlines for the group and accommodate varying schedules. The fourth C, complement, focuses on team members strengths and their ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses while also combining expertise and sharing skills in order to develop the strongest team possible and accomplish tasks and goals. Finally, the fifth C stands for commitment. This commitment refers to the respect team members have to have for each other to abide by deadlines and work together to resolve differences within the group without having to involve instructors in any potential situations that may arise.

Haworth and Conrad (1997) mentioned that a big part of the value that students will receive from online education would come from the mutually enriching interaction that students will have with faculty members that they can later integrate into real-world problems and situations. This interaction will also serve to help them reach career goals by not only widening their network, but also by enriching their knowledge and their understanding of professional practice. This interaction should be a natural progression of any leadership program, but students who feel as though they are not in receipt of this should be proactive and make an effort to develop this interaction with faculty members and other students.

Summary

The need and demand for distance education has drawn many traditional education institutions into the realm of distance education. Mariasingham and Hanna

(2006) established several benchmarks that should be established a series of benchmarks that education leaders should use to measure distance education programs. These benchmarks exist at three levels—the institutional level, the program level and the course level for maximum opportunity in distance education. At the institutional level, leaders need to look at the level of organizational commitment, the financial levels of support for online degree programs, and whether the institution has channels to address complex internal challenges and issues. At the program level, Mariasingham and Hanna propose that benchmarks should focus on elements that are critical to student learning, including inputs, processes, and support requirements. Finally, at the course level, benchmarks should include performance measures for technology, instructional design, and learner interaction. These benchmarks fall into line with much of what experts have recommended as ways to measure performance of online institutions. Leaders must focus on the financial components of online education and getting the right faculty into place, while faculty and students need to pay particular attention to the interaction and tools that are involved with distance education. Mainstream faculty members' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding distance education and technology remain critical uninvestigated factors affecting adoption (Bruner, 2007; Dillon & Walsh, 1992; Groves & Zemel, 2000; Santilli & Beck, 2005; Spotts & Bowman, 1995; Thach & Murphy, 1995). Lee and Hirumi (2004) said that as distance education and its technologies proliferate in higher education, there is a need for disciplines to consider how these new tools will impact their respective professions and the programs. Nowhere is this statement more accurate than in the field of leadership where a new wave of programs is being offered by way of distance education courses.

Leadership programs are relatively new to the field of distance education. Because of this, the guidelines for administering an education in this discipline have not been established and instead, methods drawn from general distance education for the norms of teaching leadership programs online will need to be established. While setting up these courses and programs, leaders and faculty members need to take into consideration what distance education's short history has already shown. The success of any online program is dependent upon a comprehensive orientation program including information on accessing resources, learning community norms, strategies for success, and a detailed orientation to the technology (Mueller & Billings, 2006; Ostrow & DiMaria-Ghalili, 2005). Baker and Woods (2002) emphasized that online learning puts added responsibilities on the teacher and the programmers to foster a communication-rich environment that can help develop the communal scaffolding necessary to support an effective and rich online environment.

As stated in this chapter, these are the areas that any leadership program would likely have to focus on as they enter the realm of distance education. This chapter has provided what several industry experts have mentioned as specific areas that all distance education programs need to focus on whether that be the leaders who develop the program and place the faculty that will be conducting online courses, the faculty themselves who need to acclimate themselves to the world of teaching in the online realm, or what students need to focus on as students on within their programs and how faculty should teach them. These rules apply to all programs including that of leadership, which the rest of this paper will continue to focus on. The meeting of distance education and leadership will provide many challenges for all of those involved. The Web-Based

Education Commission (2000) noted, “The power of the Internet to transform the educational experience is awe-inspiring” (p. i). Whether faculty members can translate this to also include leadership programs in distance education programs remains to be seen.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Research Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation was to uncover best practices for leaders of institutions offering distance education and teachers using this format when conducting leadership programs online. The general purposes of the following study will be:

1. To determine what method(s) of communication are most effective for teachers to use in a distance education program;
2. How faculty members can go about reaching students who are lurkers within their virtual classrooms;
3. To identify areas of concern and opportunity of faculty and leadership in distance education programs;
4. To examine the interaction of faculty and leaders within a university to determine areas of opportunity in online leadership programs;
5. To determine best practice methods for leadership faculty and leaders in distance education programs.

Research Design

In order to determine this, a qualitative case study was conducted in which faculty and leaders from existing online leadership programs were questioned to provide feedback on the questions above. Questionnaires were delivered to faculty members who agreed to participate, which contained a series of questions that utilized a research design that was exploratory, using a mixed-method approach containing data from surveys in order to gain as much data on the topic as possible within a reasonable amount of time. This data was then taken and used to determine answers to the primary research topic in

concluding which methods are best for teaching and developing leadership skills by way of distance education.

Research Methods

Several different methods were considered in determining best practices for teaching leadership in an online course before a decision was made. The first research method taken into consideration was that of a case study. Merriam (2002) defined a case study as an intensive description and analysis of a phenomenon or social unity such as an individual, group, institution, or community. She noted that the best instance to use a case study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for all parties involved. Merriam said there are three different types of case studies—particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic, all of which are significant for what they disclose about a particular phenomenon. Further describing the process of a case study, Merriam (1998) said that concentration is focused on a single phenomenon or entity where the researcher aims to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon. Willis (2008) echoed Merriam's ideas, but emphasized that—for interpretivists and critical theorists alike, one of the advantages of the case study as a research method is that it allows the scholar to take a holistic approach to studying a phenomenon in its natural setting. A case study was ultimately rejected, as the study of best practices of teaching an online leadership course involves neither a single instance nor phenomenon to be studied by way of a case study.

Another method considered for this study was to exclusively use questionnaires to gather data. The limitation of this form of research resulted in this sole use of research not being sufficient for the study. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) and Wimmer and

Dominick (2006) said there is a major disadvantage to using questionnaires and that is the low response rate as well as the inability to determine who really completed the questionnaire. In addition, researchers oftentimes refuse to complete questionnaires unless they are interested in the subject matter.

In addition, a collection of personal interviews conducted with educators at institutions of distance education was also considered. However, Wimmer and Dominick (2006) cited disadvantages of personal interviews, including time and cost, organization and bias, noting, “The physical appearance, age, gender, dress, nonverbal behavior, and comments of the interviewed may prompt respondents to answer questions untruthfully” (p. 202). Used exclusively, this method would have been particularly expensive because of the time and logistical issues interviewing personnel from various distance education institutions would have risen. These interviews, which will take place in lieu of in-person interviews, were conducted by way of the Internet. Wimmer and Dominick said interviews conducted in this nature by way of personal computer were unique for the following reasons:

1. They generally use smaller samples.
2. They provide detailed background about the reasons why respondents give specific answers. Elaborate data concerning respondents’ opinions, values, motivations, recollections, experiences, and feelings are obtained.
3. They allow for lengthy observation of respondents’ nonverbal responses.
4. They are usually very long. Unlike personal interviews used in survey research that may only last a couple of minutes, an intensive interview may last several hours and may take more than one session.

5. They can be customized to individual respondents. In a personal interview, all respondents are usually asked the same questions. Intensive interviews allow interviewers to form questions based on each respondents' answers.
6. They can be influenced by the interview climate. To a greater extent than with personal interviews, the success of intensive interviews depends on the rapport established between the interviewer and respondents (p. 135).

These reasons will make the interviews conducted by way of the Internet interesting and will also likely provide a wide array of in-depth responses. This likely will make this a vital part of the study and provide research that would probably not have been uncovered had a mixed-method study not been used and in-depth open-ended questions by way of Internet been decided as a method to conduct part of the research.

Ultimately, the decision to use a mixed-methods approach was determined to be the best fit for this study with a combination of questionnaires and in-depth open-ended questions to be used. Creswell and Plano-Clark (2007) said that a triangulation mixed methods approach involves different but complementary data collected on the same topic while Wimmer and Dominick (2006) said that triangulation, or combining the use of questionnaires and interviews, or in the case of this research, open-ended questions, aids in the establishment of credibility. Additionally, triangulation “diminishes the impact of selective perception and reactivity” (p. 123). McMillan and Schumacher (2001) said that a mixed-methods approach is one in which, “multiple strategies are used to collect and corroborate the data obtained from any single strategy and/or ways to confirm data within a single strategy of data collection” (p. 428). Glense (2006) said that qualitative research is based upon the assumption that an individual socially constructs reality based on his or

her experiences and that it is interpretive (based on inductive thinking) and naturalistic (conducted in a natural setting). Glense said that qualitative research is concerned with people's individual meaning and interpretations of phenomenon in real life and that the purpose of qualitative research was to conceptualize, interpret, and understand phenomenon. This combination will allow for both qualitative and quantitative methods of research to be performed, which will be important for this study. The questionnaires will likely prove to be an important part of the study, providing a statistical analysis of feedback from educators at distance education programs across the nation. As noted by several researchers (Linehan, 2001; Trevino, Brown, & Hartman, 2003), convincing individuals in top leadership positions to participate in research designs such as in-depth interviews that provide richer data is difficult, again, because of time constraints for these individuals. However, this part of the research that will be conducted will be vital to the study in determining in-depth viewpoints from these individuals in positions of leadership from higher education institutions.

Selection of Recipients

A total of 78 recipients from colleges and universities that met the following criteria were chosen for this study. The schools chosen for the distance education portion of the research met the following criteria:

- Be accredited by the Distance Education and Training Council and/or a regional accrediting body,
- Offer a variation of a leadership degree or certificate by way of distance education,
- At least 60% of the leadership classes take place through distance education.

In choosing schools, an Internet search for online leadership degree was conducted to reveal the schools to be chosen for this research. From there, universities were broken into two categories—traditional universities and distance education universities.

Traditional universities will be categorized according to more than 60% of leadership degrees being offered primarily in a distance education or hybrid format. At that point, the distance education universities will be separated and contacted to determine interest in participating in this research project.

Selection of Contacts

In order to get the best response for this study, a strong preference will be placed on the faculty members who engage with learners in teaching leadership online.

Therefore each faculty member whose contact information can be obtained through the school department's Web site was sent an e-mail asking if they would be interested in participating. If no contact is established, a second e-mail was sent with the subject of the e-mail indicating that it was the second attempt at contact with a third and final e-mail being sent if contact still cannot be established. Again, the subject of the e-mail indicated that this was the third and final attempt at trying to establish contact.

If contact was established and interest in participating in the survey and/or in-depth interview was indicated, thank you e-mail messages were sent to the respondent and contact information and the e-mail was stored in a folder established for positive responses. Within the thank you e-mail to be sent to recipients was a copy of the questionnaire, if that option was chosen. Instruction on how to complete the questionnaire, which was actually completed on SurveyMonkey.com, will be included. If the recipient chose to do so, he or she was welcomed to also answer a series of open-

ended questions. Instructions on completing these questions were presented in e-mail responses to participants.

Receiving and Usage of Information

To begin with, this research required the uploading of the survey questions to be presented in this study on to the Web site SurveyMonkey.com, a Web site that allows surveys to be created and hosted on the site. Once the account was created on this site, the survey was created using the title, “Teaching Leadership By Distance Education.” From there, questions were uploaded using the “Rating Scale” option, which provided boxes that survey takers will be able to mark to enter answers for the corresponding survey question. The information gathered from the surveys was then used to provide a statistical analysis on the best practices for teaching leadership online in the form of the surveys and the responses gathered from the responses.

When surveys were completed and returned through Survey Monkey, a separate folder will be kept for each recipient with this downloaded data. The data from each respondent was then entered into SPSS software and compiled to analyze. After this information was accumulated from SPSS, the compiled data was put into a Microsoft Excel sheet where the average of responses was then reviewed and assessed in determining levels of importance and comfort levels of the various questions asked. Once compiled, the statistical averages of each question was entered next to the corresponding question in a separate Microsoft Excel sheet in order to show an average score of all the respondent’s responses for each question based on the Likert scale for that query. That information was then used to determine a comfort level or importance level of that

particular question from the personnel surveyed in this study and presented as part of the recommendation made from the conclusion of the study.

Respondents were also asked via e-mail to respond to five open-ended questions in addition to the Likert scale questions, which were also located on the Survey Monkey Web site. These questions will require written responses from the respondents and were optional for respondents to complete. The information from these responses were separated from the Likert scale questions and were evaluated on a respondent-to-respondent basis. These questions were gathered, read and assessed by the researcher who will then make recommendations for teaching leadership online from these responses. Because these responses were written out and assessed individually by the researcher conducting this project, no statistical software was needed nor used in assessing this information.

Following the gathering of both sets of data, the information gathered from the Likert scale surveys was coupled with the data collected from in-depth interviews response received creating a folder for each participant. This folder was labeled with the participants name in a subfolder from the larger folder where all data will be stored for this research project.

Following the completion of this project, all statistical data was presented in a chart within the recommendations with a detailed analysis of the averages of the responses to the corresponding questions. Recommendations and a total analysis of the responses and the statistical data concluded the section analyzing the respondents' responses in this section of the research project. This analysis was then followed by an analysis of responses to the open-ended questions on the survey and recommendations

based on the analyses of these questions. Because of the nature of these responses and the in-depth information gathered from these responses, an in-depth analysis of each question with select snippets of information gathered from responses that are returned made up this section. All of this was used to present findings and recommendations from the questions presented to educators in leadership programs that were taught at least 60% online who agreed to participate in this study.

Sources of Data

The primary sources of data came from faculty members and leaders in traditional and distance education programs that feature leadership programs in some capacity. Many online programs feature leadership programs that are paired together with another discipline such as management or some related program. In this case, posed questions were focused primarily on the leadership aspect of these programs and participants were asked in advance to limit the scope of their responses to this portion of their programs and/or teaching. Participation in these interviews was relegated to experts in the field of distance education leadership from traditional and for-profit education universities.

Interview Process

Interviews by way of open-ended questions for this study were conducted strictly via the Survey Monkey Web site. Interviews were conducted through the Survey Monkey Web site and it was made clear to participants that answering these questions was completely voluntary and was not a necessary part of taking part in the study. Likert scale surveys were conducted by use of the same Survey Monkey platform in order to have written record of the participants' responses to the questions posed to them.

The participants for this qualitative research used research subjects based upon their profession within the two different types of online universities being studied. This research, which will be used to “gain a deeper understanding of some phenomenon experienced by a carefully selected group of people” (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p. 56) was used to determine the various experiences that each of the subjects in this study encounter when undergoing their work in their schools.

Survey Questions

The questions posed in this survey are based upon the findings of several researchers and the information they have presented. Each participant in this study was asked to answer the questions below using the Likert scale presented previously. Each participant was asked to respond to each of the following questions with a response ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree,” as was previously displayed. Table 1 contains the questions respondents were asked to answer along with the supporting researcher whose findings the question was based upon.

Table 1

Survey Questions and Related Researchers

Survey Question	Supporting Researcher	Related Research Question (p. 8)
1. <i>Communication barriers are not an issue in online leadership courses.</i>	Anderson, 2004; Bangert, 2005; Mancuso-Murphy, 2007; Posey & Pintz, 2006; Ryan et al., 2005; Schell, 2006	1, 2, 5
2. <i>Having to develop new technological skills to teach an online class proved to be onerous.</i>	Pyle & Dziuban, 2001	1, 3

(table continues)

Survey Question	Supporting Researcher	Related Research Question (p. 8)
3. <i>Students entering the online leadership program possessed the technical savvy to be successful in the program.</i>	Beaudoin, 2003; Black, 2003; O'Banion, 1997; Barker, 2004; McNeil, Elfrink, Beyea, Pierce, & Bickford, 2006	5
4. <i>In teaching leadership online, I have rarely encountered students who have not willingly participated.</i>	Bishop, 2007	2, 5
5. <i>Do you expect students that earn a leadership degree to have the same opportunities in career advancement that a student that attains the same degree in a traditional college?</i>	Saba, 1999; Swan, 2004	5
6. <i>I have had no problems adjusting my schedule to meet the availability of my students.</i>	Bates, 2000	3
7. <i>Online chat is a preferred medium when teaching online leadership courses.</i>	Olliges, Wernet, & Delicath, 1999; Barker, 2004; McNeil et al., 2003	1, 2
8. <i>Working adults have traditionally made up the majority of the students in my classes.</i>	O'Banion, 1997; Simonson, Smaldino, Albright, & Zvacek, 2003	5
9. <i>I see evidence of critical thinking in my online classes.</i>	Beaudoin., 2003; Black, 2003; O'Banion, 1997	5
10. <i>All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions.</i>	Anderson, 2004; Moore, 1998	1, 2, 5
11. <i>Communication by way of e-mail has not been a problem.</i>	Olliges, Wernet, & Delicath, 1999	1, 2

(table continues)

Survey Question	Supporting Researcher	Related Research Question (p. 8)
12. <i>The liberating platform of online communication has been a positive in teaching leadership online.</i>	Anderson, 2004; Moore, 1998	2
13. <i>The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than an online-only program.</i>	Allen & Seaman, 2003	4, 5
14. <i>Had it been available, online education would have been my preferred means of obtaining my degree.</i>	Moskal & Dziuban, 2001; NCES, 2003; O'Banion, 1997	3, 5
15. <i>Online classes are as effective for teaching and learning as is a traditional class.</i>	Allen & Seaman, 2003; Anderson, 2004; Carey, 2002; Carr, 2000; Hogan, 1997; Russell, 2001, 2004; Tham & Werner, 2005	1, 4, 5
16. <i>I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs.</i>	Allen & Seaman, 2003; Anderson, 2004; Carey, 2002; Carr, 2000; Hogan, 1997; Russell, 2001, 2004; Tham & Werner, 2005	1, 4, 5

Each of the questions above is based upon the findings of the researcher in the corresponding column. In addition, a third column correlates the corresponding survey question to the research question it will help ascertain, found on page eight. Below is a breakdown of the researcher's findings as well as a description as to why the question was asked and how the question will benefit the field of teaching leadership online:

Communication barriers are not an issue in online leadership courses. Communication is one of the most important features of teaching leadership via any platform. And because of the unique nature and settings of online education,

communication can be a difficult prospect. This question stems from Anderson (2004) who noted, “the greatest affordance of the Web for educational use is the profound and multifaceted increase in communication and interaction capability that it provides” (p. 45). Bangert (2005) and others noted that communication style is crucial for learner and educator to connect in an online format. This question sought to determine whether communication is an issue for educators teaching leadership in an online format.

Having to develop new technological skills to teach an online class proved to be onerous. Pyle and Dziuban (2001) noted that one of the concerns of using technology-based instruction is that technology would be driving education as opposed to technology being used as an educational tool. This question sought to derive whether educators had to develop technology skills to teach leadership online and if so, whether developing these skills proved to be a hindrance to the educator’s experience.

Students entering the online leadership program possessed the technical savvy to be successful in the program. O’Banion (1997) came to the conclusion that many learners need an alternative to traditional education, particularly older students who have a family and/or job that would otherwise make attending traditional education programs difficult. Barker (2004) and several other researchers noted that participating in an online learning environment requires basic computer skills to understand Internet protocols as well as perform otherwise simple tasks such as attaching files to e-mail. These requirements provided the impetus this question was added to the survey.

In teaching leadership online, I have rarely encountered

students who have not willingly participated. Bishop (2007) said that even though an online learning community has the right tools, chat platform and ethos, and lack of participation by learners can make the online experience a failure. Leadership as a discipline requires interaction between not only learners and educators, but between learners themselves. If students were refusing to participate, it would make the prospect of teaching leadership online a very difficult one. These students, who are referred to as “lurkers,” make teaching leadership for educators more difficult and is the reason this question was added to this survey.

Do you expect students that earn a leadership degree to have the same opportunities in career advancement that a student that attains the same degree in a traditional college? Saba (1999) noted that there is no evidence of any measurable data that shows that attaining a degree by means of distance education will limit career opportunities compared to students attaining the same degree by way of a traditional university. This question sought the opinion of educators who are teaching leadership courses through distance education regarding their students and the impact of the degree will have on their career prospects in comparison to students earning the same degree by way of traditional schooling.

I have had no problems adjusting my schedule to meet the availability of my students. In assessing the appeal of online education, Bates (2000) said that one of the main things students look for is flexibility in their degree program, requesting courses and services that are delivered at various times and locations to meet their busy schedule. This question attempted to ascertain whether educators are able to meet the demand for this requirement in adjusting their schedule to meet the needs

of students who require an educator that can meet with them when they have time to meet with their teacher.

Online chat is a preferred medium when teaching online leadership courses. Olliges, Wernet, and Delicath (1999) noted several different forms of communication when it comes to distance education including discussion groups, e-mail, instant messaging and chat. In working with students looking to develop leadership skills, educators have to determine which one is the most effective for the type of instruction they are trying to deliver. This question sought to answer whether chat or instant message has been the most useful communication method for educators teaching leadership via distance education.

Working adults have traditionally made up the majority of the students in my classes. O'Banion (1997) documented the fact that many students that are returning to school by way of distance education are older, working adults, and that the Internet is the medium of choice for these students. Simonson et al. (2003) said that this target demographic remains the primary target for online schools now. This could very well correlate into most leadership programs being taught online having to cater to older students, perhaps changing curriculum and methods of teaching leadership, providing the impetus for this question being entered on to the survey.

I see evidence of critical thinking in my online classes. O'Banion (1997) said that students that choose distance education as a method for education seek a program where they are not sitting in front of an educator lecturing to them and instead are looking to develop skills that hone career skills by developing critical thinking skills. This desire by students to hone critical thinking skills needs to be addressed by educators

teaching leadership online and again, needs to be assessed, which is why the question was included on the survey.

All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions. Leadership stresses that potential leaders possess strong communication skills and many leadership programs utilize the cohort model of teaching in order to hone these skills. Moore (1998) said that distance program mechanisms need to facilitate mutual support through dialog and encourage interaction with instructors and other learners. Anderson (2004) noted that one of the greatest assets of using the Internet for education is that it presents students with a greater opportunity to communicate with one another. Utilization of this is an asset educators teaching leadership should be taking advantage of, which is why this question was present on the survey.

Communication by way of e-mail has not been a problem. While chat and instant message are great forms of direct contact, e-mail might be a necessity for educators who are unable to meet the schedule demands of their students. Olliges et al. (1999) noted that there are several types of communication and that educators should be successful at a number of them to reach out to various types of learners who attend distance education schools. Determining whether educators teaching leadership should have a grasp on communication that does not require both parties to be online at the same time, created a need for this question on this survey.

The liberating platform of online communication has been a positive in teaching leadership online. Moore (1998) said that educators and learners need to be able to freely communicate by whatever channels are available in order to provide efficient channels whereby learners can get continuous feedback from

instructors. The online environment should provide several channels by which communication can take place and increase interaction between educator and learner in leadership programs online. This question sought to find the impact of that availability within online leadership programs.

The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than an online-only program. Allen and Seaman (2003) noted that many traditional institutions are adding online classes and programs in an effort to compete with online-only programs. At the same time, programs that were once exclusively held online are now offering face-to-face classes to target a demographic that prefers this method. This question sought to determine which format educators feel is better for use in leadership programs.

Had it been available, online education would have been my preferred means of obtaining my degree. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2003), more than three million students enroll in distance education programs at a college level. Moskal and Dziuban (2001) said that the reasons for this are the flexibility and desire to try online courses and avoiding scheduling issues normally associated with attending courses in a traditional format. O'Banion (1997) said that this results in many adults returning to school thanks to this alternative to traditional education. This question looked to determine whether, after teaching leadership online, educators would have preferred this method as a means of attaining an education.

Online classes are as effective for teaching and learning as is a traditional class. Allen and Seaman's (2003) revelation that leaders are adding online education to their traditional education institutions brings up the question as to whether

educators feel as though distance education is as effective as traditional education in teaching leadership. Carey (2002) and several other researchers noted that students attending face-to-face courses were more likely to complete courses, which brings up the question of the effectiveness and success of online leadership courses. Tham and Werner (2005) said that institutions must seek to investigate whether online education is a good fit for their school to determine whether to continue on the journey while Anderson (2004) said that distance education is more effective and efficient than at any other time in history. This survey question sought to find the opinion of this comparison from those educators teaching leadership online.

I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs. Beyond the effectiveness, this question sought to determine whether those educators teaching leadership online would give online leadership programs their own stamp of approval. With Anderson (2004) noting the effectiveness of online education and Allen and Seaman's (2003) questions of the effectiveness of online education as a whole, educators must determine for themselves whether they would personally endorse online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs.

Open-Ended Questions

In addition to the Likert scale survey questions listed in the previous section, five open-ended questions were also be asked of participants who agree to answer these questions. The questions and reasoning for asking the questions are presented in this section.

How do you ensure the authenticity of assignments delivered to you? Baker and Woods (2002) noted that online learning puts an emphasis on the

teacher and the programmer to foster a communication-rich environment that can help develop the communal scaffolding necessary to support an effective and rich online learning environment. The issue of fostering and depending on relationships that are exclusively online is the issue of authenticity and assuring that students are utilizing leadership lessons being distributed. One of the challenges educators have to face is whether learners are truly absorbing lessons taught to them. Determining whether work being turned in to educators is authentic is one that all online educators have to face and presents a potentially huge obstacle to educators teaching leadership online.

How do you ensure the message you are trying to teach reaches your students? An ongoing theme in teaching leadership is communication. Moore (1998) said that quality distance education programs need to develop mechanisms by which learners can get continuous feedback from instructors. Moore continued by noting that institutions need to be learner-friendly with efficient communication channels between students and instructors. While this detail is true for all leadership programs, it is especially true in those utilizing distance education where communication provides a unique challenge in that the learner and educator may never meet and must make an extra effort to maintain open communication with one other

Why did you choose to teach online? According to Simonson et al. (2003), distance education has improved immensely since its inception because of innovations in media and perceptions of the public of this form of education. Paired with Bass (2008), who said that everyone's definition of leadership is embedded within them from the beginning of their life, causing everyone to have a different idea of what it entails, teaching leadership online could be a very effective tool to teach leadership to

audiences that either might not have had access to leadership programs or might not have otherwise explored the field at all. Deciphering educators' reasons for teaching leadership online was the reason for the entry of this question.

What are the pros and cons to teaching leadership online? Russell (2001) compiled 20 years worth of studies that demonstrated that there was no difference in the educational outcomes of learners who attended traditional educational facilities and those that chose distance education. At the same time, Carey (2002) and other researchers revealed that students are more likely to complete courses taken in a traditional classroom versus online courses, proving that there are many different ideas when it comes to the pros and cons of distance education. This question asked educators to divulge more details on this topic in teaching leadership online.

How do you teach leadership online? This question sought to answer the ultimate question of this research. Whereas all other questions seek input on the various areas of teaching distance education and teaching leadership online, this question asks for a detailed response on how to teach leadership online.

Validity and Reliability

Because of the nature of this mixed-method research, there were a number of threats to the validity of this study. Mitchell and Jolley (2004) said one major threat to the validity of questionnaires is the problems involved with the small sample size caused by the low return rate often seen on self-administered questionnaires. However, Gall et al. (2003) noted, "Researchers tend to apply looser validity and reliability standards to questionnaires and interviews than to tests because they typically are collecting information that is highly structured and likely to be valid" (p. 223). This ideal makes

distributing questionnaires and relying on the responses from these self-administered queries more acceptable from an academic viewpoint, giving these forms of data collection validity in this study.

While reliability and validity remain issues with any study conducted, several researchers lauded the idea of mixed-method forms of study and the impact they have on the validity of the study. In quoting another set of researchers, Wimmer and Dominick (2006) said, “Maykut and Morehouse (1994) addressed the trustworthiness of a qualitative research project, summarizing four factors that help build credibility: multiple methods of data collection, audit trail, member checks, and research teams” (p. 120). This project is slated to employ multiple methods of data collection members who are considered to be at the forefront of their fields of this study, helping to provide reliability to the research conducted in this study. Other threats to the validity of this study include persons queried not responding to the questionnaires, providing inaccurate responses and/or not receiving the link to the surveys as a result of e-mail filters or other reasons. This is partly why a number of researchers will be used to provide a wide array of responses as well as provide unique introspect into this study from a number of sources to give the study the best chance of receiving accurate and true responses from experts in the field.

Guba and Lincoln (1994) set forth four standards of criteria for judging the soundness of qualitative research as an alternative to quantitative research. They recommended that internal validity be called credibility, external validity be referred to as transferability, reliability be called dependability, and objectivity be called confirmability (Trochim, 2006).

Credibility involved the believability of the phenomenon through the eyes of the participants in this study and lent credence to the fact that the researcher is an accurate judge of the phenomenon that the participant has experienced. Transferability refers to the ability of the researcher to transfer what he or she has witnessed or experienced and relay it into the context of the study being conducted. Dependability refers to the ability of the researcher's ability to come to the same conclusion if he or she had witnessed the same thing multiple times while confirmability refers to the ability of the results being confirmed or corroborated by others outside of the study.

These four areas of reliability and soundness of qualitative research will be considered when conducting qualitative research in this study.

Because of the nature of the research, sampling bias is introduced to this study. Taylor-Powell (2009) said that sampling bias is a consistent error that arises because of the sample selection and can occur any time that the sample is not a random sample. Because this research focuses on educators that teach leadership in an online format that consists of 60% or more instruction that takes place online, sampling bias is an element of this study that will impact the recommendations.

McMillan and Schumacher (2001) noted, "Because validity implies proper interpretation and use of the information gathered through measurement, it is necessary for both consumers and investigators of the research to judge the degree of validity that is present" (p. 243). Validation for this study is necessary to ensure that information gathered through this research drew the correct conclusion at the culmination of the project. The validation took place through triangulation of two outside coders that were recruited to assist with the validation of this study. Both outside coders are qualified

scholars with experience working in the field of education and whose expertise played an important role in the validation of this research.

Following the completion of the surveys from qualified respondents (those whose classes consist of at least 60% of the instruction taking place online and being a master's level program in the field of leadership), the researcher and the two outside coders met to analyze the information. To validate the study, the feedback from each survey question was discussed amongst the researcher and two outside coders to make an assessment of the data gathered. Once this assessment was made for all of the research questions, a final meeting took place between the researcher and two outside coders to finalize the results and recommendations.

One of the outside coders is a graduate student who previously worked as a coprofessor in a research class of social work at a four-year public university, whose responsibilities included teaching statistics in the school's Sociology program. The researcher is cognizant of potential sampling bias and recognizes this as delimitation.

A second outside coder is a graduate student who is pursuing a doctorate of education at a private, four-year university. This assistant has over 5 years working in a not-for-profit educational institution as a program manager and is cognizant of potential sampling bias related to this research topic. This coder recognizes this as a potential delimitation of the study.

Summary

Research by Holt and Thompson (1998) showed the need for change management related to technology in higher education as being built around a strategic framework

comprised of five: strategy, technology, structure, management processes, staff skills and roles. Meanwhile, Bush (1998), former president of Saybrook Graduate School, noted:

The higher education story today is full of major contradictions as it works to find its role sort out its future and be responsive to new demands from the new environment, while adjusting a medieval institution whose last great changes were in the industrial nineteenth century to meet the needs of the information twenty-first century. (p. 29)

The research in this topic addressed the topic of the changes that need to be made to leadership programs that have entered distance education, both from a faculty and university leader standpoint.

In conducting research, researchers have a variety of tools at their disposal to collect data and research the topic of leadership in distance education. Some of the more popular methods include such methods as case studies, descriptive, and mixed methods research. Labonte (2005) and Brigham-Sprague (2001) used case study research to review populations of higher education leaders in relation to change, and the implementation of instructional technology. Labonte used a qualitative inquiry research method to study the populations' adoption of technology, which allowed Labonte to contrast and compare historical documentation with interview transcription. Brigham-Sprague used a case study research method to determine how leadership could better manage through crisis and change.

The research methods for the topic of determining best methods for teaching leadership in a distance education program involved quantitative research in the form of surveys to compare and contrast responses from respondents in the field as a whole and

by type of learning institution by analyzing this data with SPSS software. In addition, qualitative research was conducted in the form of in-depth questions that were conducted with participants of this study who are willing to take part in this area of the research on the Survey Monkey Web site.

Chapter Four: Results

In completing this research topic, numerous professors at universities who taught at least 60% of their graduate-level leadership programs in an online format were contacted via e-mail. The recipients of these e-mails were instructed to let the researcher know of their desire to participate in the study by responding to the e-mail. Once the researcher was made aware of their willingness to participate, a consent form was sent to the professor. At the bottom of this consent form was a link that read, "I Agree". When clicked, this link took the participant to the Survey Monkey site, where the survey was located. The researcher then gathered this data from the Survey Monkey Web site and placed into SPSS software for analysis. This analysis was used to determine the frequency of the Likert scale responses as they pertained to the questions on the survey. In addition, a series of open-ended questions were also presented at the end of the Likert scale questions, which were optional for respondents to answer.

Analysis of Data

Information was gathered from participants in both survey and interview format. Interviews consisted of the same questions for each participant who agreed to take part in this study. Because of the nature of the Likert scale questions, all respondents were limited in their responses to the options that were available in the multiple-choice options, sometimes referred to as "forced choice". At the same time, all participants who opted to answer the open-ended questions were also limited to responses pertaining to the questions that were on the survey. All information taken from these responses posted on the Survey Monkey Web site was then entered into SPSS software to determine percentages from all of the responses gathered from the course of this research.

The open-ended questions, which differed from participant to participant depending on whether they agreed to answer each or any of the questions, were given consideration depending on their applicability to the research topic. These questions were given special consideration as recommendations from individuals as opposed to agreed-upon best practices from participants in the study.

Surveys consisted of a series of questions that ranged in value based on a Likert scale. The responses were as follows:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

Statistics from these surveys were then analyzed using the SPSS software in order to determine the similarities and contradictions amongst the data entered by the primary researcher and two assistants who all reviewed the data to come to a consensus based on the responses.

Each participant was asked to participate in both research methods of this study—first a series of questions regarding online education and a survey to follow-up on these questions; however, the participation in both will not be a requirement. This information was compiled to recommend best practices to teaching leadership in a distance education program.

O'Banion (1997) documented the fact that many adults are returning to school, and the average ages of college students was in fact on the rise. These adult workers are

busy with family and jobs and needed an alternative to traditional education. Higher education administrators were slowly beginning to realize that if they did not offer the nontraditional student options, students could turn to the for-profit education industry to have their needs met. Because of this division between the two types of schools and the potential impact of the conclusions drawn from this research, the information taken in this study was divided between the two types of educational institutions—one for traditional learning institutions (those whose primary form of teaching originally consisted of traditional classroom education) and those institutions whose primary form of teaching consists of online education programs. Consideration for these two categories came from the overall school that the faculty member was associated with and not just the specific leadership program with whom he or she worked.

Once this data was gathered, it was presented both as a whole of the information gathered and within the two separate categories distinguished above. This gave a perspective from each type of university as well as both as a whole. This information was then analyzed to determine inconsistencies and similarities between the two types of universities studied.

Description of Participants

Based on the criterion set forth, the researcher identified 32 universities that qualified for the study. Within these universities, the researcher contacted a total of 78 professors who taught at least 60% of his or her graduate-level leadership courses online, by e-mail. Out of the 78 contacted, 27 professors completed or nearly-completed the surveys. These results were then used for the purposes of this research project. Each of the 27 participants completed each of the 16 Likert scale questions on the survey, while

eight participants answered at least three of the open-ended questions located at the end of the survey. Of these eight, one did not answer the last of the open-ended questions present in the survey.

Presentation of the Results—Likert Scale Data

Communication by e-mail has not been an issue. Bangert (2005) noted that one of the most critical elements of teaching in an online environment is effective communication between the facilitator and student. Because of this stated importance, the first question presented to the participants was that of whether communicating online created an issue for the participants of the survey. Table 2 displays how those surveyed felt regarding the effectiveness of e-mail communication and whether this method of communication had been an issue when teaching leadership online.

Table 2

E-Mail Communication

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	22.2
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	66.7
Strongly Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Of the 27 participants surveyed, three people answered that they disagreed with the statement that “Communication barriers are not an issue,” which indicated that these facilitators teaching online felt uncomfortable communicating by e-mail, one of the primary communication methods of online teaching according to Olliges et al. (1999). The most popular choice among the respondents was “Agree,” which received 44.4% of the responses from participants while nine participants strongly agreed that

communicating by e-mail did not create a barrier. Overall, 21 of the 27 respondents (77.7%) either agreed or strongly agreed that communicating by e-mail was not a barrier to teaching leadership online. Three of the respondents were neutral to the statement.

Communication barriers are not an issue in online leadership courses. Following along with the same line of communication-based questions, the next question focused on communication as a whole to help determine whether the respondents felt as though there was a barrier when teaching leadership in an online program.

As can be seen in Table 3, 33.3% of the respondents indicated that communication barriers are an issue when it comes to teaching leadership online while three declared a neutrality in response to the question. More than half (55.5%) of the respondents chose either “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” in response to the query.

Table 3

Communication Barriers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	6	22.2	22.2	33.3
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	44.4
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	88.9
Strongly Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Having to develop new technological skills to teach an online class proved to be onerous. In answering whether having to develop new technological skills proved to be difficult, many respondents agreed that having to develop these skills was problematic.

Table 4 shows that while two-thirds of respondents disagreed that having to develop new skills was a problem, one-third of those surveyed indicated that the

development of these skills was an issue.

Table 4

Technological Skills

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	15	55.6	55.6	66.7
Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Students entering the online leadership program possessed the technical savvy to be successful in the program. With online schooling composing at least 60% of the programs the respondents taught at, the question posed to those agreeing to take part in the study attempted to ascertain students’ readiness upon entering the program. Table 5 displays how those surveyed felt about the technical acumen of those entering into their online leadership programs.

Table 5

Technically Savvy

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	24	88.9	88.9	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Of the 27 responses, 24, or 88.9%, agreed that students entering their respective programs were technically savvy upon entrance. The remaining 11.1% of responses were neutral.

In teaching leadership online, I have rarely encountered students who have not willingly participated. Bishop (2007) noted, “An online community can have the right tools, the right chat platform, and the right ethos, but if the community members are not participating the community will not flourish” (p.

1887). With that, this question attempted to determine the willingness to participate of respondents' students.

Table 6 shows that 21 out of 27 respondents agreed with the sentiment that they rarely encounter students who do not participate in their classroom activities, whereas 22.2% of respondents indicated that this has been an issue with students in their teachings.

Table 6

Online Lurkers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	22.2
Agree	21	77.8	77.8	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Do you expect students that earn a leadership degree to have the same opportunities in career advancement that a student that attains the same degree in a traditional college? Question six was intended to determine the worth of a graduate-level leadership degree in the eyes of the facilitator in asking them if they felt the same opportunities would be available to students partaking in mostly online courses as compared to learning in a traditional format.

As seen in Table 7, 77.7% of the respondents felt that attaining a degree in a mostly-online format would present students with the same opportunities that those who earned a degree in a traditional school would receive. Six respondents (22.2%) were neutral in regard to this question.

Table 7

Career Advancement

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Neutral	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	66.7
Strongly Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

I have had no problems adjusting my schedule to meet the availability of my students. In regard to whether teaching graduate-level leadership courses online was difficult as a result of scheduling, all respondents answered the question as seen in Table 8.

Table 8

Schedule Issues

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	18	66.7	66.7	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Two thirds of survey-takers agreed that they had no issues in adjusting their schedules to meet the demands of teaching online, while six strongly agreed with this sentiment for a total of 88.9% of participants stating that scheduling was not an issue in teaching online. Three respondents stated that they were neutral in the stated question.

Online chat is a preferred medium when teaching online leadership courses. In looking to determine whether online chat was the preferred method of communicating with their students, this question sought to find out whether teachers would rather use this medium as their primary source of communication. Table 9 shows how those surveyed felt about online chat being the primary medium of communication when conducting online leadership courses.

Table 9

Online Chat

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Disagree	15	55.6	55.6	55.6
Neutral	9	33.3	33.3	88.9
Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Fifteen out of the 27 respondents chose “Disagree” as their response to the question with nine respondents choosing to remain neutral on the topic. The remaining three participants agreed with the statement, indicating a preference of online chat in communicating with students.

Working students have traditionally made up the majority of the students in my class. In determining the makeup of the students in online graduate-level leadership programs, this question sought to determine who took courses taught by respondents. Table 10 shows whether those surveyed had courses primarily made up of working students.

Table 10

Working Students

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	15	55.6	55.6	55.6
Strongly Agree	12	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

All 27 of the respondents agreed with the statement that the majority of their online courses consisted of working adults with 15 choosing “Agree” and 12 choosing “Strongly Agree” as responses.

I see evidence of critical thinking in my online classes. O’Banion (1997) wrote that student demographics in online schools are changing so that they “are the products of schools that have been stressing critical thinking, collaborative problem solving, and consumerism as part of the last wave of education reforms” (p. 37). This question hoped to find out whether respondents had witnessed critical thinking in their

classes.

Again, as can be seen in Table 11, all 27 respondents either agreed (33.3%) or strongly agreed (66.7%) that evidence of critical thinking existed in their online courses.

Table 11

Critical Thinking

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	9	33.3	33.3	33.3
Strongly Agree	18	66.7	66.7	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions. Bishop (2007) wrote of Lurkers in online classrooms as students that did not regularly participate and offered no participation in an online classroom. This question sought out to determine whether respondents had regularly encountered students participating with one another in their online classrooms. Table 12 shows whether those surveyed had witnessed interaction between students on a regular basis when teaching leadership courses online.

Table 12

Student Interaction

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	33.3
Agree	15	55.6	55.6	88.9
Strongly Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

The responses to this question varied with six respondents (22.2%) choosing to disagree with the statement while three (11.1%) chose to remaining neutral. The remaining respondents chose to either agree (15 respondents or 55.6%) with the statement or strongly agree (three respondents or 11.1%).

The liberating platform of online communication has been a positive in teaching leadership online. A report by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors determined that the most important reasons to take an online course were convenience and the need to fulfill requirements for school. This question sought to determine the importance and convenience of online communication and if it had been a positive for the respondents. Table 13 displays participants' responses to whether online communication had been a liberating platform and an overall positive experience.

Table 13

Online Communication

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	15	55.6	55.6	66.7
Strongly Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Nearly all respondents indicated that the convenience of online communication was indeed a positive when it came to teaching leadership online. Fifteen respondents agreed with the positive aspects of online communication while nine strongly agreed. Three respondents were neutral to the statement.

The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than that of an online-only program. Because this study involved programs that were composed of a minimum of 60% teaching online, this statement was posed to ascertain whether a hybrid format of teaching was more effective than an online-only program in the eyes of the participants.

While Table 14 shows that 33.3% of participants agreed with the idea that a

hybrid format was more effective than online-only teaching, 22.2% of respondents disagreed with the statement while nearly half (44.4%) indicated that they felt that there was no difference in whether face-to-face classroom sessions were used.

Table 14

Hybrid Format

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
Neutral	12	44.4	44.4	66.7
Agree	3	11.1	11.1	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Had it been available, online education would have been my preferred means of obtaining my degree. With all participants teaching graduate-level leadership courses in a mostly online environment, this statement sought to find out whether respondents would have preferred to acquire their degrees online had that method been available. Table 15 shows whether participants would have chosen to pursue their degree via online education had it been available when they were pursuing their degrees.

Table 15

Preferred Method

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	9	33.3	33.3	44.4
Agree	9	33.3	33.3	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

This statement showed that 55.5% (33.3% choosing “Agree” and 22.2% choosing “Strongly Agree”) of respondents would have preferred to earn their degrees in an online environment with nine respondents choosing “Disagree” and three choosing “Strongly

Disagree” as their choices for this statement.

Online classes are as effective for teaching and learning as is a traditional class. The above statement attempted to find out the personal feelings of the respondents and their impressions in regard to online classes and their effectiveness compared to traditional classes. Table 16 displays participants’ views of online classes and whether they felt as though they were as effective for teaching and learning as traditional classes.

Table 16

Online Versus Traditional

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Neutral	6	22.2	22.2	33.3
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Most respondents agreed with the statement that online classes are as effective as traditional classes with 12 choosing “Agree” and six choosing “Strongly Agree”. Six respondents were neutral to the statement while three chose “Disagree” as their option.

I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs. The last Likert scale statement sought respondents’ feelings on whether they would recommend online leadership programs over traditional programs. Table 17 shows participants’ responses on leadership program recommendations.

Table 17

Program Recommendation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	9	33.3	33.3	33.3
Neutral	9	33.3	33.3	66.7
Agree	6	22.2	22.2	88.9
Strongly Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	9	33.3	33.3	33.3
Neutral	9	33.3	33.3	66.7
Agree	6	22.2	22.2	88.9
Strongly Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Split almost evenly across all facets, 33.3% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they would recommend online leadership programs over traditional programs while 33.3% remained neutral. Another one third chose “Disagree” as their option, indicating they would recommend classroom-based leadership programs.

At the beginning of the project, five questions were presented in order to provide recommendations regarding the teaching of leadership at a graduate level school that teaches at least 60% of its leadership content online. These five research questions were:

1. How, if at all, are online educators hampered by the need to develop technological skills in order to teach leadership skills online?
2. What are the most important means of communication, available by way of online education, to teach leadership?
3. How can teachers who have previously taught in a traditional classroom become or stay motivated enough to develop skills necessary to teach in an online teaching and learning environment?
4. How does the support that online educators receive from their institution allow them to maintain an effective online teaching and learning environment in distributing leadership practices?
5. What are the best methods to teach leadership by way of distance education?

In reviewing the Likert scale questions, the researcher identified a correlation between the Likert scale questions and the five research questions as shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Survey Questions and Related Researchers

<i>Survey Question</i>	<i>Supporting Researcher</i>	<i>Related Research Question (p. 8)</i>
1. <i>Communication barriers are not an issue in online leadership courses.</i>	Anderson, 2004; Bangert, 2005; Mancuso-Murphy, 2007; Posey & Pintz, 2006; Ryan et al., 2005; Schell, 2006	1, 2, 5
2. <i>Having to develop new technological skills to teach an online class proved to be onerous.</i>	Pyle & Dziuban, 2001	1, 3
3. <i>Students entering the online leadership program possessed the technical savvy to be successful in the program.</i>	Beaudoin, 2003; Black, 2003; O'Banion, 1997; Barker, 2004; McNeil, Elfrink, Beyea, Pierce, & Bickford, 2006	5
4. <i>In teaching leadership online, I have rarely encountered students who have not willingly participated.</i>	Bishop, 2007	2, 5
5. <i>Do you expect students that earn a leadership degree to have the same opportunities in career advancement that a student that attains the same degree in a traditional college?</i>	Saba, 1999; Swan, 2004	5
6. <i>I have had no problems adjusting my schedule to meet the availability of my students.</i>	Bates, 2000	3
7. <i>Online chat is a preferred medium when teaching online leadership courses.</i>	Olliges, Wernet, & Delicath, 1999; Barker, 2004; McNeil et al., 2003	1, 2
8. <i>Working adults have traditionally made up the majority of the students in my classes.</i>	O'Banion, 1997; Simonson, Smaldino, Albright, & Zvacek, 2003	5

9. <i>I see evidence of critical thinking in my online classes.</i>	Beaudoin, 2003; Black, 2003; O'Banion, 1997	5
10. <i>All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions.</i>	Anderson, 2004; Moore, 1998	1, 2, 5
<i>(table continues)</i>		
<i>Survey Question</i>	<i>Supporting Researcher</i>	<i>Related Research Question (p. 8)</i>
11. <i>Communication by way of e-mail has not been a problem.</i>	Olliges, Wernet, & Delicath, 1999	1, 2
12. <i>The liberating platform of online communication has been a positive in teaching leadership online.</i>	Anderson, 2004; Moore, 1998	2
13. <i>The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than an online-only program.</i>	Allen & Seaman, 2003	4, 5
14. <i>Had it been available, online education would have been my preferred means of obtaining my degree.</i>	Moskal & Dziuban, 2001; NCES, 2003; O'Banion, 1997	3, 5
15. <i>Online classes are as effective for teaching and learning as is a traditional class.</i>	Allen & Seaman, 2003; Anderson, 2004; Carey, 2002; Carr, 2000; Hogan, 1997; Russell, 2001, 2004; Tham & Werner, 2005	1, 4, 5
16. <i>I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs.</i>	Allen & Seaman, 2003; Anderson, 2004; Carey, 2002; Carr, 2000; Hogan, 1997; Russell, 2001, 2004; Tham & Werner, 2005	1, 4, 5

In analyzing the responses from the respondents, the researcher and his assistants concluded that each of the five research questions was answered by the Likert scale

questions. It was thus determined that the research questions were answered by the recommendations made based upon the Likert scale and open-ended questions.

Presentation of the Results—Open-Ended Question Responses

1. How do you ensure the authenticity of assignments delivered to you?

The first open-ended question was answered by eight respondents and sought to find out how those taking the survey determined the authenticity of assignments that were delivered to them in their classes. The responses (including a one-word response from one participant) to the statement from the eight participants were as followed:

- “They are reflective pieces that incorporate the knowledge base and THEIR OWN job-embedded experiences.”
- “I begin to recognize the ‘voice’ of the student. If the assignment does not seem authentic, I will check. Most students are highly motivated and want to learn.”
- “NA”
- “You can’t insure (SIC) it in a face to face or online course. However, the online assignments relate to their specific work situation and would be hard to very difficult for someone else to accomplish.”
- “Just as in a class setting, we cannot always ensure the student is the person who ‘wrote’ the paper or took the exam. When we can solve this in a traditional setting, only then can we solve it in the online setting.”
- “We only accept assignments uploaded into Assignment Managers in Blackboard. We use a plagiarism program if we suspect the person is not the author.”

- “Because I am regularly in the threaded discussions—I get to know each students ‘voice’. If their graded assignments seem to have a different ‘voice’ I’ll contact the student. Other than that—I have no way of knowing that the person whose name is on the assignment is the one who turned it in.”
 - “Don’t.”
2. *How do you ensure the message you are trying to teach reaches your students?*

Question 18 of the survey sought to find out how teachers ensure that the lessons in leadership they are trying to convey to students do in fact reach them. Eight responses were recorded for the question:

- “We discuss in our class.”
- “Weekly and course wide assessments. I design questions and assignments to fit my course objectives. If the class does not ‘get it,’ then I will adjust assignments or weekly discussion questions until they are thinking critically and holistically.”
- “NA”.
- “Give online quizzes and tests.”
- “Practice and experience are your friends here.”
- “I use multiple mediums of communication to facilitate student learning, and there is redundancy in them. I preview in Wimba meetings upcoming assignments, although they are explained fully in our syllabus. I structure the courses with focused learning outcomes at all levels. I grade all projects with a rubric to assessing student learning.”

- “Discussion boards, I use audio briefings—a short weekly message along with a written message. I regularly stay in the discussion to observe, participate and guide.”
- “Seek feedback.”

3. *Why did you choose to teach online?*

The 19th question asked participants for the reasons that they decided to teach online. The following are the responses given to this question:

- “The department switched to online teaching before I accepted a position.”
- “I wanted to serve students who couldn’t afford or couldn’t get a traditional education. Also, I studied hybrid learning and subject-centered pedagogy and was convinced it was worth a try. I then experimented with the same courses in hybrid and traditional formats. I discovered that a well-developed hybrid course accomplished the learning objectives better than the traditional course.”
- “I was invited to do so in order to serve an adult population from various parts of the country.”
- “Practical for distant students with families, jobs, and a home context that is a great resource to just about any adult, advanced degree student.”
- “I studied online and loved the asynchronous method, so I also chose to teach online—the depth of content, in my experience, is much greater and allows for more opportunities to discover.”
- “It allows me to increase my student teaching load, while maintaining time for my own research. It reduces my repetitive lecture time. I post these when

necessary online. It also allows me to reach mid-career students all over the world.”

- “I ‘fell’ into online teaching in ‘97 while working on my Ph.D. in an online program. I was asked to be part of the team developing a Leadership masters degree. I’ve stayed with it for convenience and now for the opportunity. The same benefit the students have of being able to take a course from anywhere in the world, we have as faculty.”
- “Opportunity arose, convenience.”

4. *What are the pros and cons to teaching leadership online?*

This question asked respondents to list the pros and cons of teaching leadership online. Eight respondents answered the question, which can be read below:

- “Pros: flexibility, everyone participates. Cons: takes more time for the teacher in preparation and answering questions.”
- “Cons—lots of extra work to create a top level learning environment; not as satisfying emotionally because students are connected to a subject and each other and not so much to you—you are not the center and that takes some adjustments emotionally, but I have developed rich friendships with students after the courses are over. Pros—students learn more; think critically and are more engaged with each other and the subject; the students are better integrators of the topic with life when taught hybrid.”
- “Most of the work I do is actually conducted by phone. Students do post papers and chat online, which works well for the most part. We have a hybrid program that includes online, in person residences, and phone coaching.”

- “Pro: 1. See #19 above. 2. Great time-invested discussions (much better than face to face because it allows all to speak and those who want more time to consider their contributions to the discussion can have it. 3. Discussions can be reviewed at any time during the course. 4. Assignments are not lost (the dog doesn’t eat them). 5. Dates and times when assignments were submitted are automatically recorded. 6. Communication is flexible for students and faculty alike. CONS: 1. More teacher time is required to prepare the course. 2. Most of us are comfortable teaching as we have been taught. So online is new/changed/different so there is resistance to the change.”
- “Cons—miss seeing faces and personalities, nonverbal clues are not available. Pros—work and go to school as schedule and family time will allow. Depth is greater—I have found that students ‘think’ more deeply about concepts and ideas and engage on a much deeper level than in a classroom. Also, traditional barriers are removed—we don’t know someone’s age, race, ‘looks; or other erroneous distractions that might influence our perceptions. We are judged simply on the content of our work and writings.”
- “Pros: Allows graduate students to stay in their context, and use assignments to lead their organization. Allows professors flexibility. Cons: doesn’t reach some students who need social learning, and verbal interaction, unless the course is designed with online meetings—doesn’t work without good structure, clarity and course alignments that are relevance, and doable in one’s context.”

- “Cons: The text base is sometimes difficult. No opportunity to observe. Interaction is asynchronous and this can be difficult to watch. Synchronous discussions are few and far between. Pros: Students who not have to relocate. Faculty and students can engage from anywhere in the world.”
- “Love the synchronicity, geographic freedom—some courses do best with interpersonal interaction with all present.”

5. *How do you teach leadership online?*

The final of the open-ended questions wrapped-up the survey by asking respondents how they go about teaching leadership online. For this question, seven people responded to the query, though the Survey Monkey Web site lost one of the responses. The remaining answers can be found below:

- “This is a big question. I clarify my course outcomes. I create the assignments that will hopefully meet course outcomes. I work with a hybrid pedagogy specialist. I create the course site and make sure that every week the student is online 2-4 hours over several days. I give weekly feedback to the entire class and individual feedback to each student. There is more assessment with hybrid courses. I have chats at the beginning, and a 3 day face to face with students in the middle, and then some sort of chat towards the end. It’s a lot of work. I’m not downloading content. I’m creating a learning environment. I’ve changed how I teach traditional courses now because the hybrid works so well. I have an online component every week where the students are connected an in discussion. I push content to online and use the weekly face to face for going

deeper. Students can't be lazy in an online environment. They can in a classroom.”

- “I don't do the actual teaching online myself. My colleagues do that part. I teach the in person residences and follow up with phone-based coaching.”
- “Everyone has fun as we experience teaching and learning leadership under the following umbrellas: 1. Theory, philosophy, 2. Practice, application, 3. Stories, 4. Case studies, 5. Videos, 6. Textbooks (electronic online), 11. Audio, 12. YouTube clips, 13. Course news, 14. Syllabi, 15. Quizzes, tests, 16. PowerPoint presentations (professor created and student created) 17. Course outline and schedule, 18. Required and recommended reading lists.”
- “100%.”
- “I teach through a mix of mediums online, dialogue, live Wimba meetings, assigned textbooks and media, assigned projects, custom feedback on projects, answering questions in 24 hour turnaround via e-mail, emphasizing the need for self-directed learning, posting numerous announcements to encourage and direct. I teach online by paying attention to the needs of my students and empowering them to learn. I don't teach, I facilitate learning.”
- “Many class materials lend themselves to reading and learning academic knowledge, doing research; some leadership learning needs to be experiential so that's not so good online.”

Conclusion

A total of 27 respondents out of the 78 contacted (approximately 35%) started the survey on the Survey Monkey Web site, all of which completed each of the Likert scale

questions on the site. Out of the 27 initial respondents, eight completed at least three of the open-ended questions located at the end of the survey while seven completed each of the open-ended questions.

The primary researcher as well as two assistants reviewed the responses and analyzed results of both the multiple-choice Likert scale questions and the open-ended responses. Upon review, it was discussed and determined that there were three major themes in which to break down recommendations for how to teach leadership in a graduate school that teaches at least 60% of its content online. These three themes will be used in Chapter Five to provide final recommendations for teaching leadership in this format.

The responses listed in this chapter were used to provide a thorough analysis of the topic and were used to provide guidelines on teaching leadership in an environment that featured at least 60% of graduate-level courses taking place in an online format.

Chapter Five: Recommendations

With survey requests sent out to 78 recipients and 27 having completed the Likert scale questions on the Survey Monkey Web site, recommendations for how to go about teaching leadership in a graduate-level program that consists of at least 60% instruction taking place online were made in this chapter. A detailed analysis consisting of a breakdown of common themes based on the responses from each respondent were presented in this chapter followed by recommendations on best practice of teaching leadership in this capacity and further research.

In reviewing the responses from survey participants, the primary research was able to develop a series of common themes taken from the responses. These themes were discussed throughout the chapter as follows:

- Communication
- Technological Barriers
- Perceived Quality of Degree

Communication

Communication in courses that mostly take place online has often been cited as one of the biggest obstacles for professors to overcome. Bangert (2005) noted that effective facilitator-learner communication is critical in an online environment and was central to several of the questions located on the survey respondents took. In observing this trait, the researcher identified six questions that were related to the issue of communication.

The first of these questions dealt with whether respondents felt as though communication by e-mail had been an issue (Table 2). Of the 27 respondents, 21 felt as

though communication by e-mail during the teaching of leadership courses was not an issue, or 77.7% of respondents. Three respondents were neutral in this response while three disagreed, signifying a feeling that communication by e-mail was a burden at time when teaching. The researcher reviewed this question along with the eighth question, which queried respondents as to whether online chat was a preferred medium when teaching leadership online. Out of the 27 respondents, 15 (55.6%) of respondents disagreed with the statement (Table 9), indicating that the majority of respondents preferred not to use online chat as their preferred medium when teaching leadership online. Nine respondents remained neutral on the statement while three agreed with the statement. Given this, only 11.1% of respondents indicated that online chat was their preference to teaching online versus 77.7% of respondents that stated using e-mail to communicate with students was not an issue.

In reviewing the survey questions above, the researcher compared them to question two, which stated that, “Communication barriers are not an issue in online leadership courses.” In Table 3, we see a wide array of answers, with nine respondents (33.3%) either strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with the statement while another three (11.1%) were neutral to the statement. These responses show that one-third of respondents see communication barriers as being an issue with teaching online. Interestingly enough, question 11 dealt with whether students regularly interact with one another during online courses. Table 12 shows that six respondents disagreed with the statement while another three were neutral. Fifteen agreed with the statement while three strongly agreed. So while one-third of respondents indicated that communication barriers are an issue in teaching online, 22.2% also indicated that students do not regularly

interact with one another and 11.1% were neutral on whether their students regularly interact. Question 12 asked respondents if online communication had been a positive in teaching leadership online. In response, 24 of the 27 respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement with only three respondents choosing to remain neutral on the statement.

From the responses above, we see a strong indication that, even though 88.9% of respondents felt as though communicating online was a positive in teaching leadership online, 33.3% of respondents indicated that there were communication barriers that presented an issue when teaching online and that most respondents were comfortable dealing with students when it comes to e-mail; however, a number of them preferred not to use online chat when teaching leadership online.

Three open-ended questions were also reviewed when looking at the issue of communication when teaching leadership online. The first of these asked the respondents to list the pros and cons of teaching leadership online (Question 20). Some of the pros that dealt with communication were as follows:

- “Everyone participates.”
- “Students are more engaged with each other.”
- “It allows all to speak and those who want more time to consider their contributions to the discussions can have it.”
- “Discussions can be reviewed at any time during the course.”
- “Communication is flexible for students and faculty alike.”
- “Faculty and students can engage from anywhere in the world.”

Some of the cons that were listed for the same questions were:

- “Not as emotionally satisfying because students are connected to a subject and not so much to you—you are not the center and that takes some adjustments emotionally.”
- “Most of us are comfortable teaching as we have been taught. So online is new/changed/different so there is resistance to the change.”
- “Miss seeing faces and personalities, nonverbal clues are not available.”
- “Doesn’t reach some students who need social learning, and verbal interaction, unless the course is designed with online meetings.”
- “The text base is sometimes difficult. No opportunity to observe. Synchronous discussions are few and far between.”

Comparing the pros and cons of this question when reviewing communication issues, it was interesting to note that while some respondents pointed out that “everyone participates” and “students are more engaged with one another,” others listed these as cons in noting, “synchronous discussions are few and far between”. At the same time, several respondents viewed the flexibility and record-keeping aspects of online communication as positives as was the fact that anyone could respond and do so in their own time thanks to the format of online classes. Despite that, some respondents were quick to point out that teaching online created issues resulting from the lack of personal contact you have with students in that you miss out on nonverbal or nonwritten clues and that there is a lack of emotional satisfaction in the online classroom format and that it takes time to develop comfort in teaching in a way that you were not taught.

A second open-ended question (Question 18) that was examined was reviewing how respondents ensured the students in their online classrooms received the message they were teaching. Among the eight responses were several that included elements of communications:

- “We discuss in our class.”
- “I use multiple mediums of communications to facilitate student learning, and there is redundancy in them.”
- “Discussion boards, I use audio briefings—a short weekly message along with a written message. I regularly stay in the discussion to observe, participate and guide.”
- “Seek feedback.”

In looking to ensure the message they are trying to teach reaches their students, respondents mentioned communication in several responses. Most notably, respondents seemed to indicate a desire to maintain open communications through a multitude of media. Previously, it was noted that respondents found e-mail to be the most desirable method of communication in teaching leadership online whereas in this series of open-ended responses, we can see that other methods of communication were used to ensure their message is being delivered.

A third open-ended question that was considered for communication was the final question, “How do you teach leadership online?” which was Question 21. Among the responses that included elements of communication were as follows:

- “I have chats at the beginning, and a 3 day face to face with students in the middle, and then some sort of chat towards the end.”

- “I push content to online and use the weekly face to face for going deeper.”
- “I teach through a mix of mediums online, dialogue, live Wimba meetings, assigned textbooks and media, assigned projects, custom feedback on projects, answering question in 24 hour turnaround via e-mail.”

Many of the respondents indicated that communication played a large role in how they go about teaching leadership online. From the responses shown in Question 21, we see that online chat and e-mail were the primary methods of communication used by respondents, though one did also show a preference toward face-to-face communication as well.

From the responses used to assess communication among the responses, we see that the majority of respondents preferred e-mail as the primary method of communication while online chat was not viewed as an optimal primary method of communication. At the same time, communication barriers were listed by 33.3% of respondents as being an issue in teaching leadership online. Respondents that opted to answer open-ended questions indicated that while student participation was not an issue, teaching in an online environment means missing out on personal interaction as well as nonverbal clues, which can be important for teaching leadership. A number of open-ended responses indicated that using a multitude of media for communication was important, including face-to-face interaction.

Technological Barriers

The researcher identified a number of questions listed on the survey that had a direct or indirect correlation to the issue of technological barriers in teaching leadership online. According to Pyle and Dziuban (2001), one of the dangers of recent advances in instructional technology is that instruction and instructors are often driven by technology

rather than having technology drive the needs of instruction. In attempting to ascertain the issues that technology might have when teaching leadership online, the following questions were grouped together for analysis.

Question three asked respondents for their feelings about the statement, “Having to develop new technological skills to teach an online class proved to be onerous.” Of the 27 respondents, 15 (55.6%) chose disagree while three others chose strongly disagree as their choice, resulting in 66.7% of respondents disagreeing with the statement. The remaining nine respondents (33.3%) agreed with the statement, indicating that they indeed found having to develop new technological skills to teach leadership online to be an issue.

Question four asked participants to respond to the statement, “Students entering the online leadership program possessed the technical savvy to be successful in the program.” In response to the statement, 24 respondents (88.9%) agreed with the statement with the remaining three respondents remaining neutral on the topic. The responses to this statement seemed to indicate that students that entered the program were ready from a technological standpoint to take part in the program.

Question 11 asked participants to respond to the statement, “All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions.” In Table 12, we see that while 15 respondents agreed and another three respondents strongly agreed with the statement, six respondents (22.2%) disagreed with the statement and the remaining three (11.1%) were neutral to the topic. Bishop (2007) wrote that one of the major issues teachers in an online environment will encounter is the issue of lurkers who refuse to participate in an online community within a classroom. However, respondents seemed to indicate the

lurkers were not an issue in their classes and that technological issues were not a reason for any lack of participation that had been encountered.

Question 12 sought a response to the statement, “The liberating platform of online communication has been a positive in teaching leadership online.” As can be seen in Table 13, 88.9% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement while three were neutral to the statement. These results show that respondents viewed communicating with students using the technology that online courses offer are a positive in teaching leadership online.

Question 13 sought a response to the statement, “The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than that of an online-only program.” In Table 14, we see that many respondents (44.4%) chose to remain neutral on the topic while 22.2% disagreed with the statement. Three respondents agreed with the statement while six strongly agreed with the statement. So while a total of 33.3% agreed with the statement, 22.2% disagreed with the statement. From this data, the researcher came to the conclusion that while this topic was strongly-divided among respondents, respondents seemed to favor a hybrid format of teaching, though many remained neutral on the topic while many disagreed with the statement.

The first open-ended question (Question 17) used for analysis was, “How do you ensure the authenticity of statements delivered to you?” Among the responses that were related to technology were as follows:

- “We only accept assignments uploaded into Assignment Managers in Blackboard.”
- “We use a plagiarism program if we suspect the person is not the author.”

While this was the only response that the researcher was able to identify as relating to technology, it does show technology as being a tool to ensure the authenticity of assignments being delivered. This shows a comfort level of the respondent in using technology, as it is a tool used to ensure the authenticity of assignments that are delivered in an online environment.

The second open-ended question, (Question 18) used for analysis was, “How do you ensure the message you are trying to teach reaches your students?” The following responses were reviewed:

- “Give online quizzes and tests.”
- “I use multiple mediums of communication to facilitate student learning, and there is redundancy in them.”
- “Discussion boards, I use audio briefings—a short weekly message along with a written message.”

In the above responses, the researcher noticed the fact that technology was being used in multiple ways to ensure the delivery of the message being delivered to students. In one instance, we see quizzes and tests being delivered online to deliver a steady stream of messages to students while another teacher uses multiple mediums of communication to stay in contact with students. A third respondent stayed in contact with students using discussion boards, using this technological communication tool to reach their students and ensure the message they are trying to deliver reaches their students.

Question 20 was the third open-ended question to be used in analysis, which asked respondents, “What are the pros and cons to teaching leadership online?” In

reviewing the technological barriers involved in the list of pros and cons given by respondents, the researcher identified the following pros:

- “Great time-invested discussions (much better than face to face because it allows all to speak and those who want more time to consider their contributions to the discussions can have it).”
- “Discussions can be reviewed at any time during the course.”
- “Assignments are not lost (the dog doesn’t eat them).”
- “Dates and times when assignments were submitted are automatically recorded.”

While there does not seem to be a common theme among the responses listed in the pros, respondents seemed to identify several pros when it came to technology in their online classroom setting. In listing cons of technology, the researcher identified the following:

- “Not as satisfying emotionally because students are connected to a subject and each other and not so much you.”
- “More teacher time is required to prepare the course.”
- “Most of us are comfortable teaching as we have been taught. So online is new/changed/different so there is resistance to the change.”
- “Miss seeing faces and personalities, nonverbal clues are not available.”
- “Doesn’t reach some students who need social learning, and verbal interaction, unless the course is designed with online meetings.”
- “No opportunity to observe.”
- “Interaction is asynchronous and this can be difficult to watch.”

The researcher noticed that many of the cons listed by respondents had to do with communication and the limitations that an online environment entails. Two respondents noted the lack of social interaction as being a con of teaching online with nonverbal clues lacking in an online environment. Another respondent noted the lack of observation as being a con, which comes from the technological barrier that can be present in online classrooms.

The final open-ended question the researcher used in assessing technological barriers was the final question, which asked, “How do you teach leadership online?”

From a technological standpoint, respondents answered as follows:

- “I create the course site and make sure that every week the student is online 2–4 hours over several days.”
- “I have chats at the beginning, and a 3 day face to face with students in the middle, and then some sort of chat towards the end.”
- “I teach through a mix of mediums online, dialogue, live Wimba meetings, assigned textbooks and media, assigned projects, custom feedback on projects, answering questions in 24 hour turnaround via e-mail, emphasizing the need for self-directed learning, posting numerous announcements to encourage and direct.”
- “Some leadership learning needs to be experiential so that’s not so good online.”
- “Everyone has fin (SIC) as we experience teaching and learning leadership under the following umbrellas: 1. Theory, philosophy, 2. Practice, application, 3. Stories, 4. Case Studies, 5. Videos, 6. Textbooks (electronic online), 11.

Audio, 12. YouTube clips, 13. Course news, 14. Syllabi, 15. Quizzes, tests, 16 PowerPoint presentations (professor created and student created).”

In reviewing the above responses to Question 21, the researcher noticed that the respondents seemed to each be using technology in a unique manner. Instead of technology being a barrier to these respondents, each found a way to utilize what it had to offer.

Overall, while technology seemed to present an obstacle to many of the respondents, others indicated that they had found ways to adapt. The biggest issue seemed to be the fact that some respondents were more inclined to believe that hybrid style programs were better for teaching and that a lack of face-to-face interaction was an issue in teaching leadership, some had adapted their courses and coursework to technology.

Quality of the Degree

Among the questions that were posed to respondents included those that attempted to ascertain the quality of the degree in the eyes of those surveyed. As a result, the researcher identified several questions that were related to the topic and had analyzed them in this section. The first of these questions was question six, which asked, “Do you expect students that earn a leadership degree to have the same opportunities in career advancement that a student that attains the same degree in a traditional college?” In response to this question as can be seen in Table 7, 12 of the 27 respondents (44.4%) agreed that students in their programs would have the same opportunities as those in a traditional college while nine (33.3%) strongly agreed that they would. Six respondents were neutral on the topic. Overall, the results indicated that respondents felt as though

students in their programs would have the same opportunities after getting their degree as those who attained their graduate degree in leadership in a traditional college.

O'Banion (1997) noted that students learning in an online environment were interested in learning in an environment that stressed critical thinking and collaborative problem solving. As a result, the second question the researcher reviewed was Question 10, which stated, "I see evidence of critical thinking in my online classes." In response to this statement, each respondent either agreed (nine of the 27 responses) or strongly agreed (18 of the 27 respondents). This would indicate that critical thinking is evident in these online programs, which would also indicate a higher quality of learning and the programs in general.

The third Likert scale question that was analyzed was Question 11, which stated, "All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions." In response to this, 15 of the 27 surveyed agreed with the statement while three strongly agreed for a total of 18 (66.7%) agreeing that students regularly interact with each other during online class sessions. Six of the respondents (22.2%) disagreed with the statement while three respondents (11.1%) were neutral. Given this information, most respondents felt as though students regularly interacted with one another, an important component in teaching leadership whether online or in a traditional school.

The fourth question analyzed to determine the quality of online programs looked at Question 13, which contained the statement, "The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than that of an online-only program." Table 14 shows us that nine respondents agreed with the statement (three agreed and six strongly agreed) while six disagreed with the statement with 12

choosing to be neutral on the topic. In reviewing these results, it would appear as though respondents were unsure as to whether the hybrid format classes had a distinct advantage over an online-only class, though nine felt as though it held an advantage over online-only courses in a graduate-level leadership program.

Question 14, which stated, “Had it been available, online education would have been my preferred means of obtaining my degree.” looked at respondents’ preferences after having taught leadership courses online and whether they would have taken that route in going to school. In Table 15, we see that nine respondents (33.3%) agreed that they would have preferred online school had it been available with six respondents (22.2%) strongly agreeing with the statement. Nine respondents (33.3%) disagreed while three (11.1%) strongly disagreed. The responses indicate that many of the respondents felt confident in the quality of the degrees that are available online and that had it been available, they would have chosen to get their degree in an online format with 15 out of 27 respondents (55.5%) choosing to agree with the statement.

The researcher, in looking at the quality of leadership programs taught online reviewed Question 16. The statement, “I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs” yielded the following results: nine disagreed (33.3%) with the statement; nine were neutral (33.3%), six agreed (22.2%) with the statement and three strongly agreed (11.1%). These responses showed a wide array of responses and feelings regarding the statement. While previously it was noted that many respondents indicated that students earning a leadership degree online would have the same opportunities as those in a traditional college and many would choose to pursue their degree online had it been available, in this statement we see a conflict. Nine

disagreed with the statement, indicating that they would in fact recommend traditional leadership programs and another nine respondents were neutral on the topic. These responses would seem to differ from previous responses and show a preference toward traditional leadership programs amongst respondents over online leadership programs.

Question 17, which asked, “How do you ensure the authenticity of assignments delivered to you?” was the first open-ended question reviewed in looking at the quality of degrees offered online. In reviewing these responses to ascertain quality of degree, the researcher looked at the following snippets from respondents:

- “I begin to recognize the ‘voice’ of the student. If the assignment does not seem authentic, I will check. Most students are highly-motivated and want to learn.”
- “You can’t insure (sic) it in a face to face or online course. However, the online assignments relate to their specific work situation and would be hard to very difficult for someone else to accomplish.”
- “Just as in a class setting, we cannot always ensure the student is the person who ‘wrote’ the paper or took the exam. When we can solve this in a traditional setting, only then can we solve it in the online setting.”
- “We only accept assignments uploaded into Assignments Managers in Blackboard. We use a plagiarism program if we suspect the person is not the author.”
- “Because I am regularly in the threaded discussions—I get to know each students ‘voice’. If their graded assignments seem to have a different ‘voice’ I’ll contact that student.”

- “Don’t.”

From the responses above, we see that while respondents indicate that they take very active positions in trying to determine the authenticity of students’ work, they are limited in the same way that professors teaching in a traditional college are. One respondent indicated a possible solution was being able to tell the “voice” of students while another respondent replied with the one-word answer, “Don’t”.

Question 19 asked respondents, “Why did you choose to teach online?” to which the researcher noted the following responses as it pertained to the quality of the degree:

- “I wanted to serve students who couldn’t afford or couldn’t get a traditional education.”
- “I discovered that a well-developed hybrid course accomplished the learning objectives better than the traditional course.”
- “I studied online and loved the asynchronous method, so I also chose to teach online—the depth of content, in my experience, is much greater and allows for more opportunities to discover.”
- “It allows me to increase my student teaching load, while maintaining time for my own research. It reduces my repetitive lecture time.”

In terms of quality, we see that the answers range from those that got into teaching online for the convenience of being able to teach online while also performing their own research to those that did it to reach students who might not otherwise have access to such an education. One respondent mentioned quality in noting that it offers greater depth of content and opportunities to discover.

Another open-ended question that was reviewed was Question 21, which asked, “How do you teach leadership online?” In reviewing the responses, the researcher determined that because each response had a direct correlation, the following themes were identified among the responses:

- Open communication,
- The use of technology and various mediums to deliver teaching materials, and
- Quick turnaround in responses.

The above responses show that respondents felt as though communication in a timely and efficient manner was important in teaching leadership online.

In reviewing the quality of online leadership programs, many conclusions were drawn from the responses by those who agreed to take the survey. Among those are the facts that while many respondents felt as though the opportunities were the same for students who attained a graduate-level degree in leadership in an online versus traditional program and many would have attained their degree in this format were it available, a large number would not recommend getting a degree in an online environment. At the same time, open-ended questions indicated that respondents were quick to point out that online degrees allowed for greater availability for students who might not have otherwise had a chance to attain the degree were it only available at a traditional college.

Theme Conclusions

After reviewing the 16 Likert scale questions that the 27 respondents answered along with the open-ended questions that were answered by a handful of participants, the researcher came to several conclusions that would seem to be key for those teaching leadership at a graduate-level school in format that is taught at least 60% online.

Communication seems to be one of the keys when it comes to teaching online. Of the responses given, e-mail was the preferred form of communication while chat was not seen as an optimal form of communication among respondents. A quick turnaround was also seen as an important factor in responding to students while communication barriers were only seen by one-third of respondents as being an issue to teaching leadership online.

Technology was not an issue for respondents, though some indicated that there was an incubation period in teaching in a format in which you were not taught. At the same time, there was a disagreement among respondents as to whether the hybrid format of teaching was preferred to an online-only format. This disagreement in format could have stemmed from some open-ended questions, which noted that online-only formats lack nonverbal clues and emotional satisfaction that can be vital to teaching leadership. The lack of social interaction was also seen as an issue for some respondents, who saw that as an obstacle that came from the technological limitations of teaching online.

Overall quality created some conflict among responses. While 77.7% of respondents (Table 7) agreed that students getting a graduate-level degree in leadership would have the same opportunities as the same student in a traditional college, and 15 of 27 respondents (55.5%) would prefer to get their degree online had it been available (Table 15), 33.3% of respondents disagreed that they would recommend online programs versus traditional while another 33.3% were neutral on the topic. This disparity creates an interesting discussion as to why respondents who would have been eager to pursue their degree online and feel as though their students will have the same opportunities as those

in traditional college would at the same time have questions about recommending an online program over a traditional one in leadership.

Summary

In addition to the main themes listed above, the primary researcher arrived at three conclusions when it came to teaching leadership in a graduate-level school in which at least 60% of the courses take place online. One of the primary conclusions is the positive approach of the faculty when it comes to teaching in this format.

When reviewing the Likert scale questions, we see that many of the questions reflect the fact that teaching leadership online has been a positive experience overall for the respondents. In question 12, 24 out of the 27 respondents viewed the liberating platform of online communication to be a positive in teaching leadership online while 18 out of 27 respondents indicated that online classes are as effective for teaching and learning as is a traditional course. In addition, two-thirds of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that availability was not an issue in teaching online, which would indicate that scheduling was a positive aspect in teaching leadership in this format.

A second conclusion that was formed was the fact that professors teaching leadership online were confident in their ability to grasp technology in a way that allowed them to teach leadership effectively. Question three reveals that two-thirds of respondents felt as though they did not need to develop new technology in order to teach leadership online while question two revealed that 15 out of 27 indicated that communication barriers were not an issue in teaching online. At the same time, 21 out of 27 respondents indicated that communicating by e-mail was acceptable, revealing a confidence in teaching leadership by communicating via e-mail. Many respondents also showed an

ability to grasp technology by utilizing several different methods of contacting and reaching out to students, including chat, message boards, videos and so forth in order to teach leadership. This confidence in teaching leadership online was shown repeatedly in reviewing the respondents' responses.

A third and final conclusion revolved around the challenges of teaching leadership online. Among these challenges are:

- Lurkers: Several respondents indicated that student interaction was an issue and getting all students to participate was a problem in teaching leadership online. Getting all students to participate was a problem that seems to present a growing issue among respondents and needs to be addressed by professors teaching leadership online.
- Identifying Nonverbal Communication: Because professors are likely to not be able to see students, they will have to find ways to identify nonverbal forms of communication. While teachers in traditional colleges may be able to identify nonverbal communication such as a befuddled look on student's faces, teachers teaching online cannot rely on such indicators. Teachers leading an online class must find ways to identify nonverbal indicators to properly convey messages and teach online leadership courses.
- Plagiarism: Because purchasing papers and assignments can take place online, teachers teaching leadership online need to find ways to check for plagiarism. Some of the ways respondents noted handling this issue included online plagiarism programs that check for the assignment's presence online and

checking for the presence of content that might have appeared in lectures and/or other assignments within the suspected coursework.

- **Recognizing The Voice Of The Student:** In interacting with students, teachers should begin to recognize each student's "voice" through the verbiage the students use in assignments, classes and other forms of teacher-to-student or even student-to-student interaction. Developing this sense of being able to recognize the voice of the student was identified as being important in finding ways to teach leadership online.

Recommendations

The purpose of the research project was to bridge any potential gaps in teaching leadership in an online format versus a traditional school. Perhaps the most telling response in the survey was Question 16, which stated, "I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs." In response to that statement, one-third of respondents disagreed with the statement while another one-third were neutral to the query. Six respondents agreed with the statement while the remaining three strongly agreed. Taken collectively, we see that one-third disagreed with the statement, one-third were neutral and another one-third agreed. Evenly divided among the 27 responses, respondents were unable to agree on whether they would recommend online leadership programs over traditional programs. This would seem to indicate that there is at least a small measure of confusion among those that teach these programs as to the quality of online leadership programs versus traditional programs.

The study conducted in the course of this paper showed several points that can be used in determining best methods for teaching leadership in an online format. Perhaps the

most important would be communication. From the responses gathered, using a wide array of mediums with students appears to be the best way to communicate in an online format. Among the forms of communication mentioned include e-mail, the preferred method, along with discussion boards, some method of technology that allows visual communication and a hybrid format where face-to-face communication is also utilized at times. At the same time, many respondents indicated that quick turnaround times when contacting students is important in teaching leadership online.

From the responses gathered, technological barriers are not an issue, though some respondents indicated that it was onerous at times. It is recommended that teachers teaching leadership in an online format be given support when needed so that technological barriers do not become an issue or are not deemed to be onerous by those teaching in these programs. Technology and communication seemed to be closely related in the responses gathered in the survey, which the researcher analyzed to indicate that developing skills to master communicating through these mediums is very important to teach leadership online, as is using these to remain in contact with students to enhance the quality of online leadership programs.

Based on the responses, the researcher has the following recommendations for teaching leadership online:

- **Equity Of Communication:** Several respondents gave recommendations that included the usage of various forms of communication to reach each student. Because each student may react differently to various forms of communication, the researcher recommends introducing a variety of forms of

communication including video, YouTube, message boards, chat, e-mail and other forms of online communication.

- Usage Of Web Cams: Because many respondents indicated a lack of social interaction and the lack of nonverbal communication was an issue in teaching leadership online, the researcher recommends use of Webcam, Skype or other forms of online communication that allows professors and students to be able to see each other in online courses when possible.
- Quick Turnaround: With e-mail and message boards being such a prominent part of communication and because of the nature of online leadership courses, it is recommended that professors do their best to respond to students in a timely manner. This will enable smooth communication between professors and students who might have questions that might not be responded to in a timely manner that might otherwise be presented in traditional colleges, which are more likely to feature face-to-face and telephone interaction.
- Social Change: The ongoing evolvement of social media presents interesting developments for the field of teaching leadership online. Finding ways to incorporate social media such as Facebook, Twitter and other social media Web sites into the curriculum will be yet another way to enhance the teaching of leadership online.

Recommendations for Future Research

In addition, the researcher has several recommendations to be presented for those looking to teach leadership in an online environment:

- Chat: While 88.9% of respondents indicated that the online environment provided a liberating form of communication, only 11.1% of respondents showed a preference toward using online chat. Future research should be conducted as to why more professors do not prefer to use chat as a method of communication and why this is not a preferred method of communication by those teaching leadership online.
- Team Building: Several respondents indicated that the field of leadership included team building exercises. Future research should revolve the ability to promote team building exercises through online classes to enhance teaching leadership online. This could include ways to introduce games that enhance leadership skills through the online courses or other methods to promote team building in online environments.

Final Conclusions

As a growing field, leadership itself is always changing and evolving. Adding in the element of teaching this field online presents a whole new slew of opportunities for change and growth. Because teaching leadership is a relatively new development, the field of teaching leadership online presents many opportunities for researchers and professors to enhance the experiences that those taking online courses will endure. While this research presented a nationwide study in this field, this growing issue requires further research be conducted to optimize the learning environment that those embarking on the journey of taking leadership courses online will face.

Overall, utilizing technology to improve the quality of online education through various forms of communication and remaining in close contact with students seemed to

be the most important factors when it comes to teaching leadership online. As online leadership programs begin to graduate more and more students who one day may return to teach in this format, communication and technology should be less of an issue as these students who are accustomed to the format and the learning style are able to implement these methods to make the perception that teaching leadership online and the programs themselves are as effective and beneficial as leadership programs in traditional colleges.

REFERENCES

- Ali, N. S., Hodson-Carlton, K., & Ryan, M. (2004). Students' perceptions of online learning: Implications for teaching. *Nurse Educator*, 29, 111–115. Retrieved from <http://journals.lww.com>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2003). *Seizing the opportunity: The quality and extent of online education in the United States, 2002 and 2003*. Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/sizing_the_opportunity2003
- Ally, M., & Coldeway, D. O. (1999). Establishing competencies and curricula for the distance education expert at the master's level. *Journal of Distance Education*, 14(1), 75-88. Retrieved from http://cade.athabascau.ca/vol14.1/ally_et_al.html
- Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R. O., & Gumport, P. J. (2005). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic changes* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Anderson, T. (2004). Toward a theory of online learning. In T. Anderson & F. Elloumi (Eds.), *Theory and practice of online learning* (pp. 33–60). Retrieved from http://cde.athabascau.ca/online_book/
- AuBuchon, D. (2010). *The definition of a teacher*. Retrieved from <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/150398>
- Backhouse, C., Burns, N., Dani, S., & Masood, S. (2006, June). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: The situational strength perspective. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers—Part B—Engineering Manufacture*, 220(6), 941–949. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.
- Baker, D., Woods, J., & Woods, R. (2002, August). *Social dynamics of online learning: Pedagogical imperatives and practical applications*. Presented at the 18th Annual Conference on Distance Learning, Madison, WI.
- Bangert, A. W. (2005). The seven principles of effective teaching: A framework for designing, delivering, and evaluating an Internet-based assessment course for nurse educators. *Nurse Educator*, 30(5), 221–225. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16170265>
- Barker, A. (2004). Using online learning technology to develop nurse leaders. *Nurse Leader*, 2(5), 32–35. Retrieved from <http://www.nurseleader.com/article/S1541-4612%2804%2900111-9/abstract>
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

- Bassi, S., & Polifroni, E. C. (2005). Learning communities: The link to recruitment and retention. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 21(3), 103–109. Retrieved from <http://journals.lww.com/jnsdonline/>
- Bates, A. W. T. (1995). *Technology, open learning and distance education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bates, A. W. (2000). *Managing technology change: Strategies for colleges and university leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Beaudoin, M. (2003). Distance education leadership for the new century. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 6(2), 131-144. Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer62/beaudoin62.html>
- Beaudoin, M. F. (2004). *Reflections on research, faculty and leadership in distance education*. Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg: Bibliotheks
- Bennis, W. (2000). *Managing the dream: Reflections on leadership & change*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- Bennis, W. (2007, January). The challenges of leadership in the modern world. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 2–5. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.
- Berge, Z. (Ed.). (2001). *Sustaining distance training: Integrating learning technologies into the fabric of the enterprise*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bichelmeyer, B., & Molenda, M. (2004). *Issues and trends in instructional technology*. Retrieved from <http://www.indiana.edu/~molpage/Issues%20&%20Trends%202005.pdf>
- Bishop, J. (2007). Increasing participation in online communities: A framework for human-computer interaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 1881–1893. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.84.2826>
- Bitler, D. (2001). Managing technological change: Strategies for college and university leaders. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 80–82. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-76524320.html>
- Black, L. (2003). Adult and distance education management: An application of the metaphor “organizations as organisms.” *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 6(4), 17-31. Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter64/black64.htm>
- Blanchard, K., & Hersey, P. (1981, June). So you want to know your leadership style? *Training & Development Journal*, 35(6), 34–48. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov

- Brigham-Sprague, M. A. (2001). *A case study of crisis, leadership, and change in the community college* (Doctoral dissertation.). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (AAT 3050311)
- Brown, L. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2001). Exploring the relationship between learning and leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(6), 274–280. Retrieved from www.integrativeleadership.ca/resources/articles/article_1.pdf
- Bruner, J. (2007, Summer). Factors motivating and inhibiting faculty in offering their courses via distance education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 10(2). Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer102/bruner102.pdf>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bush, G. R. (1998). Is constant fund raising the future for higher education? A look at the real issues. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 230-233. Retrieved from www.accessmylibrary.com
- California Community Colleges Board of Governors. (2003). *Distance education report* (Report No. 7.2). Sacramento, CA: California Community College Chancellor's Office.
- Calvert, J. (2003). Handbook of distance education. *Distance Education*, 24, 265–300.
- Caplan, D. (2004). The development of online courses. In T. Anderson & F. Elloumi (Eds.), *Theory and practice of online learning* (pp. 175–194). Retrieved from http://cde.athabascau.ca/online_book/
- Carey, J. M. (2002). Effective student outcomes: A comparison of online and face-to-face delivery modes. *DEOSNEWS*, 11(9). Retrieved from http://www.ed.psu.edu/acsde/deos/deosnews/deosnews11_9.asp
- Carr, S. (2000). As distance education comes of age, the challenge is keeping the students. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(23), A39. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/As-Distance-Education-Comes-of/14334>
- Carter, D. (2010). For-profit colleges face more scrutiny in new report. *eCampus News*. Retrieved from www.ecampusnews.com
- Christo-Baker, E. A. (2004). Distance education as a catalyst for change in higher education. *Proceedings of the 2004 Association of Small Computer Users in Education Conference*, 37, (pp. 39-49). Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICEExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED490098&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&acno=ED490098

- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, M., & March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college presidency*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Cornford, J., & Pollock, N. (2003). *Putting the university online: Information, technology, and organizational change*. Buckingham, England: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Crabtree, L. F. (2000). A comparison of community college student performance, retention, and demographics in online and onground courses. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(12), 4653.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curran, C. (1997). *The origins of distance education and its use in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://thejournal.com/articles/1999/09/01/the-origins-of-distance-education-and-its-use-in-the-united-states.aspx>
- Darabi, A. A., Sikorski, E. G., & Harvey, R. B. (2006). Validated competencies for distance teaching. *Distance Education*, 27, 105–122. Retrieved from <http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/link.asp?target=contribution&id=H67868VX04506J5M>
- Dexter, D. J. (1995). Student performance-based outcomes of televised interactive community college distance education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56 (06), 2027A.
- Diekelmann, N., & Mendias, E. P. (2005). Being a supportive presence in online courses: Attending to students' online presence with each other. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 44, 393–395. Retrieved from <http://www.slackjournals.com/article.aspx?rid=35019>
- Dillon, C. L., & Walsh, S. M. (1992). Faculty: The neglected resource in distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 6, 5–21. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08923649209526796#preview>
- Du Mont, R. R. (2002). *Distance learning: A systems view an assessment and review of the literature*. Retrieved <http://www.rcet.org/>
- Edelson, P. J., & Pittman, V. V. (2001). E-Learning in the United States: New Directions and Opportunities for University Continuing Education. *Global E-Journal of Open, Flexible and Distance Education*, 1(1), 71–73. Retrieved from www.glovedu.com

.stonybrook.edu/spd/dean_papers/newdelhi.pdf

- Edwards, C. (1993). Association for computing machinery. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(5), 76–79. Retrieved from <http://cacm.acm.org/magazines/1993/5>
- Ertl, B., Winkler, K., & Mandl, H. (2007). E-learning: Trends and future development. In F. Neto & F. Brasileiro (Eds.), *Advances in computer-supported learning* (pp. 4–18). Hershey, PA: Information Science.
- Fabel, L. (2010, August). Feds fear tax dollars wasted at for-profit colleges. *Washington Examiner*. Retrieved from www.allbusiness.com
- Fisher, M. (2003) On-line collaboration learning: Relating theory to practice. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 31(3), 227–249. Retrieved from <http://baywood.metapress.com/app/home/contribution.asp?referrer=parent&backto=issue,2,7;journal,39,155;linkingpublicationresults,1:300322,1>
- Freiberg, J., & Freiberg, K. (2004). *Guts! Companies that blow the doors off business-as-usual*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Galbreath, J. (1997). The Internet: Past, present, and future. *Educational Technology*, 37, 39–45. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ555773&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ555773
- Gall, M., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Galusha, J. M. (1997). Barriers to learning in distance education. *Interpersonal Computing and Technology*, 5(3–4), 6–14. Retrieved from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol7/iss3/general/article1.cfm>
- Garrison, D., & Shale, D. (1987). Mapping the boundaries of distance education: Problems in defining the field. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, (1), 4–13. Retrieved from http://www.ajde.com/Contents/vol1_1.htm
- Garrison, D. R. (2006). *Online community of inquiry update: Social, cognitive, and teaching presence issues*. Retrieved from www.communitiesofinquiry.com
- Germain, L. S., & Quinn, D. (2005). Investigation of tacit knowledge in principal leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 70, 75–91. Retrieved from http://proflern.janison.com:80/TPPP/DMap_04/pdf/ff05_75-90.pdf
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). New

York, NY: Longman.

- Goddard, M. (2002). What do we do with these computers? *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 35(1), 19–26. Retrieved from <http://www.iste.org/learn/publications/journals/jrte-old.aspx>
- Goffee, R., & Jones, G. (2006). *Why should anyone be led by you? What it takes to be an authentic leader*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gordon, P. (2000). *Measuring distance learning outcomes and resource utilization*. Fort Myers, FL: Edison Community College.
- Government Accountability Office. (2010). *For-profit colleges: Undercover testing finds colleges encouraged fraud and engaged in deceptive marketing practices*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-948T>
- Green, K. (2000). The real IT problem: People, not products. *Converge*, 3(1), 76–77. Retrieved from www.nea.org/assets/img/PubAlmanac/ALM_03_09.pdf
- Groves, M. M., & Zemel, P. C. (2000). Instructional technology adoption in higher education: An action research case study [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 27, 57–65. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/international-journal-of-instructional-media/oclc/44490972?title=&detail=&page=frame&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.umi.com%2Fpqdauto%2F%26checksum%3Def7b71a00a8aab9ade54221550763f2e&linktype=digitalObject>
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gunawardena, C., & McIsaac, M. (2002). Distance education. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (2nd ed.): *A project of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology*, 355-395. Retrieved from patricklowenthal.com/publications/socialpresenceEDOL-pre-print.pdf
- Harkin, T. (2010, September). Sen. Harkin: For-profit colleges' dropout rates tops 50%. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com
- Harley, D. (2001). *Higher education in the digital age: Planning for an uncertain future*. Retrieved from <http://campustechnology.com/articles/2001/08/higher-education->

in-the-digital-age-planning-for-an-uncertain-future.aspx

- Harley, D., & Lawrence, S. (2006). *The regulation of e-learning: New national and international policy perspectives*. Retrieved from University of California, Berkeley, Center for Studies in Higher Education Web site: <http://repositories.cdlib.org/>
- Harris, M. H. (1999). Is the revolution now over, or has it just begun? A year of the Internet in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 1, 243–251. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1096751699801572>
- Haworth, J., & Conrad, C. (1997). *Emblems of quality in higher education: Developing and sustaining high quality programs*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hogan, R. (1997). *Analysis of student success in distance learning courses compared with traditional courses*. Paper presented at the annual Conference on Multimedia in Education and Industry, Chattanooga, TN.
- Holmberg, B. (1986). *Growth and structure of distance education*. London, U.K.: Croom Helm.
- Holt, D. M., & Thompson, D. J. (1998). Managing information technology in open and distance higher education. *Distance Education*, 19, 197–228. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0158791980190203>
- Irlbeck, S. (2001). *Distance education programs and transformational leadership characteristics in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. AAT 3026468)
- Jaffee, D. (1998). Institutionalized resistance to asynchronous learning networks. *ALN*, 2(2), 1–11. Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/system/files/v2n2_jaffee.pdf
- Jasper, T. (1995). *Student perceptions of the affective experiences encountered in distance learning courses* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and These (UMI No. AAT 9531182).
- Jung, D., Chow, W., & Wu, A. (2004). *The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings*. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S104898430300050X>
- Kagima, L. K., & Hausafus, C. O. (2001). Faculty: The central element in instructional technology integration. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 93, 33–37. Retrieved from <http://www.waset.org/journals/ijhss/v2/v2-3-27.pdf>

- Karsenti, T. (1998). *Student motivation and distance education on the web: Love at first sight* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Quebec, Montréal.
- Keegan, D. (1990). *Foundations of distance education* (2nd ed.). London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Kerka, S. (1996, January). *Distance learning, the Internet, and the world wide web* (Report No. EDO-CE-96-168). Columbus, OH: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED395214)
- Kirby, E. (1999). *Building interaction in online and distance education courses*. Paper presented at the Society for Information Technology Teacher Education International Conference, San Antonio, TX. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED432230)
- Knowlton, D. S. (2005). A taxonomy of learning through asynchronous discussion. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 16*(2), 155–177. Retrieved from <http://www.editlib.org/noaccess/5675>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1990, January). The credibility factor: What followers expect from their leaders. *Management Review, 79*(1), 29. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kowch, E. (2004). The web in higher education: Assessing the impact and fulfilling the potential. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 33*, 101–107. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-989021861.html>
- Kozlowski, D. (2004). Factors for consideration in the development and implementation of an online RN-BSN course: Faculty and student perceptions. *CIN: Computers, Informatics, Nursing, 22*, 34–43. Retrieved from http://journals.lww.com/cinjournal/Abstract/2004/01000/Factors_for_Consideration_in_the_Development_and.8.aspx
- Krentler, K. A., & Willis-Flurry, L. A. (2005). Does technology enhance actual student learning? *Journal of Education for Business, 80*(6), 316–321. Retrieved from http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/results/external_link_maincontentframe.jhtml?_DARGS=/hww/results/results_common.jhtml.44
- Kruger, K. (2000). Using information technology to create communities of learners. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Involving commuter students in learning. New directions for higher education* (pp. 59–70). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Ku, H., Cheng, Y., & Lohr, L. (2006). The cultivation of group collaboration in webbased learning environments. In M. Orey, V. J. McClendon, & R. M. Branch (Eds.), *Educational media and technology yearbook 2006* (Vol. 31; pp. 127–138). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- LaBonte, R. (2005). *Leadership and educational technologies: Leading the charge for elearning in British Columbia school* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (AAT NR10524)
- Land, T., & Bright, T. (2004). The distant learning leader: What you don't know could hurt you. *Distance Learning, 1*, 24–32. Retrieved from <http://www.editlib.org/noaccess/11325>
- Lao, T., & Gonzales, C. (2005). Understanding online learning through a qualitative description of professors and students' experiences. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 13*, 459–474. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/?fuseaction=Reader.ViewAbstract&paper_id=4692
- Lee, J., & Dziuban, C. (2002). Using quality assurance strategies for online programs. *Educational Technology Review, 10*(2), 69–78. Retrieved from <http://clt.odu.edu/mabdous/eci731/weeks/week11/Quality%20Assurance%20Strategies%20for%20Online%20Delivery%20Program%20Delivery.pdf>
- Lee, J., & Hirumi, A. (2004, October). *Analysis of essential skills and knowledge for teaching online*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED485021)
- Lee, Y., & Nguyen, H. (2007). Get your degree from an educational ATM: An empirical study of online education [Electronic version]. *International Journal on E-Learning, 6*(1), 31–40. Retrieved from <http://editlib.org/p/6271>
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(4), 498–518. Retrieved from <http://eaq.sagepub.com/content/30/4/498.full.pdf+html>
- Levine, A., & Sun, J. C. (2002). *Barriers to distance education*. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/distributed-learning/distributed-learning-06.pdf>
- Lewis, J. M., & Farrell, M. (2005). Distance education: A strategy for leadership development. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 26*(6), 362–367. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb3317/is_6_26/ai_n29227987/
- Lewis, L., Farris, E., & Alexander, D. (1997). *Distance education in higher education. Statistical analysis report. Postsecondary education*. (Report No. NCES-98-062). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED413829)

- Linehan, M. (2001). Women international managers: The European experience. *Cross Cultural Management*, 8(3–4), 68–84. Retrieved from <http://www.deepdyve.com/lp/emerald-publishing/women-international-managers-the-european-experience-pJBNfHayjh>
- Lorenzo, G., & Moore, J.C. (2002). *The Sloan Consortium report to the nation: The five pillars of quality online education*. Retrieved from <http://www.mendeley.com/research/sloan-consortium-report-nation-five-pillars-quality-online-education/>
- Maddux, C. D., & Johnson, D. L. (1997). The world wide web: Historical, cultural, context, and a manual for developers of educational information-based web sites. *Educational Technology*, 37, 5–12. Retrieved from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol9/iss2/socialstudies/article1.cfm>
- Maloney-Krichmar, D., & Preece, J. (2005). A multilevel analysis of sociability, usability, and community dynamics in an online health community. *Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 12(2), 201–232. Retrieved from <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1067864>
- Mancuso-Murphy, J. (2007). Distance education in nursing: An integrated review of online nursing students' experiences with technology-delivered instruction. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 46(6), 252–260. Retrieved from <http://www.slackjournals.com/fulltext.aspx?rid=34774>
- Mariasingham, M. A., & Hanna, D. E. (2006, Fall). *Benchmarking quality in online degree programs: Status and prospects*. Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall93/mariasingam93.htm>
- Martinez, M. (2002). Understanding state higher education systems: Applying a new framework. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 349–375. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/jhe/summary/v073/73.3martinez.html>
- Masood, S. A., Dani, S. S., Burns, N. D., & Backhouse, C. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: The situational strength perspective. *Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, 220(B6), 941–950. Retrieved from <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/4585>
- Matkin, G. M. (2007). *Internet as teenager in higher education: Rapid growth, transformation, uncertain but bright future*. Retrieved from <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=273>
- Mavrincac, M. (2005). Transformational leadership: Peer mentoring as a values-based learning process. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5, 391–404. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/pla/summary/v005/5.3mavrincac.html>
- Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: Philosophic and practical guide*. Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

- McGovern, D., Foster, L., & Ward, K. (2002). College leadership: Learning from experience. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8, 29–42.
- McGregor, D. (2006). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- McMillan, J. H., & Scumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Longman.
- McNeil, B. J., Elfrink, V. L., Bickford, C. J., Pierce, S. T., Beyea, S. C., Averill, C., & Klappenbach, C. (2003). Nursing information technology knowledge, skills, and preparation of student nurses, nursing faculty, and clinicians: A U.S. survey. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 42, 341–349. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12938896>
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp. 18–33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2004). *Research design explained* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Mohamed, A., & Fahy, P. (2002, August). *Using student's learning styles to provide support in distance education*. Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference on Distance Learning, Madison, WI.
- Molenda, M., & Robinson, R. (2004). *The meanings of educational technology*. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~molpage/Meanings%20of%20ET_4.0.pdf
- Moore, M. G. (Ed.). (1990). *Contemporary issues in American distance education*. Retrieved from http://www.gwu.edu/~ed220ri/reading/Gibson_Selected_Research.pdf
- Moore, M. G. (1998). Introduction. In C.C. Gibson's (Ed.), *Distance learners in higher education* (pp. 1–7). Retrieved from <http://www.cios.org/EJCPUBLIC/009/1/00914.HTML>
- Moore, M. G. (2003). *From Chautauqua to the virtual university: A century of distance education in the United States*. (Report No. 393). Retrieved from ERIC database. (No. ED482375).
- Moore, M., & Kearsley, G. (1996). *Distance education: A systems view*. New York, NY: Wadsworth.

- Moore, M., & Kearsley, G. (2004). *Distance education: A systems view* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Moskal, P. D., & Dziuban, C. D. (2001). Present and future directions for assessing cybereducation: The changing research paradigm. In L. R. Vandervert, L. V. Shavinina, & R. A. Cornell (Eds.), *Cybereducation: The future of long-distance learning* (pp. 157–184). New York, NY: Mary Ann Liebert.
- Moursund, D. (1984). Microcomputer technical overview. *School Psychology Review*, 13, 440–448. Retrieved from <http://www.pages.oregon.edu/moursund/Books/IAW-PS-in-IA/pdf>
- Mueller, C. L., & Billings, D. M. (2006). Supporting learner success. In J. M. Novotny & R. H. Davis (Eds.), *Distance education in nursing* (2nd ed.; pp. 47–68). New York, NY: Springer.
- Nasseh, B. (1997). *A brief history of distance education*. Retrieved from <http://www.bsu.edu/classes/nasseh/study/history.html>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Limited English proficient students*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=80>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *Distance education at postsecondary education institutions: 1997–98* (NCES Report No. 2000013). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Findings from the condition of education 2002: Nontraditional undergraduates* (Condition of Education Report No. NCES 2002-012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *The condition of education 2004*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004077.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2006a). *The condition of education 2006*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006071.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2006b). *Integrated postsecondary education data system: Executive peer tool and peer analysis system*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *National Center for Education Statistics: Fast facts: How many postsecondary institutions offer distance learning programs*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=80>
- Normile, D. (1997). Schools ponder new global landscape. *Science*, 277(5324), 311.

Retrieved from <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/277/5324/311.full>

- O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- Olcott, D. (2005). Reflections on research, faculty and leadership in distance education. *Distance Learning*, 2, 36–38. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/232/315>
- Olliges, R., Wernet, S. P., & Delicath, T. A. (1999, May). *Using WebCT to educate practice professionals*. Speech presented at meeting of Using WebCT for Course Development at Columbus, Ohio.
- Ostrow, L., & DiMaria-Ghalili, R. A. (2005). Distance education for graduate nursing: One state school's experience. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 44, 5–10. Retrieved from http://www.journalofnursingeducation.com/PDFs/2005Annual_Index.pdf
- Owen, P., & Demb, A. (2004). Change dynamics and leadership in technology implementation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 636. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/jhe/summary/v075/75.6owen.html>
- Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (1999). *Building learning communities in cyberspace: Effective strategies for the on-line classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2005). *Collaborating online: Learning together in community*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Peterson's. (2005). *Peterson's guide to distance learning programs*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Thomson Learning.
- Phillips, V. (1998). Virtual classrooms, real education. *The Journal*, 25(4), 22-24. Retrieved from <http://thejournal.com/articles/1999/09/01/the-origins-of-distance-education-and-its-use-in-the-united-states.aspx>
- Picciano, A. C. (2001). *Distance learning: Making connections across virtual space and time*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Pierson, M. (2001). Technology integration practice as a function of pedagogical expertise [Electronic version]. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education* 33, 413–430. Retrieved from <http://ijedict.dec.uwi.edu/viewarticle.php?id=571&layout=html>
- Portugal, L. (2006). Emerging leadership roles in distance education: current state of affairs and forecasting future trends. *The Online Journal*, 4(3). Retrieved from http://www.academicleadership.org/article/Emerging_Leadership_Roles_in_Distance_Education

- Posey, L., & Pintz, C. (2006). Online teaching strategies to improve collaboration among nursing students. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 6, 372–379. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17052806>
- Potashnick, M., & Capper J. (1998). Distance education: Growth and diversity. *Finance & Development*, 35(1), 42–45. Retrieved from <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/1998/03/pdf/potashni.pdf>
- Pyle, R. C., & Dziuban, C. D. (2001). Technology: Servant or master of the online teacher? *Library Trends*, 50(1), 130–144. Retrieved from <http://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/8382>
- Quan-Haase, A. (2005). Trends in online learning communities. *Association for Computing Machinery (ACM): Special Interest Group on Supporting Group Work (SIGGROUP) Bulletin*, 25(1), 2–6. Retrieved from <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1316630>
- Ready, D. A. (2002). How storytelling builds next-generation leaders. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan Management Review*, 43(4), 63–69. Retrieved from <http://tppserver.mit.edu/esd801/readings/storytelling.pdf>
- Relan, A., & Gillani, B. (1997). Web-based instruction and the traditional classroom: Similarities and differences. In B. Khan (Ed.), *Web-based-instruction* (pp. 41–46). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology.
- Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Person Education.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Rovai, A. P. (2003). In search of higher persistence rates in distance education online programs. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 6, 1–16. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1096751602001586>
- Rumble, G. (2001). Re-inventing distance education, 1971–2001. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20, 31–43. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02601370010008246#preview>
- Russell, T. (2001). *The no significant difference phenomenon: A comparative research annotated bibliography on technology for distance education as reported in 355 research reports, summaries, and papers*. Raleigh, NC: International Distance Education Certification Center.
- Ruth, S. R., Sammons, M., & Poulin, L. (2007). E-learning at the crossroads—What price quality? *Educause Quarterly*, 30(2), 32–29. Retrieved from <http://www.educause>

.edu/EDUCAUSE+Quarterly/EDUCAUSEQuarterlyMagazineVolum/ELearninga
taCrossroadsWhatPric/157453

- Ryan, M., Hodson-Carlton, K., & Ali, N. S. (2005). A model for faculty teaching online: Confirmation of a dimensional matrix. *Journal of Nursing Education, 44*, 357–365. Retrieved from <http://www.mendeley.com/research/model-faculty-teaching-online-confirmation-dimensional-matrix/>
- Saba, F. (1990). Integrated telecommunications systems and instructional transaction. In M. G. Moore & G. C. Clark (Eds.), *Readings in principles of distance education* (Number 1; pp. 29–36). University Park, PA: American Centre for the Study of Distance Education.
- Saba, F. (1999). Is distance education comparable to “traditional education”? *Distance Educator, 3*(18), 1-3. Retrieved from <http://www.distance-educator.com/der/comparable.html>
- Saba, F. (2003). Distance education theory, methodology, and epistemology: A pragmatic paradigm. In M. G. Moore & W. G. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 3–20). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Salmon, G. (2000). *E-moderating: The key to teaching and learning online*. London, U.K.: Kogan Page.
- Santilli, S., & Beck, V. (2005). Graduate faculty perceptions of online teaching. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 6*, 155–160. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=ldNZuJQqna0C&pg=PA155&lpg=PA155&dq=Graduate+faculty+perceptions+of+online+teaching.+The+Quarterly+Review+of+Distance+Education,+6,+155%E2%80%93160.&source=bl&ots=KSv3xeQfwb&sig=reRnCJyJJ0E3nScC-2lRPCR9x80&hl=en&ei=7vhaTvSNOYTmiAKn6-HOCQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CB8Q6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=Graduate%20faculty%20perceptions%20of%20online%20teaching.%20The%20Quarterly%20Review%20of%20Distance%20Education%2C%206%2C%20155%E2%80%93160.&f=false
- Sarasin, L. C. (1999). *Learning style perspectives: Impact in the classroom*. Madison, WI: Atwood.
- Schell, K. A. (2006). A Delphi study of innovative teaching in baccalaureate nursing education. *Journal of Nursing Education, 45*(11), 439-448. Retrieved from <http://www.mendeley.com/research/delphi-study-innovative-teaching-baccalaureate-nursing-education/>
- Schlosser, L. A., & Simonson, M. (2002). *Distance education: Definition and glossary of terms*. Bloomington, IN: Association for Educational Communication and Technology.

- Schraeder, M., Swamidass, P., & Morrison, R. (2006). Employee involvement, attitudes, and reactions to technology changes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12, 85–101. Retrieved from <http://jlo.sagepub.com/content/12/3/85.abstract>
- Schrum, L., & Luetkehans, L. (1997). *A primer on distance education: Considerations for decision makers*. Bloomington, IN: Association for Educational Communications and Technology.
- Shale, D. (1990). Toward a reconceptualization of distance education. In M. J. Moore (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in American distance education* (pp. 333–343). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Shneiderman, B., & Plaisant, C. (2005). *Designing the user interface: Strategies for effective human-computer interaction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Addison Wesley.
- Simanek, D. (1997). *On being a student*. Retrieved from <http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/goodstud.htm>
- Simonson, M., & Schlosser, L. (2003). *Association for educational communications & technology: Distance education—Towards a definition and glossary of terms: Defining distance education*. Bloomington, IN: AECT.
- Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., Albright, M., & Zvacek, S. (2003). *Teaching and learning at a distance. Foundations of distance education* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Singh, R., & Means, B. (2000). *Technology and education reform*. Washington, DC: SRI International.
- South Central Regional Library Council. (n.d.). *Distance learning glossary*. Retrieved from <http://scrlc.org/site/view/5066>
- Spotts, T. H., & Bowman, M. A. (1995, March-April). Faculty use of instructional technology in higher education. *Educational Technology*, 35, 55–65. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ499832&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ499832
- Stacey, E., & Gerbic, P. (2007). Teaching for blended learning—Research perspectives from on-campus and distance students. *Education and information technologies*, 12, 165–174. Retrieved from <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1285532>

- State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA), the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2007). *Maximizing the impact: The pivotal role of technology in a 21st century education system*. Retrieved from <http://www.setda.org/web/guest/maximizingimpactreport>
- Sternberg, R. J. (2005). A model of educational leadership: Wisdom, intelligence and creativity, synthesized. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 8(4), 347–364. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603120500156088#preview>.
- Sutton, S. C. (2003). An exploration of college persistence for students enrolled in web enhanced courses: A multivariate analytic approach. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(02), 379.
- Tabata, L. N., & Johnsrud, L. K. (2008). The impact of faculty attitudes toward technology, distance education, and innovation. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 625–646. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/r781432m38u0438w/>
- Taylor, J. (2001, June). *Fifth generation distance education*. Speech presented at meeting of 5th Generation Distance Education at Southern Queensland, Australia.
- Taylor-Powell, E. (2009). *What is sampling bias?* Retrieved from 4h.uwex.edu/evaluation/documents/Whatissamplingbias.pdf
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2003). *Distance education*. Retrieved from <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/distanceded/>
- Thach, E. C., & Murphy, K. L. (1995). Competencies for distance education professionals. *Educational Technology, Research, and Development*, 43, 57–79. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/fulltext.pdf?id=doi:10.1007/BF02300482>
- Tham, C. M., & Werner, J. M. (2005). Designing and evaluating e-learning in higher education: A review and recommendations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11, 15–26. Retrieved from <http://jlo.sagepub.com/content/11/2/15.abstract>
- Thomas, S. (2004, October). *Developing thought leaders*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.
- Thomason, L. M. (2004). The distance education evolution: Issues and case studies. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 5, 305–400. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-844312291.html>

- Thompson, M. M. (1998). Overview of distance learners in higher education. In C. Campbell Gibson (Ed.), *Distance learners in higher education*, (pp. 9–24). Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/system/files/v3n2_thompson.pdf
- Tifflin, J., & Rajasingham, L. (1995). *In search of the virtual class: Education in an information society*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Tompkins, P., Perry, S., & Lippincott, J. (1998). New learning communities: Collaboration, networking, and information literacy. *Information Technology Libraries*, 17(2), 100–106. Retrieved from <http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsid=2399574>
- Trevino, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1), 5–37. Retrieved from <http://hum.sagepub.com/content/56/1/5.short?rss=1&ssource=mfc>
- Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). *Research methods knowledge base* [electronic version]. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net>
- Vadanovich, S., & Piotrowski, C. (2001). Internet-based instruction: A national survey of psychology faculty. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 28, 253–255. Retrieved from <http://essays24.com/print/InternetBased-Instruction-National-Survey-Psychology/7696.html>
- Vrasidas, C., & Zembylas, M. (2003). The nature of technology-mediated interaction in globalized distance education. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 7(4), 271–286. Retrieved from <http://vrasidas.com/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/techmediatedinteraction.pdf>
- Waits, T., & Lewis, L. (2003). Distance education at degree-granting postsecondary institutions: 2000–2001. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003017>
- Web-Based Education Commission. (2000). *The power of the Internet for learning: Moving from promise to practice* (NTIS Report No. PB2001-105809). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/offices/AC/WBEC/FinalReport/WBECReport.pdf>
- Willis, B. (1993). *Distance education: A practical guide*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Willis, J. W. (2008). *Qualitative research methods in education and educational technology*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2006). *Mass media research: An introduction*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Yukl, G. (1989, June). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251–290. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

Zhao, J. (2006). Research university faculty perceptions of smart classroom technologies. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: A&I database. (Publication No. AAT 3247165).

APPENDIX A

Sample Survey

Leadership Survey

Blanchard and Hersey (1981) defined leadership as an ability to influence followers to adjust their behavior as they encounter receptiveness or opposition in various situations.

The first section of the following survey will ascertain your feelings about leadership as it applies to online education in the field of leadership. Please respond using the five selections (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree) as they reflect your feelings regarding the question as it applies to your experience in teaching leadership in an online format.

Following these questions, please answer the open-ended questions to the best of your ability by writing your reaction to the corresponding question in as many words as you feel necessary to respond to the query. Thank you again for your time!

Survey Questions

1. Communication barriers are not an issue in online leadership courses.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

2. Having to develop new technological skills to teach an online class proved to be onerous.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

3. Students entering the online leadership program possessed the technical savvy to be successful in the program.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

4. In teaching leadership online, I have rarely encountered students who have not willingly participated.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

5. Do you expect students that earn a leadership degree to have the same opportunities in career advancement that a student that attains the same degree in a traditional college?

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

6. I have had no problems adjusting my schedule to meet the availability of my students.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

7. Online chat is a preferred medium when teaching online leadership courses.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

8. Working adults have traditionally made up the majority of the students in my classes.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

9. I see evidence of critical thinking in my online classes.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

10. All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

11. Communication by way of e-mail has not been a problem.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

12. The liberating platform of online communication has been a positive in teaching leadership online.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

13. The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than an online-only program.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

14. Had it been available, online education would have been my preferred means of obtaining my degree.

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

15. *Online classes are as effective for teaching and learning as is a traditional class.*

Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree

16. *I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs.*

Open-Ended Questions

How do you ensure the authenticity of assignments delivered to you?

How do you ensure the message you are trying to teach reaches your students?

Why did you choose to teach online?

What are the pros and cons to teaching leadership online?

How do you teach leadership online?

Blanchard, K., & Hersey, P. (1981, June). So you want to know your leadership style?.
Training & Development Journal, 35(6), 34-48. Retrieved March 19, 2010 from
EBSCOhost database.

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Participant:

Principal Investigator: Joseph E. Craig

Title of Project: *Uncovering and Analyzing Potential Gaps in Teaching Graduate Programs in Leadership by Way of Online Education*

1. I (name of participant), agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Joseph E. Craig under the direction of Dr. Monica Goodale
2. The purpose of this study will be to analyze any potential gaps in the teaching of leadership at an institution that teaches leadership primarily online versus one that utilizes a more traditional brick-and-mortar institution as its place of instruction. Once information is gathered, analyses will be conducted to determine commonalities among responses from participants to ascertain potential gaps and areas that need to be addressed according to respondents.
3. My participation will involve participating in a voluntary online Likert scale survey with the option to also participate in an additional survey consisting of open-ended questions, which will also be present on the Survey Monkey Web site and can be answered on the Web site.
4. My participation in the study will begin once I have clicked the "I agree" link at the end of this form, which will take me to the study on Survey Monkey Web site. My participation will end once I have answered the questions on the Survey Monkey Web site and clicked "Submit" to submit my responses to the primary researcher.
5. I understand that the possible benefits to myself or society from this research are the overall development in teaching leadership online, that my participation will contribute to. I understand that in answering the questions presented in this survey, the related research will have a positive impact in assisting others in the field of academia develop stronger teaching methods in teaching leadership in an online environment.
6. I understand that there are certain risks and discomforts that might be associated with this research. These risks include the feeling that my identity will be revealed as

having pointed out areas for improvement in an online leadership program. All data that links participants' names or any other identifying information will be known only to the participant and the researcher and will be destroyed immediately following the project.

7. I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.
8. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.
9. I understand that the investigator(s) will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws. Under California law, there are exceptions to confidentiality, including suspicion that a child, elder, or dependent adult is being abused, or if an individual discloses an intent to harm him/herself or others.
10. I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact Dr. Monica Goodale at (818) 772-7036 or Monica.Goodale@yahoo.com if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Dr. Yuying Tsong, Chairperson of the Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, Pepperdine University at 310-568-5768 or Yuying.Tsong@Pepperdine.edu.
11. I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research, which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.
12. I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form, which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person's consent.

I AGREE

APPENDIX C

Likert Scale Responses

1. *Communication by e-mail has not been an issue.*

Table C1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	22.2
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	66.7
Strongly Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

2. *Communication barriers are not an issue in online leadership courses.*

Table C2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	6	22.2	22.2	33.3
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	44.4
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	88.9
Strongly Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

3. *Having to develop new technological skills to teach an online class proved to be onerous*

Table C3

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	15	55.6	55.6	66.7
Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

4. *Students entering the online leadership program possessed the technical savvy to be successful in the program.*

Table C4

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	24	88.9	88.9	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

5. *In teaching leadership online, I have rarely encountered students who have not willingly participated.*

Table C5

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	22.2
Agree	21	77.8	77.8	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

6. *Do you expect students that earn a leadership degree to have the same opportunities in career advancement that a student that attains the same degree in*

a traditional college

Table C6

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	66.7
Strongly Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

7. *I have had no problems adjusting my schedule to meet the availability of my students.*

Table C7

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	18	66.7	66.7	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

8. *Online chat is a preferred medium when teaching online leadership courses.*

Table C8

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	15	55.6	55.6	55.6
Neutral	9	33.3	33.3	88.9
Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

9. *Working students have traditionally made up the majority of the students in my class.*

Table C9

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	15	55.6	55.6	55.6
Strongly Agree	12	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

10. *I see evidence of critical thinking in my online classes.*

Table C10

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	9	33.3	33.3	33.3
Strongly Agree	18	66.7	66.7	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

11. *All students regularly interact with one another during online class sessions.*

Table C11

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	33.3
Agree	15	55.6	55.6	88.9
Strongly Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

12. *The liberating platform of online communication has been a positive in teaching leadership online.*

Table C12

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	15	55.6	55.6	66.7
Strongly Agree	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

13. *The hybrid format, which incorporates both face-to-face and online classes, is a more effective means of teaching than that of an online-only program.*

Table C13

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	6	22.2	22.2	22.2
Neutral	12	44.4	44.4	66.7
Agree	3	11.1	11.1	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

14. *Had it been available, online education would have been my preferred means of obtaining my degree.*

Table C14

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Disagree	9	33.3	33.3	44.4
Agree	9	33.3	33.3	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

15. *Online classes are as effective for teaching and learning as is a traditional class.*

Table C15

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Neutral	6	22.2	22.2	33.3
Agree	12	44.4	44.4	77.8
Strongly Agree	6	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

16. *I would recommend online leadership programs over traditional leadership programs.*

Table C16

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	9	33.3	33.3	33.3
Neutral	9	33.3	33.3	66.7
Agree	6	22.2	22.2	88.9
Strongly Agree	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	27	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX D

Open-Ended Responses

Q17. How do you ensure the authenticity of assignments delivered to you?

1 They are reflective pieces that incorporate the knowledge base and THEIR OWN job-embedded experiences.

2 I begin to recognize the “voice” of the student. If the assignment does not seem authentic, I will check. Most students are highly motivated and want to learn.

3 NA

4 You can't insure it in a face-to-face or online course. However, the online assignments relate to their specific work situation and would be hard to very difficult for someone else to accomplish.

5 just as in a class setting, we cannot always ensure the student is the person who 'wrote' the paper or took the exam. when we can solve this in the traditional setting, only then can we solve it in the online setting

6 We only accept assignments uploaded into Assignment Managers in Blackboard. We use a plagiarism program if we suspect the person is not the author.

7 Because I am regularly in the threaded discussions - I get to know each students “voice”. If their graded assignments seem to have a different “voice” I'll contact the student. Other than that, - I have no way of knowing that the person whose name is on the assignment is the one who turned it in.

8 Don't

Q18. How do you ensure the message you are trying to teach reaches your students?

1 We discuss this in our class

2 Weekly and course wide assessments. I design questions and assignments to fit my course objectives. If the class does not “get it,” then I will adjust assignments or weekly discussion questions until they are thinking critically and holistically

3 NA

4 Give on-line quizzes and tests.

5 practice and experience are your friends here

6 I use multiple mediums of communication to facilitate student learning, and there is redundancy in them. I preview in Wimba meetings upcoming assignments, although they are explained fully in our syllabus. I structure the courses with focused learning outcomes at all levels. I grade all projects with a rubric to assessing student learning.

7 Discussion boards, I use audio briefings - a short weekly message along with a written message. I regularly stay in the discussion to observe, participate and guide.

8 Seek feedback

Q19. Why did you choose to teach online?

1 The department switched to online teaching before I accepted a position

2 I wanted to serve students who couldn't afford or couldn't get a traditional education. Also, i studied hybrid learning and subject-centered pedagogy and was convinced it was worth a try. I then experimented with the same courses in hybrid and traditional formats. I discovered that a well-developed hybrid course accomplished the learning objectives better than the traditional course.

3 I was invited to do so in order to serve an adult population from various parts of the country.

4 Practical for distant students with families, jobs, and a home context that is a great resource to just about any adult, advanced degree student.

5 i studied online and loved the asynchronous method, so i also chose to teach online—the depth of content, in my experience, is much greater and allows for more opportunities to discover

6 I allows me to increase my student teaching load, while maintaining time for my own research. Ie. it reduces my repetitive lecture time. I post these when necessary online. It also allows me to reach mid-carrier students all over the world.

7 I “fell” into online teaching in 97 while working on my Ph.D. in an online program. I was asked to be part of the team developing an Leadership masters degree. I've stayed with it for convenience and now for the opportunity. The same benefit the students have of being able to take a course from anywhere in the world, we have as faculty.

8 opportunity arose, convenience

Q20. What are the pros and cons to teaching leadership online?

1 Pros: flexibility, everyone participates. Cons: takes more time for the teacher in preparation and answering questions

2 Cons - lot of extra work to create a top level learning environment; not as satisfying emotionally because students are connected to subject and each other and not so much to you -you are not the center and that takes some adjustments emotionally, but I have developed rich friendships with students after the courses are over Pros students learn more; think more critically and are more engaged with each other and the subject; the students are better integrators of topic with life when taught hybrid

3 Most of the work I do is actually conducted by phone. Students do post papers and chat on line, which works well for the most part. We have a hybrid program that includes online, in person residences, and phone coaching.

4 Pro 1. See #19 above. 2. Great time-invested discussions (much better than face to face because it allows all to speak and those who want more time to consider their contributions to the discussion can have it). 3. Discussions can be reviewed at any time during the course. 4. Assignments are not lost (the dog doesn't eat them). 5. Dates and times when assignments were submitted are automatically recorded. 6. Communication is flexible for students and faculty alike. CONS: 1. More teacher time is required to prepare the course. 2. Most of us are comfortable teaching as we have been taught. So on-line is new/change/different so there is resistance to the change.

5 pros and cons for profs or students? Cons—miss seeing faces and personalities, nonverbal clues are not available. Pros—work and go to school as schedule and family time will allow. depth is greater—I have found that students ‘think’ more deeply about concepts and ideas and engage on a much deeper level than in a classroom. also, traditional barriers are removed—we dont know someone's age, race, ‘looks’ or other erroneous distractions that might influence our perceptions. we are judged simply on the content of our work and writings.

6 Pros: —allows graduate students to stay in their context, and use assignments to lead their organization. —allows professors flexibility Cons: —doesn't reach some students who need social learning, and verbal interaction, unless the course is designed with online meetings. —doesn't work without good structure, clarity and course alignment of learning outcomes and applied assignments that are relevance, and doable in one's context.

7 Cons: The text base is sometimes difficult. No opportunity to observe. Interaction is asynchronous and this can be difficult to watch. Synchronous discussions are few and far between. Pros: Students do not have to relocate. Faculty and students can engage from anywhere in the world.

8 Love the asynchronicity, geographic freedom - Some courses do best with interpersonal interaction with all present

Q21. How do you teach leadership online?

1 D2l, moodle

2 This is a big question. I clarify my course outcomes. I create the assignments that will hopefully meet course outcomes. I work with a hybrid pedagogy specialist. I create the course site and make sure that every week the student is online 2-4 hours over several days. I give weekly feedback to the entire class and individual feedback to each student. There is more assessment with hybrid courses. I have chats at the beginning, and a 3 day face to face with students in the middle, and then some sort of chat towards the end. It's a lot of work. I'm not downloading content. I'm creating a learning environment. I've changed how I teach traditional courses now because the hybrid works so well. I have an online component every week where the students are connected and in discussion. I push content to online and use the weekly face to face for going deeper. Students can't be lazy in an online environment. They can in a classroom.

3 I don't do the actual teaching online myself. My colleagues do that part. I teach the in person residences and follow up with phone-based coaching.

4 Everyone has fun as we experience teaching and learning leadership under the following umbrellas: 1. Theory, philosophy, 2. Practice, application, 3. Stories, 4. Case studies, 5. Videos, 6. Lectures, 7. On-line chats, 8. On-line discussions, 9. Drop boxes, 10. Textbooks (electronic on-line), 11. Audio's, 12. U-tube clips, c 13. Course NEWS, 14. Syllabi, 15. Quizzes, tests, 16. Powerpoint presentations (professor created and student created) 17. Course Outline and Schedule 18. Required and recommended reading lists

5 100%

6 I teach through a mix of mediums online, dialogue, live Wimba meetings, assigned textbooks & media, assigned projects, custom feedback on projects, answering questions in 24 hour turn around via email, emphasizing the need for self-directed learning, posting numerous announcements to encourage and direct. I teach online by paying attention to the needs of my students and empowering them to learn. I don't teach, I facilitate learning.

7 Many class materials lend themselves to reading and learning academic knowledge, doing research; some leadership learning needs to be experiential so that's not so good online