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ABSTRACT

This study collected data on art education faculty and administrator experiences with and perceptions of distance education. Based on researching distance education courses and degree options, I determined that art education has been slower to embrace distance education in comparison to other departments. After contacting Admissions Offices at over 60 colleges and universities in the United States, I learned that only one offers a distance-delivered art education degree, which is the Department of Art Education at The Ohio State University, and few schools offer art education courses via distance.

I used a mixed methods approach to collect data. To collect the data, I sent a survey to art education faculty and administrators. Next, I conducted one-on-one interviews to build a case study of the leading online program in the field of art education. The survey recipients included 138 art education faculty and 44 administrators from 60 schools and the goal was to learn more about their experiences with and perceptions of distance education. I received responses from 33 of the 60 colleges and universities surveyed, representing fifty-five percent participation. Twenty-eight percent of faculty and eighteen percent of administrators responded.
Since The Ohio State University Department of Art Education offers the only online degree in art education, I conducted interviews with eight faculty members and one administrator who had experience with this program to build a case study. The data collected from the interviews added a more detailed perspective.

Reviewed from a grounded theory perspective, I analyzed the data to identify themes and make recommendations for the field. The major interests cited by survey and interview participants in distance education were the desire to reach diverse, multi-cultural or underserved audiences, and the desire to deliver a rich educational experience to students. The respondents described their teaching philosophy as aligned with constructivism. Generally, art education faculty perceived the quality of education via distance to be inferior to face-to-face classroom teaching. In comparison, faculty interviewed for the case study reported having positive experiences with distance education.

The key themes that emerged were constructivism, connected support and technology. Respondents identified additional time to teach, reduced workload and recognition as significant motivators. In comparison, barriers were time and level of technology knowledge. This study will help art education administrators introduce distance education courses or online degrees to their department. It can also provide guidance and insight to a faculty member who is interested in creating distance education courses.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Internet has impacted the way we learn. More and more courses offered by institutions of higher education are delivered via the Internet. At a minimum, PowerPoint presentations, smart classrooms, email and other technologies have become common instructional tools. According to Eduventures, Inc., a leading independent research and consultancy firm that specializes in corporate, postsecondary and K-12 learning markets, online degree granting programs generated $1.75 billion in tuition revenues for institutions in 2003 and 2004 (Eduventures, 2006). Eduventures, Inc. estimates that the distance learning market for online degree programs is increasing at an annual rate of 45 percent (Eduventures, 2006). Because online distance education is a fast-growing area, it is imperative that we gain a better understanding of this mode of distance education delivery. As a researcher in art education, my interest is in gaining an understanding of issues that impact distance-delivered art education.
For the past five years, I have been an adjunct instructor of a graduate-level marketing course in the Arts, Media and Entertainment Program at Columbia College, a private arts-centered college in Chicago. The Columbia College Center for Teaching and Learning offered faculty an opportunity to apply for a $5,000 grant to put their course in an online format. An additional payment would be made by their department if they taught the online course. When I learned of this grant I was interested in applying. Since I already had a full-time job, I needed a partner to co-author the grant application and project. I approached a full-time faculty member who taught another section of the same class to partner with me. He declined because the Chair of the department did not support distance education and there was no personal benefit to him in committing to the project.

In 1998, I worked on a WebCT project for Dr. James Hutchens in the Department of Art Education at The Ohio State University. This was my first introduction to distance-delivered art education. At the time, I thought the distance education technology we were experimenting with would be revolutionary and would completely change education because the majority of students would be completing their degrees via distance education within the near future. I envisiononed the time and cost savings of traveling to campus, fighting traffic and parking. Nine-years have passed and my vision of the majority of students taking courses via distance education at home in their slippers or at their favorite location has not materialized. The main reason I chose to investigate faculty and administrator perceptions of distance education
is to examine some of the factors that have shaped adoption of or resistance to distance education in the field of art education.

Most all of my professional experiences have had some distance education component, and through these experiences I have become a supporter of distance education. Whether designing an online business simulation as a Media and Entertainment consultant or preparing higher education faculty to teach, I have pursued opportunities to continue my knowledge of distance education processes and technology. However, I have not yet experienced teaching an online course for a post-secondary institution.

Currently, I work in the Academic Affairs Department as Vice President of Faculty for Kaplan Higher Education. The company owns over 70 campuses, has 3,000 full-time and part-time faculty, and offers degrees ranging from art and fashion to education and business. It is our practice to provide development opportunities to our faculty, both in their professional sector and in teaching best practices. It is a challenge to deliver training to 1,700 full-time faculty who are in the classroom more than 80% of their time, and even more challenging to reach 1,300 part-time faculty who are usually juggling other obligations with their adjunct role. As a result, training must be asynchronous and self-directed with manager or team-supplemented workshops, due to the hours and needs of the different campuses.

One of the workshops we have built teaches faculty to use blended learning and distance education technologies. What I have learned after launching this training is that faculty embrace distance education technology for
two primary reasons: They are intrinsically driven to learn a new way to engage their students, or they are pressured to use technology in their class by their President, Dean or Chair. The survey I will launch as part of this study will gather information on faculty motivation, and determine if this is applicable to the field of art education.

These experiences piqued my interest in investigating this situation further to understand what the real drivers are that motivate faculty to use distance education technology in their courses. I conducted a literature search and found that much was written about distance education but little in the area of art education faculty practices. I felt that as a faculty member and administrator, investigating why art educators chose participation or non-participation in distance education would be a worthwhile study.

Background of Study

The teaching of the arts, specifically art education, is usually considered to be an interactive experience. Studying art criticism or the teaching of art in a face-to-face environment enables the student to develop skills that may not be developed in an online setting. The paucity of distance education courses in art education could suggest that faculty perceive distance education to be an inferior education experience in comparison to classroom learning.

More students are taking online college courses than ever before, yet the majority of faculty are not embracing the concept of distance education (Chronicle Higher Education, 2006). Roughly 3.2 million students took at least
one online course from a degree-granting institution during the fall 2005 term according to the Sloan Consortium (2006). This number has doubled from the 2002 statistics, the first year the group collected data, and is more than 800,000 students above the 2004 total (Sloan Consortium, 2006). While the number of online course participants has increased each year, the rate of growth slowed from 2003 to 2004 (Sloan Consortium, 2006). Though there has been a slowdown, distance education will continue to be a major force in education in the future. My study examines factors that impact distance-delivered art education courses and programs, and specifically focuses on faculty and administrator perceptions of distance education.

I have identified approximately 60 art education departments in the United States (appendix B). Of this group, only one offers a degree program online, and a case of this program is presented. For the purpose of this study, art education program is defined as a program granting a bachelor's and/or master's degree, is nationally and/or regionally accredited, and is recognized by a University as a department or program with an approved curriculum.

With the myriad of education options available, departments need to be competitive to attract the best and brightest students and faculty. Higher education is a multi-billion dollar industry, and there is much at stake for institutions to increase their market share, whether it is in research or teaching (Chronicle Higher Education, 2005). There are many ways in which higher education institutions compete: curriculum, reputation, faculty members, cost, flexibility, career services, etc.
Since this study evaluates participation of art education programs at colleges and universities in the United States, faculty and administrators were surveyed to gather data about current practices and attitudes. Quantitative and qualitative feedback from administrators and faculty was gathered to determine what drives participation. Additionally, nine faculty at The Ohio State University Department of Art Education were surveyed to build a case study of their experiences with distance-delivered art education.

Through this research, I seek to learn about art education faculty and administrators’ perceptions of distance education, regardless of level of experience. Upon the completion of the study, I will have an understanding of 1. art education faculty and administrator perceptions of distance education, 2. the scope of distance-delivered art education experience, 3. what technology is being used and is practical to deliver art education courses via distance, and 4. what are some motivators and barriers specific to the field and how that is or is not different from other fields.

**Statement of Problem**

With the technology boom of the late 1990’s came new advances in software and hardware which resulted in the creation of more compelling distance education courses (Boettcher, 1997). Prior to technological developments, correspondence, radio, video and television courses dominated the distance education market (Boettcher, 1997). Now, distance education, email courses, and streaming content offer more robust delivery methods than
their predecessors (Boettcher, 1997). Higher education institutions are faced with the dilemma of determining which distance education delivery methods meet faculty and student needs. Accreditation, technology adoption, faculty training, copyright, content quality and fiscal issues impact decisions administrators make about distance education programming (Berge, 2001).

In light of the aforementioned issues, the problem statement is: As demand for distance education courses continues to grow and technology continues to evolve, are art education departments and faculty interested in, willing to, or able to build distance education courses? The findings of this study will identify the opportunities and challenges to implementing distance education for art education departments. These insights will recommend best practices for departments that are beginning to build distance education courses or are reevaluating existing courses and programs. The data will provide a better understanding of how to utilize resources, ensure student learning outcomes are met, and align distance education, at the department-level, with the college’s vision, mission and goals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of my study is to gather data on art education faculty and administrator perceptions of distance education. In this study, I identify opportunities and challenges to participation in distance education by surveying faculty and administrators across 60 art education departments, as well as through data collection from interviews.
Research of art education faculty and administrators’ attitudes and practices is important for two reasons. First, it is important to understand what individual characteristics may contribute to department success and failure and faculty members’ participation in distance education. Some studies suggest that successful implementation is dependent on faculty acceptance and participation (Chang, 1998). Second, it is important to understand what institutional characteristics may affect faculty and administrators’ perceptions of distance education since these issues impact future growth and development of art education programs, as well as faculty and student participation.

Methodology

This study employs mixed methods research based in pragmatism and grounded theory. Pragmatism is a method in philosophy where action is determined by practical results. Originally developed by Charles S. Peirce and William James (1907), it is a movement consisting of varying but associated theories which posit that the meaning of an idea or a proposition lies in its observable, practical consequences. The pragmatist insists that no questions are significant unless the results of answering them in one way rather than another have practical consequences.

Grounded theory is an approach for looking systematically at qualitative data with the goal of the generation of theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Grounded theory combines a specific style of research with pragmatic theory of action and with some methodological guidelines. Grounded theory research
methodology is a useful tool to explore important questions in consultation and to generate new conceptualizations and theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Grounded theory does not see qualitative research as antagonistic towards or incompatible with quantitative methodologies (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The research results from grounded theory provide substantive theory about change processes.

The literature review is conducted from a grounded theory perspective. Examining relevant literature in a grounded theory perspective may mean accessing additional literature as it becomes relevant. Reading widely helps to make sense of data and may even provide models, which help to ultimately interpret data (Glaser, 1998). Thus, the literature review becomes part of data collection and the foundation for the study. Constantly comparing the literature to the emerging theory is treated in the same manner as comparing emerging data to the developing theory. Through this method, I was able to seek questions that probe the exceptions or seek explanations for any differences that occurred between the emerged data and the literature (Glaser, 1998).

Qualitative and quantitative data was collected by surveying over 150 faculty and administrators who work in art education departments at colleges and universities in the United States. Data was coded, then analyzed, and recommendations were determined as a result of the analysis. Next, interviews were conducted face-to-face and over the phone. This data was structured to mirror the framework of the literature review, and gives greater insight into the data collected from the surveys.
Personal Biases and Assumptions

Personal biases are not viewed as a negative trait in qualitative research. As described by Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin’s (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, “Persons are products of their cultures, the times in which they live, their genders, their experiences, and their training. The important thing is to recognize when either our own or the respondents biases, assumptions, or beliefs are intruding into the analysis” (p. 97).

My personal biases are what brought me to develop this study from the beginning. The following is an overview of my biases and assumptions in approaching this study, and awareness of these assumptions will help minimize researcher bias. I approach this research from the following perspectives:

1. Art education departments should offer distance education courses in their curriculum.

2. Art education can be delivered in a compelling and rigorous way via distance education.

3. Technology will continue to be a part of higher education programs in art education.

4. The higher education market will continue to remain competitive for student enrollment (Berge, 2001).
5. Distance education is an important method of delivering educational content to students who are unable to attend classroom courses (Moore & Kearsley, 1996).

6. The quality of distance education courses is important to administrators, faculty and students (Betts, 1998).

7. Distance education should provide the same quality of educational experience that classroom courses provide (Schifter, 2000).

8. Distance education courses should receive the same level of credibility as classroom courses (Olcott, 1995).


10. Technology utilized in distance education will continue to advance (Betts, 1998).

Significance of the Study

The goal of my dissertation is to add to the body of knowledge covering art education and distance education. I feel that this study will become a useful document for the art education departments it seeks to survey, as well as those who were not surveyed. I received a variety of responses based on each department’s size, budget, experience, technology and administrative support. The result is an understanding of the practices in creating and delivering art education courses from faculty and administrators’ perspectives. Data collected in this study will help faculty and administrators in the field of Art Education make
decisions concerning whether or not to adopt distance-delivered art education, and what approaches to take when designing and developing online courses and programs.

Chapter Overview

In the following chapters, I will review issues relevant to the study. The topics to be examined in-depth are art education and technology, curriculum and instruction, distance education technology, organizational theory, leadership theory, and faculty motivation. All of these factors impact the structure and decision-making process for distance education programs. This analysis provided a framework for the survey questions and data interpretation.

Chapter 1 provides the introduction to the issues and the study, and frames the readers’ expectations. Chapter 2 discusses art education, distance education and technology, and provides an overview of current practices. Chapter 3 reviews curriculum and teaching theory, in which constructivism is a focus. Chapter 4 involves a review of technology issues that make possible the delivery of distance-delivered art education. Chapter 5 is an analysis of themes in the literature that impact change within organizations. Chapter 6 is a document-based content analysis of seven frequently cited studies on faculty motivation to teach via distance education technologies.

Chapter 7 details the methodological approach and discusses pragmatism and grounded theory in detail. Chapter 8 presents the findings from the survey, and Chapter 9 is a case study of a successful online degree program offered by
The Ohio State University Department of Art Education. Chapter 10 is a discussion of the findings, including recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

ISSUES RELATED TO ART EDUCATION, TECHNOLOGY,
AND DISTANCE EDUCATION

Art education is not only the practice of coming to know about art, but also
the study of the character of this knowledge and the ways in which we come to
know it. Art education takes place in many different forms. Research and
theory in art education involves investigation into the natures and origins of art
knowledge and its relationship to new technologies.

The success of an Art Education Program is determined by its ability to
prepare students to be professionals in their field. Thus, program requirements,
course outcomes, assessment and accreditation standards are important to
measure that success. Higher education practices and standards shape
activities that occur and trends in the field of art education. This chapter will
evaluate some key trends in art education curriculum at post-secondary
institutions and review technology and distance education practices in the field.
Post-secondary Art Education

There are a number of factors that impact distance-delivered art education. The degree offered by the institution, coursework focus, number of faculty, and program goals and mission influence the level of involvement a program may commit to distance education. I have identified approximately 60 Art Education Programs in the United States based on a review of literature and college websites.

It becomes difficult to define an Art Education Program or Department given the interdisciplinary nature of art education. Many schools that offer Art Education degrees have a formal Art Education Department that is part of the College of Education or the College of the Arts. For example, Art Education at The Ohio State University is part of the College of Arts. Conversely, Art Education at Indiana University is part of the College of Education. The degrees offered range from Certification to B.A. / B.S., M.A. / M.S., or Ph.D. Some colleges such as Boise State University, offer a Master's of Art in Teaching (MAT) with an Art Education focus. This program is led by one art education faculty member under no formal department.

Each Art Education Program has different requirements. Some of this is determined by the State or an accreditation agency. Administrative leadership or faculty may also influence program requirements. Even though there are different course offerings and concentrations offered by each college, after reviewing the curriculum and mission statements of these 60 colleges, I
determined that most programs have similar standards. Coursework offered at these schools includes Discipline Content (Art Studio, Art Criticism, Aesthetics, Art History), Education, Clinical Practicum, Teaching Methods, Technology, Curriculum, Assessment, Classroom Management, Diversity, Leadership and Professionalism, and Museum Education.

Goals and missions vary at each institution based on market need and faculty profile. For example, the Columbia University Teachers College mission is two-fold:

“To promote proficiency in specific fields; and to explore the purposes, practices and processes of education both within-and across-disciplines. Individual fields of study include: philosophy, history, culture, religion, social studies, language studies as well as linguistics and the arts” (Teachers College Columbia University, 2006, para. 2).

In comparison, Penn State University’s Art Education program does not identify its mission, but describes the program as:

“The program’s approach to art education is expansive rather than exclusive. Students immerse themselves in the related but sometimes very different worlds of art, visual culture, and education. Students are encouraged to examine the educational consequences of emerging art forms. They are as likely to pursue digital technologies and create performances as they are to make paintings and drawings. Alongside the creation of artworks, they also practice the critical analysis of art” (The Penn State University, 2006, para 2).

These descriptions are fairly similar; however, one interesting point is that Penn State University has indicated digital technologies as an area of specialization in addition to traditional areas such as studio and performance art. The only department that offers an online Program is The Ohio State University. After searching the course catalogues of several schools, I was unable to find
any other art education courses offered in a similar capacity. Indiana University offers an online Masters in Instructional Design Technologies and charges in-State tuition for the program, regardless of where the student resides. Below is an overview of some programs, degrees and curriculum, and distance education offerings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Art Courses</th>
<th>Art Education Courses</th>
<th>Education Courses</th>
<th>Distance Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>B.F.A., M.A.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Studio and art history</td>
<td>21 Art Education courses</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>B.A., B.S. M.A., Ph.D.</td>
<td>6 Full-time Art Education</td>
<td>Studio core, art history</td>
<td>7 Art Education courses</td>
<td>Education coursework, and student teaching</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>B.A., M.A., Ph.D.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Studio, art history and art criticism</td>
<td>Discipline-based and multi-cultural issues</td>
<td>Education coursework</td>
<td>Yes – Art criticism. Uses a proprietary platform built on D2L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>B.A., B.S., M.S., Ph.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Studio core, art history</td>
<td>9 Art Education courses</td>
<td>Student teaching</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., Ed.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Studio, art history and art criticism</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Education coursework, and student teaching</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>M.A., Ph.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>3 core courses required</td>
<td>9 courses outside of art education</td>
<td>Offers a M.A in Instructional Design Technologies online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>B.F.A., M.A.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60 Studio, 6 Art History, Additional upper division courses</td>
<td>7 Art Education courses</td>
<td>14 Education courses, plus student teaching</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: An overview of Art Education programs and their distance education offering.
Distance-Delivered Art Education

Distance education technology is not just an issue for art education; it has become a practical aid that is being used in schools globally. In addition, forced by market trends and the competitive nature of market demand, many courses have now become almost totally computerized, and the teaching methodology has been altered and shaped in response to the market employment needs. Distance education when reduced to techniques, nevertheless, lacks humanity and spirituality. Interaction needs to be instilled in the teaching and learning of technology. By forming art communities and inviting students to participate in proactive learning, the use of distance education technology may bolster higher-order thinking and authentic exploration (Gigliotti, 1993). Through distance-delivered art education we can learn about art through visual investigations of complex ideas, such as, visual culture, environment, exploitation, beauty, democracy, and violence.

Distance education using computers and the Internet continues to emerge and become more robust. Due to its virtual nature, the issue of creating meaningful interaction within an art education class is especially important. Besides transferring their own perspectives through the Web and instructional audio and video materials to distance students, instructors must also take into consideration the possibilities for distance students to better express and exchange opinions. In the article *Constructing a Streaming Video-Based Learning Forum for Collaborative Learning*, Chang (2004) proposed a collaborative learning strategy, Jigsaw 11, to integrate a computer desktop
camcorder into distance education. He found that a computer desktop

The Internet provides considerable opportunities for interesting and

Eggmeyer (2004) suggested, Internet access has developed into a new channel for displaying art, and it prompted the existence of cyber culture. Paul (2003) also stated that, "Internet art has been created to be seen by anyone, anywhere, anytime, and does not need a museum to be presented or introduced to the public" (pp. 23-24). Furthermore, tutorial lessons for design software such as Painter and Premier may be available online. Consequently, in addition to learning in a classroom, art education teachers and students may take advantage of computer technology.

Eggers (1999) researched award-winning web-based courses in art and design in higher education and found that "active learning and construction of knowledge learning theories were foundational" and "courses were student-centered rather than instructor-centered" (Eggers, 1999, p. 237). Course flexibility was high, and interactivity and student response were required, as "many of the instructors indicated that they made in-course corrections based on regular and ongoing feedback from students" (Eggers, 1999, p. 240). Learning in a web-based course, according to the findings in this research, is related to "social interactions, interpersonal relations, and communications with others" (Eggers, 1999, p. 249). Eggers (1999) concluded that distance education should
be based upon innovative pedagogy that will motivate students and promote active learning in virtual learning communities. Finally, in her recommendations for higher education administrators, she stressed the importance of faculty support, innovation in course design, quality in-class interaction, administrative support for course development, student service, and creativity in the programs.

When assessing computer-integrated curriculum projects, Grabe and Grabe (2004) noted that one must consider issues such as which computer technology is used, whether it aids the learning goals, what role a teacher plays, what instructions are needed, whether computer technology creates an ethical issue, the validity and quality of Internet sources, and how student assessment should be made. In addition, educators may also need to ask questions regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of the learning process within a computer-integrated environment.

Distance-delivered art education has been adopted at varying degrees within K-12, post-secondary, and museum education. Desired outcomes and achieved goals in the classroom would involve faculty understanding, planning, and acknowledgement of technology. This calls for models and innovative programs to assist the educator in implementing realistic, real-life experience in distance-delivered art education.

Technology in Art Education

There are more examples of how technology has been infused with art education in the classroom than examples of distance-delivered art education.
Technology impacts art education differently than other areas of education. Greh (1997) explained that art education is different in that three areas (art, education and art education) are impacted. Art considers the way it is created and the way it is viewed (Greh, 1997). Education considers what students need to know, how they learn, and how they are taught (Greh, 1997). Finally, art education is impacted by what students create, how art is created, new ways of teaching about art and new approaches to integrating art with other disciplines (Greh, 1997).

Technology has changed how we view art, learn about art and make art. Artists, educators and students have new ways, such as computers, videos, digitizers, and scanners, to experience art. Methods of producing have lead to the creation of a new genre of art that is digitally manipulated. Finally, the language of viewing and describing art is impacted by technology. When viewing an image on a computer, words like line, composition, pixel, and shading have different meanings.

In relationship to technology and art education, educators have become more comfortable and savvy when integrating PowerPoint, websites, CD Roms and other technology in the classroom. Since the early use of computers, art educators have been seeking way to integrate technology into teaching. Sontag’s (1987) study of *Computers in College University Art Departments: Present and Future* was one of the early surveys examining technology practices in art education.
The purpose of the study was to review the involvement of art departments in higher education with computer technology and to identify the general factors that affected the involvement (Sontag, 1987). A survey of six questions was sent to 309 art departments. The results determined that larger departments had adopted technology and computer policies, and smaller departments would need to work to catch up (Sontag, 1987). One interesting concept that still carries over today is “The limited role that faculty play in the development of commercial software and the lack of communication between software developers and faculty” (Sontag, 1987, p. 160). My survey is different in that I have conducted more in-depth research in identifying specific institutions and emailing my survey to participants. Another differentiator is that I am focused specifically on Art Education faculty and administrators’ experiences and perceptions.

Other researchers have discussed the notion of computers as visual art media (Etinger & Roland, 1986). Technology challenges us to redefine our notions of painting, pencil or charcoal (Etinger & Roland, 1986). The mouse replaces traditional tools used to create art. Etinger and Roland (1986) proposed redefining our language to create a new visual grammar. However, their article did not describe how a digital studio experience differs from a face-to-face experience.

Greah (1993) investigated new technologies in the classroom. She discussed that technology impacts art education through the way art is created and viewed. It impacts what students need to know, how they learn and how
they are taught, what students create, how art is created, new ways of teaching about art, and new approaches to integrating art with other disciplines (Greh, 1993).

Moats and Wodzicki (2000) share an example of art criticism curriculum delivered through technology. Though an interesting example of art education and technology, there is no discussion of how technology impacts the learning experience. This reflects other articles that discuss technology and art education in terms of using the Internet, email, web pages and CD Roms (Callow, 2001; Greh, 1993).

Technology development allowed Callow to interact with others interested in art and exchange ideas and tips (Callow, 2001). Anticipating the global potential for communication in the classroom, Callow (2001) sought to investigate and develop themes across cultures via the Internet. He saw the potential for technology as enormous and exciting, when one can access information and be an active participant, rather than a passive consumer of information and images. Callow stressed the elements of curiosity and exploration as being part of the potential for technology and art education.

Undoubtedly, the scope of technology, learning and art education has yet to be totally explored and utilized in an educational context for distance education. Callow viewed the art room as being capable of making an active contribution to bridging art and technology. There were two reasons for this. The first was the global potential of information and imagery that can be shared,
and second the art teachers’ roles in inspiring the creations for the Internet by their students.

In my current role in the Academic Affairs Department at Kaplan Higher Education, one of my responsibilities is to help make technology decisions that have a positive impact on curriculum and design. It is possible for our faculty to deliver computer technology, accounting or English courses online and entirely through distance education. By comparison, fashion design, photography, and studio art do not fit the same delivery model. We have not identified an appropriate technology to deliver these courses via distance education that would meet our education standards. The challenge is that when dealing with the creation of physical objects, like sewing a dress or creating a sculpture, these activities are difficult to teach via distance education. An instructor cannot touch the student’s dress or demonstrate how to use the material to complete the sculpture.

One form of technology we have experimented with is 2-way video that can be delivered in real time. Students and faculty would have a video camera attached to their computer monitor. On their computer screen, they would be able to view their instructor as well as other participants. However, in the test phase, the technology has had problems with dropping participants and challenges with time delays in the delivery. Another issue with this technology is that studio materials such as a kiln, industrial sewing machine, or sculpting tools would need to be provided by the student. Even if this technology is developed to work seamlessly, it could be argued that it does not replace the creative
process a student experiences by working in the same studio as her instructor and other students.

Benefits of Art Education and Technology

With technology in an art educational setting, the development of a broad, deep, and creative understanding of community, culture, economics, and international politics, past and present, helps students acquire the social skills to work across differences and distances (Riel, 1994). These same experiences will enable students to participate in living lives in the global, digital, information-based future they all face (Dwyer, 1994).

Valid reasons for integrating technology into education can be reviewed in a summary of Peck and Dorricott's (1994, p. 24) research of the top ten reasons for the use of educational technology. This summary represents an overview of the status of what technology in the classroom may accomplish. The potential of technology to assist with educational goals was:

- Individualization
- Increased global awareness
- Access to high-level and high-interest courses
- Increased proficiency at accessing, evaluating, and communicating information
- Increased comfort level with the tools of the Information Age
- Increased quantity and quality of students' thinking and writing skills
- Improved student ability to solve complex problems (a skill that cannot be taught, but which appears to develop in a more focused manner when productivity tools are available)
- Nurtured artistic expression (many flexible tools are available)
- Opportunities for students to do meaningful work
- Increased productivity and efficiency of schools (Peck & Dorricott, 1994, p. 25).
Many of the reasons listed by Peck and Dorricott (1994) supported the philosophy of what art education involves and were congruent with art education goals and practices. When discussing art education and distance education, questions around curriculum, technology infrastructure, organizational culture, leadership and faculty motivation arise. These factors impact decisions made, which in turn impact perceptions. The next chapters will shed light on the myriad of factors that inform this issue.
CHAPTER 3

CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGICAL APPROACHES THAT SHAPE DISTANCE-DELIVERED ART EDUCATION

To analyze art education faculty and administrator experiences with and perceptions of distance education it is important to understand the capabilities and limitations of teaching via distance, as well as different educational approaches to teaching via distance. Technology has enabled faculty to be more dynamic with their instruction by using the Internet in comparison to methods such as TV, video, radio or correspondence. This chapter will evaluate instructional styles and educational approaches that impact the delivery of distance education courses.

In the prior chapter, different Art Education program structures were discussed. Each program has variations in its focus, and can offer or require courses such as Discipline Content (Art Studio, Art Criticism, Aesthetics, Art History), Education, Clinical Practicum, Teaching Methods, Technology, Curriculum, Assessment, Classroom Management, Diversity, Leadership and Professionalism, and Museum Education.
Teaching or taking a studio course is a different experience compared to an art criticism course. However, it is not impossible to teach either studio or art criticism via distance. This issue is the effectiveness of the course, which is impacted and measured by course objectives, lesson planning and assessment. Every face-to-face classroom experience risks being ineffective if course outcomes are not clearly determined or communicated and student learning is not supported.

Research has shown that students gain significant benefits when learning from audio-visual or computer media, as opposed to conventional instruction (Clark, 1983). However, the same studies suggest that the reason for those benefits is not the medium of instruction, but the instructional strategies built into the learning materials. Similarly, Schramm (1977) suggested that learning is influenced more by the content and instructional strategy in the learning materials than by the type of technology used to deliver instruction. It has been recognized that through innovative delivery technologies distance education can provide efficient and timely access to learning materials (Clark, 1983). However, Clark (1983) has claimed that technologies are merely vehicles that deliver instruction, but alone do not influence student achievement.

Distance education is one of three modes by which students gain access to learning. The other two modes of delivery are face-to-face and blended. Each classification may be defined as follows (Bourne, McMaster, Rieger, & Campbell, 2000):
1. Face-to-face: same place at the same time (e.g. traditional classroom)
2. Blended: face-to-face and online
3. Distance education: Synchronous or asynchronous, and separated by distance.

The selected mode of delivery is contingent upon which best suits the needs and desires of the students. Gilbert (2000) mentions that several consumer-based studies show that the growth in the number of distance education students is due to their desire to engage in learning that is flexible, and learning can occur anytime, anywhere (Caviedes, 1998).

Behaviorist, Cognitivist and Constructivist Approaches

Distance education theory may be drawn, adapted, applied, and integrated from pedagogical theories. Pedagogical theory emerges from the theme of behaviorist, cognitivist and constructivist approaches to teaching and learning (Glasser & Bassok, 2000). Behaviorist, cognitivist, and constructivist theories have contributed in different ways to the design of distance education materials, and they will continue to be used to develop materials for learning (Berejikian, 2002). Behaviorist strategies can be used to teach the facts (what), cognitivist strategies to teach the principles and processes (how), and constructivist strategies to teach the real-life and personal applications and contextual learning (Berejikian, 2002). There is a shift toward constructive learning, in which students are given the opportunity to construct their own meaning from the information presented during the online sessions (Berejikian, 2002).
Early distance education courses were designed based on a behaviorist approach to learning. The behaviorist school of thought, influenced by Thorndike (1913), Pavlov (1927), and Skinner (1974), purports that learning is a change in observable behavior caused by external stimuli in the environment (Skinner, 1974). Behaviorists claim that it is the observable behavior that indicates whether or not the student has learned something, and not what is going on in the student's head. In response, some educators claimed that not all learning is observable and that there is more to learning than a change in behavior (Berejikian, 2002). As a result, there was a shift away from behaviorist to cognitive learning theories (Berejikian, 2002).

Cognitive psychology claims that learning involves the use of memory, motivation, and thinking, and that reflection plays an important part in learning (Berejikian, 2002). They see learning as an internal process and contend that the amount learned depends on the processing capacity of the student, the amount of effort expended during the learning process, the depth of the processing, and the student's existing knowledge structure (Ausubel, 1974).

Like many other arts educators, my teaching style utilizes constructivist techniques, and I believe this method has a greater impact on student learning outcomes, in comparison to other approaches. Constructivist theorists claim that students interpret information and the world according to their personal reality. Students learn by observation, processing, and interpretation, and then personalize the information into personal knowledge (Wilson, 1997). Students
learn best when they can contextualize what they learn for immediate application and to acquire personal meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Approach</th>
<th>Faculty Role</th>
<th>Student Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviorist</strong></td>
<td>Facilitating the transfer of knowledge to the student via strategies can be used to teach the “what” (facts).</td>
<td>Passive. Independent of others, each student is responsible for learning information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitivist</strong></td>
<td>Facilitating the transfer of knowledge to the student via strategies can be used to teach the “how” (processes and principles).</td>
<td>Passive. Independent of others, each student is responsible for learning information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructivist</strong></td>
<td>Facilitating the transfer of knowledge to the student via creating a learning environment conducive to active and interactive participation in the learning process.</td>
<td>Active. Discovering, constructing, practicing, and validating acquired knowledge via active exploration and interactive social collaboration with others. (Crumpacker, 2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Summary comparison of teaching and learning theories.

When the behaviorist, cognitivist, and constructivist schools of thought are analyzed closely, many overlaps in the ideas and principles become apparent. The design of distance education materials can include principles from all three. Behaviorists’ strategies can be used to teach what (facts), cognitive strategies
can be used to teach how (processes and principles), and constructivist strategies can be used to teach why (higher level thinking that promotes personal meaning and situated and contextual learning) (Ertmer and Newby, 1993). An instructor may determine her teaching style and consider how it will fit into a distance-delivered course.

As distance education has grown with technological developments, learning models have developed that create a framework and approach for teaching. Distance education learning models and theories give insight to successful strategies for distance-delivered art education. The Interactive Online Model by McClintock and Black (1995) and the Bounded Interactive Online Model by Bedore (1998) are two emerging theories on teaching via distance using newer technologies.

Constructivist Online Models

Grounded in constructivism, McClintock and Black (1995) proposed that when students are constructing knowledge, they are studying. McClintock and Black (1995) argued that the term study better defines what a student is doing in the construction of knowledge than does the term learn. From this argument, McClintock and Black (1995) designed study support environments. Their intent was to develop a study environment as opposed to a learning environment. The basis for the approach to a constructivist study environment is grounded in a seven-stage process called the Information Construction (ICON) model (McClintock & Black, 1995). The seven stages defined in the process
demonstrate an alignment with the key characteristics which are associated with how an interactive online model works. The seven stages presented by McClintock and Black (1995) are:

1. Observation: Students make observations of primary source materials embedded in their natural context or simulations thereof.
2. Interpretation Construction: Students interpret their observations and explain their reasoning.
3. Contextualization: Students construct contexts for their explanations.
6. Multiple Interpretations: Students gain cognitive flexibility by being exposed to multiple interpretations from other students and from expert examples.
7. Multiple Manifestations: Students gain transferability by seeing multiple manifestations of the same interpretations (McClintock & Black, 1995, pp.64-65).

These seven steps translate into the interactive online environment, and also support an adult learning model. The student-centered, asynchronous, interactive online classroom is designed to bring students’ diverse life, work, and educational experiences into a discussion that fosters critical thinking skills and produces clear examples that the students understand and can apply.

This process requires a continual stream of input, feedback, and questioning between students and between students and the facilitator (McClintock & Black, 1995). From this input, feedback, and questioning process, faculty are able to know where each student stands, in relation to achieving the course and program outcomes.

The asynchronous, interactive, online learning model was initially developed to support a mature or adult student (Gibbons & Wentworth, 2001).
The model supports the assumptions Malcolm Knowles (1970) presented, regarding adult students. Knowles coined the term “andragogy” to differentiate between the learning processes associated with adult students and the learning processes associated with less mature and experienced students. Knowles (1970) presented four basic assumptions associated with adult students:

1. Adult students want to be self-directed.
2. Adult students want to use their life, work, and educational experiences in the process of constructing meaning in the learning.
3. Necessary motivations exist within the student.
4. Adult students want knowledge and skills that are relevant to their lives (Knowles, 1970).

Knowles suggested that educators need to do the following to support an adult-student approach to learning. They must support a collaborative learning environment, involve the student in the development of outcomes that are relevant to the student, scaffold the learning from simple to complex, and provide courses with different learning style options (Knowles, 1970).

The characteristics associated with successful students in the interactive online environment remain unclear. The literature discusses experience-teaching courses, using many models at different academic and professional levels. Knowles found some common characteristics associated with successful online students, including self-discipline, motivation, and excellent communication and technology skills (Clark, 1996).

This model could be used to teach distance-delivered art education courses: art criticism, art history, aesthetics, research methods, and art education. These model may also be more appropriate for art education
graduate students than undergraduate students. In comparison to the interactive online model, the bounded interactive online model takes a more cognitivist approach to student learning, but remains grounded predominantly in constructivism.

Bedore et al. (1998) suggested that the bounded interactive online model represents a slight shift on the learning continuum, moving from the Socratic end toward the independent-study end of the continuum. Bedore et al. (1998) suggested that this model provides for a greater degree of flexibility in terms of time commitment and student convenience. However, the ability to construct learning through collaborative activities is diminished because the participation requirements associated with the student are reduced. The course construct is shifted to force a development of the learning through processes resembling and relating to an independent-study. The learning model can also be viewed as more cognitive than constructivist in nature (Bedore et al., 1998).

Many organizations offering online programs may favor the bounded interactive model because it allows more students to be placed in each class and the degree of accountability on the part of the instructor is greatly diminished in relation to that required by an interactive online classroom (Bedore et al., 1998).

Though this is an interesting model, this may not be the best framework for distance-delivered art education courses. Independent study may be appropriate for fundamental courses or methodology courses. In my experience, when faculty teach online, they use more linear methods, because it is easier to fit the content to the technology platform when delivering the learning experience.
Understanding the interactive online model and the bounded interactive online model will help instructors consider their options when creating or delivering a distance education course.

In this literature review, two models are discussed as examples to approach distance education in an online environment. There are key themes that emerge from both of these models. The model requires a high level of participation in the learning process for both the student and facilitator and participation is defined as advancing the learning (McClintock & Black, 1995). Delivery is best in an accelerated, asynchronous 5- or 6-week model, where class size is limited at 10 to 15 students in a class. A constructivist approach to learning is utilized and courses designed to support adult students.

Courses developed for the interactive online classroom or the bounded interactive model need to allow and support an appropriate level of socialization among students, even if the class is structured more like an independent study. Learning is enhanced when the learning environment is flexible, when it values the diversity of the students, and when collaboration among students is encouraged.

Instructional Design

Having considered the approaches discussed in this chapter, the reader can see that application of the theories impacts the instructional design of the distance-delivered art education course. The goal of any instructional system is to promote learning. Therefore, before any learning materials are developed,
educators must, tacitly or explicitly, know the principles of learning and how students learn (Nielsen, 2002). This is especially true for distance education, where the instructor and the student are separated (Nielsen, 2002). The development of effective distance education materials should be based on proven and sound learning theories. The delivery medium is not the determining factor in the quality of learning. Rather, the design of the course determines the effectiveness of the learning (Rovai, 2002).

There are many schools of thought on learning and distance education, and no one school is used exclusively to design distance education materials (Nielsen, 2002). One can use a combination of theories to develop appropriate materials. In addition, as research progresses, new theories are evolving that should be used in developing online materials. Instructional designers and faculty must know the different approaches to learning in order to select the most appropriate instructional strategies. Learning strategies should be selected to motivate students, facilitate deep processing, build the whole person, cater to individual differences, promote meaningful learning, encourage interaction, provide feedback, facilitate contextual learning, and provide support during the learning process (Nielsen, 2002).

At the lowest level of interaction, there must be student-interface interaction to allow the student to access and sense the information. The interface is where students use the senses to register the information in sensory storage (Wiley, 2002). In distance education, for example, the interface is with the computer to access the content and to interact with others. Once students
access the materials, there must be student-content interaction to process the information (Wiley, 2002).

As distance students interact with the content, they should be encouraged to apply, assess, analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and reflect on what they learn (Berge, 2002). It is during the student-content interaction that students process the information to transform it from short-term to long-term memory. The higher the level of processing, the more associations are made in long-term memory, which results in higher-level learning (Berge, 2002).

As students complete the learning activities, they will be involved with a variety of interactions (Berge, 2002). Students need to interact with the interface to access the online materials. The interface should not overload students, and should make it as easy as possible for students to sense the information for transfer to sensory store and then into short-term memory for processing. There should be interaction to collaborate, participate in shared cognition, form social networks, and establish social presence, and this interaction should occur among the students, between the student and the instructor, and between the student and experts (Berge, 2002). Students should be able to interact within their context to personalize information and construct their own meaning (Berge, 2002).

Technology can also support simulation and problem-based activities, which some schools are using with Second Life, a virtual simulation software product, to create virtual universities and classrooms. As a tool, technology can be used to produce documents, create artwork, and construct reports. In the
interactive online classroom, technology serves as a primary means for communication and for presenting information. It is a tool to support a learning process focused on learning outcomes, not the technology. As a best practice, technology can be viewed as a partner that supports the learning process.

As discussed in this chapter, technology is limited in its application to the learning process. As distance education has evolved, many more areas have become associated with supporting an online program influenced by technology than with simply addressing the learning process.

Factors such as cost, scalability, integration potential with front and back-end applications, and other considerations come into play when considering best practices associated with the use of technology in online learning. Therefore, best practices must be considered within the appropriate context as it applies to the specifics of the program. The next chapter will discuss technology and distance education infrastructure, and the ability to create rich distance-delivered art education courses.
Different terminologies have been used for distance education, which makes it difficult to develop a generic definition. Ideas that are commonly used include e-learning, Internet learning, distributed learning, networked learning, tele-learning, virtual learning, computer-assisted learning, Web-based learning, and distance learning. All of these terms imply that the student is at a distance from the tutor or instructor, that the student uses some form of technology to access the learning materials, that the student uses technology to interact with the tutor or instructor and other students, and that some form of support is provided to students.

Although distance education delivered via computer and the Internet through sophisticated Learning Content Management Systems (LCMS) is a relatively new phenomenon, distance education itself is not. A LCMS combines technology from a LMS (Learning Management System) and CMS (Content Management System). LMS systems have traditionally been used for corporate training and CMS systems for the education sector. Nevertheless, the use of
telecommunications to establish and deliver distance education programs has led to a revision of distance education’s formal definition. As defined by the United States Distance Learning Association, distance education is “the acquisition of knowledge and skills through mediated information and instruction, encompassing all technologies and other forms of learning at a distance” (2005, para. 1)

Beginning at the turn of the century, correspondence education was soon followed by the advent of educational radio. Radio was replaced soon after the introduction of the television as educational television, which remains a part of distance education culture today, became the prominent distance education media (Saba, 1999). Today, computer technology has made yet another major change in the education sector. The research in this study is focused on distance education delivered via computer technology. New technologies are on course to transform what is presently understood to be distance education and to impact the future of learning in an online environment.

Art Education and Distance Education Practicalities

From March 2006 to December 2006, I conducted monthly Google searches looking for schools that offered Art Education bachelors or masters degrees. There are many advertisements for online degrees mostly for proprietary education companies who do not offer art education degrees. In addition to searching Google, I send email inquiries about enrollment in distance education courses or programs to all 60 colleges and universities surveyed in this
study. I received responses back from 45 of the 60 Admissions Departments I sent inquiries to. No school reported offering art education distance education courses or degrees online, or via any other distance-delivered medium. The phenomena could be a result of poor communications between departments and admissions. However, based on my research I identified one distance-delivered art education programs, which is a graduate-level degree program offered by The Ohio State University. This program will be discussed in detail later in this dissertation.

As discussed in earlier chapters, art education requires students to take courses in art, education and art education. While conducting the Google search, the first art education course to be identified is Art Education 160, Art and Music from 1945 to the present, offered by The Ohio State University. When continuing the search for art education courses, it was discovered that Penn State University and Texas Tech State offer online courses, but when reviewing their course catalogue, the courses referenced could not be found.

There are schools that offer studio courses online. For example, Matthew Stewart (2006), of the Art Institutes Online, wrote in the article Teaching Art at a Distance, that his school is a nationally accredited art and design school that offers distance education drawing and painting courses. He explained that the Web-based system used by instructors and students enables students to receive teaching materials, and upload images of their work at each stage of development without the delays, transport costs, and security problems (Stewart, 2006).
When starting this project, Stewart and his colleagues were faced with a barrage of criticism and doubt that teaching studio courses via distance was not possible. He wrote, “Text-based subject disciplines present fewer problems than art courses in the online realm because art courses require that students create and submit visual materials for appraisal and comment. The criticism came from two distinct fronts, which were the technically, it can't be done crowd, and the aesthetically, it shouldn't be done crowd” (Stewart, 2006, p. 5).

Their move into the distance education space was based on the need to expand their student base. Stewart researched various methodologies for teaching and considered alternatives to the classroom-based, lecturer-led experience. Faced with escalating delivery costs, increasingly diverse audience and the need to maximize the effectiveness of staff-student contact time, educators are under pressure to develop leaner approaches to professional practice (Steward, 2006). Though the research was partly driven by a financial imperative, they were also charged with examining means of delivering effective learning to those finding it difficult to access traditional, studio-based art courses (Stewart, 2006).

At the Art Institutes, everything is online, and each student is given access to her personal online studio where she can download learning materials and communicate with faculty and classmates. Students use a digital camera to photograph and upload their work throughout each stage of development through to completion. The Art Institutes provides an opportunity for domestic and international students who were previously unable to access courses of this type.
They currently have students from 29 countries enrolled in academic programs (Stewart, 2006).

The disadvantages that Stewart discussed are lack of face-to-face contact between faculty and students, and further, the loss of the interaction between students that forms a vital part of any classroom-based experience. However, Stewart (2006) claimed that any potential disadvantages were far outweighed by the advantages. In the online studio, there is as much time as is necessary to teach each student (Stewart, 2006). Students are encouraged to upload images of their work at every stage of its development to produce a comprehensive record of the creative process.

Another interesting concept that the Art Institutes is involved in is experimenting with a virtual-reality product called Second Life. The school has opened a student campus in Second Life to teach a new business communications course (The Art Institutes Online, 2006). Based on the success of Second Life, the company realized students would be interested in learning in a virtual 3D environment, which would also serve for the course's development (The Art Institutes Online, 2006).

Developed by San Francisco-based Linden Lab, Second Life is a rapidly growing and constantly changing 3D MUVE (multi-user virtual environment) where residents can discover a world of exploration, socializing, creativity, self-expression and learning. Within Second Life, members can exchange Linden dollars to purchase goods or property, can build a home or an entire town, and can interact with users from around the world. The online society uses real-time
3D streaming technology and runs on proprietary software that students can
download from the website.

The Art Institutes Online students and faculty may create avatars, which
are cartoon-like characters that interact with one another and are controlled via
keyboard and mouse. The course will be primarily asynchronous and students
will have the opportunity to communicate in an environment that lends itself to
socialization. The communication course they are experimenting with will involve
both constructivism and simulation-based learning. By providing real-world
objects, structures and scenarios, students can apply business processes and
techniques associated with the real world to this virtual environment.

With this technology, Art Education programs could set up virtual
classrooms, museums and galleries for students to interact with each other and
experiment within a simulated environment. Not only could courses be
structured this way, but a virtual university would enable students to recreate
some of the activities they would experience on campus. For example, students
could study at the library together, visit a professor in her office, or socialize
together.

For an Art Education program to use this technology, it would need to
work with Second Life to create an island, or virtual space, in which only its
students would have access. There is a cost associated with building this site,
which varies based on the end-user agreement. Outsourcing is available at
additional charges if the department wants Second Life to build the site, or an
employee or faculty member who is skilled in technology could build the site.
After the site is built, access links can be emailed to students to join Second Life, create an avatar, and visit the classroom. Within the virtual world, a faculty member could create a classroom, museum, gallery, or other space to teach students. Student can chat live with others in the classroom. Second Life claims that over 70 colleges and universities are using its site, including New York University, Vanderbilt, and Stanford (Second Life, 2007).

In addition to the Art Institutes, there are a handful of proprietary online schools that claim to offer art, education, or art education; however, upon further investigation it is unclear what degrees are truly offered. These schools are University of Phoenix, Strayer University, Colorado Technical University, International Academy of Design and Technology, Brooks Institute of Photography, Western Career College, and Collins College. None of these schools offer an art education degree, although their Web marketing claims that they do.

Obviously, any learning-technology investment is costly and requires careful planning to mitigate expensive mistakes. The next section will map out the planning process and some of the decisions one would encounter when building the platform for distance-delivered art education.

Infrastructure

Building the infrastructure for a distance-delivered art education requires that many factors be considered, so it is difficult to provide a straightforward checklist or recipe to follow (Howell et al., 2003). In traditional universities and
colleges, faculty can be unaware of all the complexities involved. In comparison, when developing distance-delivered art education, an understanding of how the entire system of curriculum development and delivery occurs, and how these systems link to other components are vital aspects of ensuring effectiveness and quality (Howell et al., 2003).

Infrastructure is critical to the success of a distance education program. Limited resources, legacy systems that have loyal advocates, key staff who must be retrained, outdated policies and practices, inadequate governance processes, administrative systems that might or might not be made to work with the new systems, etc, are all factors that will undermine the success of the program (Wolcott, 1996). Furthermore, after these factors are considered, curricula, learning technologies, and approaches evolve all of the time, and therefore any system must also be able to change constantly.

Any infrastructure must consider that the department, faculty, or institution will have a mandate, a mission, specific goals, and values that have to be considered when planning and designing a system (Berge, 2002). There are other internal and external environmental factors, such as competing priorities, budget constraints, and professional group requirements. All of these factors must be well understood and accounted for at the outset.

All teaching and learning systems should be built on two foundations: the needs of the intended students and the learning outcomes of the course or program (Clark, 1983). A successful distance education program will be based on a plan that develops from a full understanding of these two fundamentals.
Distance education initiatives often spring from the experimentation of an individual educator, or a small group of educators, who sometimes have no clear idea of what benefit the experiment of building a distance education course will bring to the learning experience (Berge, 2002). The degree to which an organization (department, faculty, company, or institution) wants to foster and allow experimentation, versus keeping tight control over a single distance education system, will be driven by its mission, mandate, core values, and financial resources (Wolcott, 1996).

Even where the student market is well understood and learning outcomes are clearly defined or prescribed, the implementation of distance education often involves a good deal of trial and error. With the best information and intentions, the results and experience rarely meet expectations, and thus the ability to adapt and refine the distance education system is crucial (Perreault et al., 2002).

Centralization v. Decentralization

Faculty and administrator relationships can impact the decision regarding centralization versus decentralization in distance education delivery. Typically, the administration prefers a more centralized system to avoid duplication, ensure security, and minimize the divergence of approaches and the subsequent complexity of support (Perreault et al., 2002). Those involved in the design and delivery of educational programming prefer a more decentralized approach, with more freedom to innovate and to choose platforms and applications that suit their specific needs and preferences (Perreault et al., 2002). Challenges may arise if
the desire for academic values and needs has priority over an administration’s perceived values and needs (Perreault et al., 2002).

In an ideal case, it should not matter how such departments are organized or linked, because the overall goals and values of the institution would govern people’s behavior and perceptions, and everyone would accommodate each other's needs, responsibilities, and functions. In reality, conflicting priorities and approaches quickly arise, and clear statements of roles and responsibilities, processes, and policies must be established to help balance the relative need for control / centralization and freedom / decentralization (Perreault et al., 2002).

Another key decision to be made at the development phase is the choice of LCMS, sometime referred to as the CMS (classroom management system) or the LMS (learning management system). The first question to be considered in this decision is whether to use an external software provider or to develop an in-house system, which may or may not also be based on freely available, imported open-source software.

There are many solutions available to choose from when deciding between external vendors or in-house development. Assessing which of the available options is the best fit for the needs of a particular distance education program can be an onerous task. The choices must be carefully considered and are often made with the help of an independent evaluation source (Edutools, 2001).

For an in-house system, many free, open-source solutions are available which have the same functionality of the proprietary systems and can be adapted
in any manner needed. Open-source means that the source of the software program is open so that programmers can customize the program to fit their needs. This approach, however, might require more initial development and different skill sets among staff to ensure the robustness of the system, to provide a higher level of on-going technical support, to prepare documentation and training, and to interface with other systems as necessary.

The three most used technology platforms are WebCT, Blackboard and Moodle. WebCT and Blackboard completed their merger in February 2006, and it will be interesting to see how the software evolves as a result. Currently Moodle has 2,981 deployments, representing 54% market share and WebCT and Blackboard have 2,500 deployments representing 45% market share (Educause, 2006).

Opinions over which is the best solution varies greatly. I conducted a Google search for comparisons of the three software programs and found a number of articles supporting each one. I have only used WebCT and Moodle, and I do not have a strong opinion favoring one over the other. Of note, Moodle is open-source and free which could have another series of implications, such as student support services and security, depending on the technology philosophy at a given school.

Desire2Learn is used by The Ohio State University, which first used WebCT and then switched to Desire2Learn in 2004, which is called Carmen and has been customized to meet OSU’s needs. Penn State University uses Angel which, like D2L, is another technology that is gaining popularity. Consolidation
and mergers will create new opportunities and challenges for departments who seek to offer distance-delivered art education courses and programs.

Pilots and Systems Tests

An important factor in organization change, which will be discussed in the next chapter, is the use of pilots and systems tests for new developments. The impact of a new distance education program must be evaluated before the developments proceed to wider adoption. Pilot programs can offer the opportunity to engage faculty that might be skeptical towards distance education. It also enables faculty to provide feedback to the change process. Ultimately, the organization can receive benefit from the pilots, and change can be seen to be open and effective (Oblinger & Maruyama, 1996).

My survey asked participants what technology they are using to deliver distance education. This provided insight into what different schools or individuals are using with students and confirmed information found in the literature. There is no menu or prescribed solution for distance education that will fit every department. Depending on the department’s and institution’s goals and mission, distance education goals and objectives will be different.

In developing an infrastructure that supports excellence in art education and distance education, the issues to be addressed are almost all the same as for any post-secondary educational enterprise: a clear understanding of the goals of the curriculum and of the characteristics and needs of the intended students.
Furthermore, distance education is fundamentally a human endeavor, with the technology available to support the agreed upon principles and goals.
CHAPTER 5

ISSUES IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND LEADERSHIP THEORY THAT IMPACT DISTANCE-DELIVERED ART EDUCATION

The adoption of a new program or technology is a change that could be embraced or resisted by art education faculty. The organization and its administrative leadership impacts the process in which the change occurs. This chapter will evaluate issues that impact organization change and leadership theories that shape the change process in adapting new technologies or distance education programs.

In Sullivan’s (1989) article, *Curriculum in Art Education: The Uncertainty Principle*, he comments that the stages of curriculum research and development are characterized by uncertainty. His article discusses the curriculum process as being dependent on the U.S. Department of Education, and part of a cyclical structure whereby subject areas alternatively undergo a process of curriculum evaluation (Sullivan, 1989). The outcome of this process is dependent upon the leadership and change factors.
Curriculum decisions may be made through different decision-making processes. At some institutions, decisions are made top-down. This means the leader of the organization makes the decisions with little or no input from the organization. Others have a bottom-up model, which means organizational decisions are generated by line managers and become adapted by the entire group. Finally, there are democratic models, where individuals are elected to a committee and make decisions on behalf of the group. Each art education program has a different structure in which it makes decisions.

Organizational Change

The model of change that is employed in this study has been the four step diagnostic model suggested by Connor and Lake (1994) as follows: 1. formulate a problem statement, 2. gather information, 3. analyze the information, and 4. derive suggestions for future actions.
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Figure 5.1: Overview of Connor and Lake change model.

Art education, like other academic areas, is impacted by technology change and innovations (Saba, 1999). Such change requires a paradigm shift.
(Rockwell, Schauer, Fritz, & Marx, 2000). For art education administrators and faculty, this means there are many factors that impact this transformation. Such significant change is inevitably met with many opportunities and challenges.

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges is the rate at which change occurs. Rapidly evolving technological advances continue to transform distance education like no other innovation of the past century. Many different models have emerged; however, it is unclear which is the best or most successful. Until a proven model is developed, uncoordinated attempts at addressing the needs of the stakeholders, which are art education students, faculty and administrators, is the standard.

It is increasingly apparent that the new instructional delivery methods have not only transformed the role of the art education student, but also faculty and administrators as well (Wegner, 1999). As has been the case with each progressive innovation, art education faculty must learn to apply their expertise within a distance education framework. Art education faculty training and development become integral parts of the transformation process and a necessity of a successful distance education program.

When determining whether or not to integrate distance education into an art education program, it is necessary to examine the impact change will have on the individuals working in the department, and how that affects the organization as a whole. It has been suggested that negative faculty perceptions of distance education are a manifestation of resistance to change (Betts, 1998). Resistance to change is "a slow motion response or even a complete refusal to cooperate
with change” (Connor, 1994, p. 30). Resistance to change is a universal phenomenon and is often the initial reaction to change (Connor & Lake, 1994).

Distance education and other technologies are relatively new media for delivering curriculum in higher education. As with all change, individuals will not always respond positively to it (Connor & Lake, 1994). Various authors have presented different classifications of resistance to change. One such model is that proposed by Connor and Lake (1994). Their model groups change resistance into barriers to understanding and barriers to acceptance of change.

Barriers to understanding change suggest that it is resisted because individuals lack understanding of the need, content, or consequences of change (Connor & Lake, 1994). Such resistance was thought to result from poor communication and lack of information. Incompatibility of change with individual or organizational culture or behaviors or actions inconsistent with the adoption of the change by those responsible for disseminating or driving the change also causes resistance (Connor & Lake, 1994).

Organizational culture drives barriers to understanding change, as conceptualized by Connor and Lake (1994). Culture is leader-centric, and shaped by the practices and behaviors modeled by leaders. Culture is determined by what leaders paid attention to through praise and criticism, their reactions to crises, and their behaviors and actions (Schein, 1992). This would include technology decisions, budget and resource allocation. Additionally, the manner in which rewards are allocated and the criteria for recognition are also
factors defined by leadership that impact the culture of an organization (Schein, 1992). Leadership will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

George, Sleeth, and Pearce (1996) suggested that the introduction of technological change without adequate preparation of or input from faculty might lead them to feel that they are victims of change. This mindset can be translated into active or passive resistive behaviors. As more art education programs move toward implementing distance education programs, they will have to take into account the reactions of those faculty not currently engaged in distance education, who will have to adopt it, in order to avoid or minimize resistance to change. Schein (1992) agreed and noted that resistance arises from those whose jobs are directly affected; therefore, for any change effort to be successful, management must foresee and neutralize any resistance that may occur.

Integrated Technology Adoption and Diffusion Model

In the integrated technology adoption and diffusion model, Sherry (1998) describes a learning and adoption trajectory in faculty. It consists of individual, technological, organizational, and instructional elements for the practice of a development in technology for faculty. This model presents a cyclic process, in which faculty evolve from learner to adopter of educational technology, to co-learner, and finally, to a reaffirmer or rejecter. This model integrates the adoption process with the learning process of the intended adopters and expands to include the fifth stage of leader (Sherry, 1998).
To progress and reach the reaffirmer stage, and eventually the leader stage, requires effective strategies through professional development (Sherry, 1998). This learning-adoptive trajectory is aimed to go beyond the linear limitations of the traditional adoption models, to incorporate external factors, and ultimately, to "make visible both the patterns and the context of involvement of the various players and parts of the system" (Sherry, 1998, p. 4). Sherry (1998) identifies five stages of Learning Adoption Trajectory (learner, adopter, co-learner, reaffirmer, leader).

The first stage is the teacher as learner. This stage in the learning adoption trajectory model is an information-gathering stage in which "teachers learn the knowledge and skills necessary for performing instructional tasks using technology" (Sherry, 1998, p. 2). Effective strategies in this stage include demonstrations of promising use of technology by peers rather than one-shot workshops by outside experts. Training sessions should stress the alignment of technology and curriculum standards. Faculty must make time for training exercises that will improve their understanding about technology and its use in the classroom.

In the next stage of the learning adoption trajectory model, the teacher as adopter, "teachers progress through stages of personal and task management concern as they experiment with the technology, begin to try it out in the classroom, and share their experiences with their peers" (Sherry, 1998, p. 3). During this stage, accessible technology support is very crucial in helping faculty on their journey of learning to teach with technology. Online resources, on-site
technology support, peer technology mentoring, and open lab workshops are possible ways to establish mechanisms to deal with technical problems as faculty incorporate technology in the classroom.

Next, in the teacher as co-learner stage, "teachers focus on developing a clear relationship between technology and the curriculum, rather than concentrating on task management aspects" (Sherry, 1998, p. 3). In this stage, workshops need to include strategies for enhancing instruction and integrating technology into curriculum. Effective development strategies include collegial sharing of exemplary products and innovative ideas of technology integration and use of students as informal technical assistants.

For the teacher as reaffirmer, in this stage, "teachers develop a greater awareness of intermediate learning outcomes. Faculty begin to create new ways to observe and assess impact on student products and performances, and to disseminate exemplary student work to a larger audience" (Sherry, 1998, p. 4). Administrative support is important as faculty develop awareness of immediate learning outcomes of students, such as greater student engagement and increased metacognitive skills in technology-based active learning.

Finally, in the teacher as leader stage, "experienced teachers expand their roles to become active researchers who carefully observe their practice, collect data, share the improvements in practice with peers, and teach new members. Their skills become portable" (Sherry, 1998, p. 2). The reaffirmer goes on to take on a leadership role, assisting with the trouble shooting, serving on technology planning committees, and planning workshop sessions at schools. They often
become the change agents for their colleagues. Effective development strategies in this stage include incentives for co-teaching on-site workshops, release time to allow peer coaching and outside consulting, and support from a network of faculty-leaders.

This model can help art education faculty and administrators understand how change occurs within their organization. Identifying individuals within each role can help ease the resistance or stress that occurs with new technology. The ultimate goal is an increase in the acceleration and acceptance of change. Strong faculty-leaders and reaffirmers can help adopters and co-learners move more seamlessly through their change stage and embrace new distance education courses or programs.

**Leadership Theory**

As discussed in the prior section, leadership drives organizational change. Leadership theories provide a theoretical framework for analyzing the impact of instructional leadership. One factor in educational effectiveness research is an emphasis on strong, instructional leadership (Edmonds, 1979; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Weber, 1971). Instructional leadership has many different definitions and models that conceptualize it, starting from the early 1900’s. The instructional leadership construct is defined in terms of the administrator’s behaviors that lead an institution to educate all students and achieve student learning outcomes (Locke & Latham, 1990).

Instructional leadership incorporates behaviors which define and
communicate shared goals, monitor and provide feedback on the teaching and learning process, and promote campus or department-wide professional development (Locke & Latham, 1990). Defining and communicating shared goals encompasses activities that focus attention to the technical core of schools. These goals increase the effort exerted by college members, increase persistence, and increase the development of strategies (Locke & Latham, 1990). Instructional leaders consistently make decisions with these goals in mind. The shared goals of a college or university foster group unity, trust and commitment, whether this is at the department level or throughout the whole institution (Locke & Latham, 1990).

Defining and communicating shared goals, monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process, and promoting college-wide professional development are inextricably interwoven. Effective instructional leaders demonstrate the behaviors described above from each of these dimensions. Instructional leadership offers colleges and universities a process to become more effective at the teaching and learning process (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Hallinger & Heck, 1996).

Instructional leadership consists of administrator behaviors that set high expectations and clear goals for student and faculty performance, monitor and provide feedback regarding the technical core (teaching and learning) of colleges, provide and promote professional growth for all staff members (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

In addition, leadership behavior theory provides the framework for
behavioral research of leaders. It hypothesizes that identifiable leadership behaviors exist that distinguish an effective leader from an ineffective leader. Research during the last fifty years has been comprised of observations, interviews and questionnaires. The conceptualization of leadership behaviors has centered around two main characteristics: interpersonal relations or consideration for others and task-oriented behaviors such as goal attainment, production, and structure (Yukl, 1998; Hoy & Miskel, 2000).

Hemphill and Coons (1950) developed one of the most influential leadership behavior questionnaire instruments at The Ohio State University. The instrument, the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), was developed by researchers who compiled a list of leadership behavior descriptors. Through field tests, 1,800 items were narrowed to 150. The Ohio State leadership questionnaires have been utilized in hundreds of studies.

From this research, Yukl (1998) proposed an integrated framework for classifying behaviors. His taxonomy includes three factors that are closely aligned with “consideration” and “initiating structure” (Yukl, 1998). These include task-oriented behavior, relations-oriented behaviors, and change-oriented behaviors (Yukl, 1998).

Task-oriented behavior reflects doing things that are primarily concerned with accomplishing the task, utilizing personnel and resources efficiently, and maintaining stable and reliable operations. Behaviors include clarifying roles, planning and organizing operations, and monitoring operations (Yukl, 1998). In comparison, relations-oriented behavior involves doing things that are primarily
concerned with improving relationships and helping people, increasing cooperation and teamwork, increasing subordinate job satisfaction, and building identification with the organization. Behaviors include supporting, developing, recognizing, consulting, and managing conflict (Yukl, 1998).

Finally, change-oriented behavior reflects doing things that are primarily concerned with improving strategic decisions, adapting to change in the environment, making major changes in objectives, processes, and gaining commitment to the changes. “Behaviors include scanning and interpreting external events, articulating an appealing vision, proposing innovative strategies, and making persuasive appeals about the need for change” (Yukl, 1998, p. 61). Ideally, leaders need to use all three categories of behaviors depending on their situations and organizational environments (Yukl, 1998). What is important is the context in which each of these is used.

The above leadership theories provide a framework for instructional leadership. Leadership in social organizations evolves as the social and political climates influence the organization. The premise of instructional leadership is to lead art education faculty and students to reach their full potentials by creating climates characterized by acceptance of change, defining and communicating shared goals, monitoring the teaching and learning process, and promoting lifelong learning of stakeholders and the organization.

Organizational change and leadership have a major impact on the acceptance or rejection of distance-delivered art education. In addition to understand change and leadership theory, faculty motivation is a key driver in the
acceptance of distance-delivered art education. An art education program in which incentives are attainable, obstacles are mitigated, or both should elicit a higher level of effort which should ultimately impact student success. Thus, identifying faculty-perceived incentives and obstacles is paramount, which will be discussed in the next chapter.
Art education faculty motivation is a key factor that impacts faculty and administrator perceptions of distance-delivered art education. Faculty development, training, compensation, time and stress are all factors that are motivators and barriers to the creation of art education distance education programs. This chapter will discuss faculty intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as it related to distance education.

When art education faculty become involved in distance education, the traditional roles of research, teaching and service are changed and often separated. Most often this means limiting distance faculty to task-based activities related to instruction (Sherron & Boettcher, 1997). This shift may be a welcome change for the distance educator, freeing him or her to focus exclusively on the endeavors associated with teaching and learning. However, it is also likely that it may be a detractor with regard to occupational satisfaction by removing duties that brought fulfillment and reward.
Faculty play an essential role in the implementation of distance-delivered art education and technological change (Betts, 1998). Perception of, and consequently, usage of, technology is shaped by individual assumptions regarding the nature of technology (O'Sullivan, 2000). O'Sullivan (2000) suggested therefore, that if educational institutions are to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by new technologies, faculty perceptions should be adapted to embrace new practices that incorporate technology into their teaching. Anecdotal evidence suggests that most higher-education faculty are not very enthusiastic about delivering instruction via the Internet (Eisenberg, 1998). One reason advanced for faculty reluctance to adopt distance education is that developing and preparing courses for distance education formats takes more time than it does for traditional classroom instruction (Eisenberg, 1998).

This chapter will discuss seven key works that have shaped the quantitative questions in the survey. This section will clarify how and why I selected these texts and review the themes that emerged after applying document-based content analysis.

Many researchers have examined factors that affect the success or failure of distance education. As I read the literature, I felt I needed to establish a framework around the topics to have a better perspective of the issues. The first step I took in the research process was to conduct a literature search for relevant research studies. I searched OhioLink, WorldCat Dissertation Abstracts, ERIC, JSTOR, Education Abstracts Full Text, ISI Citation Index, and ProQuest Direct. In addition, the following online journals and organizational websites were
reviewed for research articles: the *Studies in Art Education*, *Journal for Asynchronous Learning*, the *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, and the *American Journal of Distance Education*.

In selecting literature to review, I defined the parameters to include documents that were relatively current and no older than ten years. Thus, the range of dates for the research studies was between 1996 and 2006, with the majority of studies chosen from 1997 to 2005. The keywords used in searching these databases and websites were: art education, arts education, visual art, art history, art technology, faculty, distance education, distance learning, participation, motivation, deterrents, barriers, perceptions and factors.

This initial search yielded a total of forty-three articles. After including additional keywords (satisfaction, barriers, asynchronous learning, synchronous learning, distance education, perceptions, and Web-based learning) paired with the initial keywords and searching the reference lists of those articles already found, an additional search yielded thirty-one articles, some of which were actual research studies and others that were descriptive articles or summaries.

The research studies chosen for this literature review focused on perceptions and attitudes of faculty teaching via distance education and more specifically, the perceptions that faculty have regarding motivators and barriers of teaching via online distance education. The research studies included seven studies, which used both quantitative and qualitative methods, typically employing surveys that included short-answer questions or interviews which represented the qualitative aspect of the studies (Berge, 1998; Betts, 1998;
Jones & Moller, 2002; McKenzie et al., 2000; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000).

Written by individuals with Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor status, these articles were the forerunners in conducting research of faculty perceptions of distance education. These studies were most closely aligned with the research I planned to conduct. Also, they were the most referenced by other researchers who were examining distance education and higher-education issues. All were set in higher-education institutions, ranging from community colleges to four-year institutions. Only a few studies noted a public or private institutional affiliation. Of those studies, two included only public institutions (Jones & Moller, 2002; Schifter, 2000).

The research methodology used in all of the studies was survey research, and a theoretical framework was not discussed. The seven studies contained similar purpose statements and tended to focus on identifying factors that either motivated or deterred faculty participation in online teaching. Both motivating and deterring factors were discussed in all of the studies, while three studies discussed either motivational factors (McKenzie et al., 2000) or deterrents (Berge, 1998; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002).

Two of the seven studies profiled participants who taught online courses or programs (Berge, 1998; McKenzie et al., 2000). Betts (1998), O'Quinn and Corry (2002) and Schifter (2000) divided the faculty in their studies by those who had participated in teaching an online course and faculty who were considered non-participants, defined as those who never have taught via distance education.
technologies. One study did not distinguish between faculty who had or had not participated in distance education (Jones & Moller, 2002). Four studies included administrators, as well as faculty, as participants in the studies (Betts, 1998; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000).

In Berg’s study, *Barriers to Online Teaching in Post-Secondary Institutions: Can Policy Changes Fix It?*, he electronically surveyed 812 people who he speculated taught online courses based on a database he had accumulated between 1996 and 1998 (Berge, 1998). Sixty-three faculty members completed the survey and, of those, nineteen were not usable. Of the forty-four faculty who did meet Berg’s criteria, a second follow-up survey was sent (Berge, 1998). The barriers identified were faceless teaching, fear of replacement by computers, diffusion of degree value, lack of time to prepare and implement online courses, high cost of materials, resistance to change, and lack of technological assistance (Berge, 1998).

Berge grouped the issues into seven operational areas: academic, fiscal, geographic service area, governance, labor-management, legal, and student support services. He also felt that there was a difference in perception between those who had already taught online and those who were about to begin (Berge, 1998). Berge’s conclusion was to encourage policy decisions around his seven identified areas to mitigate faculty barriers.

Betts’ study, titled *An Institutional Overview: Factors Influencing Faculty Participation in Distance Education in Postsecondary Education in the United States: An Institutional Study*, surveyed faculty and deans at George Washington
University in the spring of 1998 (Betts, 1998). Betts’ study is the most widely known and cited. Surveys were sent to 1,001 faculty and deans, and she received responses from 532 faculty and 7 deans, representing a 53.8% response rate (Betts, 1998). The purpose of her study was to identify factors that have motivated faulty who were participating in, or had participated in, distance education. Pearson Chi-squares (crosstabs), ANOVAs, including Scheffe’s post hoc analysis, and dependent paired t-tests were employed to determine various relationships (Betts, 1998). In general, the results were that both faculty and deans supported distance education.

The study A Comparison of Continuing Education and Resident Faculty Attitudes towards Using Distance Education in a Higher Education Institution in Pennsylvania was conducted by Jones and Moller in 2002 (Jones & Moller, 2002). Seventy-eight resident faculty and fifty-four continuing-education faculty members were asked to complete a 20-question survey consisting of 6 multiple-choice questions, 11 Likert-scale choices and 3 open-ended questions (Jones and Moller, 2002). Data from participants was analyzed using descriptive statistics and content analysis. The primary barrier to faculty participation in distance education was an inferior perception of the quality of distance education to face-to-face instruction (Jones & Moller, 2002).

McKenzie, Mims, Bennett and Waugh co-authored Needs, Concerns and Practices of Online Instructors in 2000 (McKenzie et al., 2000). The purpose of their study was to identify factors that influence faculty participation in distance education. All instructors and a few administrators at State University of West
Georgia received a survey. McKenzie et al. received a 47% return rate for a total population of thirty-one. SPSS and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The conclusion of the study was that faculty were motivated to deliver online courses because of intrinsic factors, generally wanting to be a great teacher and interest in technology in the classroom (McKenzie et al., 2000).

O’Quinn and Corry titled their study *Factors that Deter Faculty from Participating in Distance Education*. Five hundred and seventy-two faculty and fifteen chairs received the survey (O’Quinn, 2002). One hundred and sixteen responded, and of that population all except one of the thirteen chairs who responded had taught distance education courses. One chair, who described his academic discipline as art and design reported that the field was hands-on and not applicable to distance education (O’Quinn, 2002). The factors that most determined faculty participation were course delivery mode, change of the facilitator role and lack of departmental support (O’Quinn, 2002).

The study *Incentives and Obstacles Influencing Higher Education Faculty and Administrators to Teach via Distance Education* was conducted by Rockwell, Schauer, Fritz and Marx in 1999 (Rockwell et al., 1999). The purpose of the study was to identify what faculty and administrators perceived as being incentives that encourage them to develop educational opportunities via distance, and obstacles that discourage them from doing so (Rockwell, et al, 1999). Two colleges within the University of Nebraska were surveyed via mail (Rockwell et al., 1999). Data was analyzed using Haenszel Chi-square test and
SAS. Their study found that incentives were intrinsic or personal, and obstacles were time, training, and support needs (Rockwell et al., 1999).

Finally, in Schifter’s 2000 study, *Faculty Participation in Asynchronous Learning Networks: A Case Study of Motivating and Inhibiting Factors*, she identified the top five motivating and inhibiting factors for faculty participation in distance education (Schifter, 2000). Her survey was distributed via mail in April 1999 to faculty and administrators at Temple University. Two hundred and sixty-three surveys were returned for a response rate of 44%. Schifter used variance analysis (ANOVA) to calculate the mean scores and the difference between the ratings (Schifter, 2000). Her study found that “personal motivation to use technology” was the major factor driving distance education use (Schifter, 2000, p.20).

Document-based Content Analysis

Content analysis is a well known method for analyzing documents and written communication. With an awareness that written text is “capable of transmission, manipulation, and alteration,” (Hodder, 2000, p. 704) the researcher will use content analysis to identify significant meaning from the literature. The process involves establishing categories and counting the number of instances each category occurs in the literature (Silverman, 1997). I used content analysis to review the seven studies and as a method of textual investigation. This analysis helped shape my survey questions that were sent to art education faculty and administrators.
Borg and Gall (1998) describe content analysis as “a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest of content communication” (p. 159). The content analysis of a portion of the data gathered for this study will allow me to make replicable and valid inferences from the data to their context (Robson, 1997).

I created a chart to track dominant themes and to use it in comparison to my survey after the results were collected. Once the factors were charted, they were grouped into categories. The criteria were selected after reading each of the studies and conducting a literature review. Thus the final categories were intrinsic or personal, extrinsic, and institutional. The factors within these categories are outlined in the next section of this review.

The list of barriers and motivational factors in regard to faculty perceptions of distance education is lengthy. Motivation refers to the general internal or external state or condition that arouses one to action. Motivation directs action toward a particular goal or end. Motivation keeps one engaged in certain activities (Ormrod, 1999). Extrinsic motivation is defined as sources of motivation that lie outside the individual or the task being performed (Ormrod, 1999) and refers to the individual’s desire to participate in a given activity for some reason other than the activity itself (Betts, 1998). Intrinsic motivation is an individual’s desire to participate in a given activity where the reward is the activity itself. Intrinsic motivation comes from curiosity, a sense of challenge, or inherent satisfaction that accompanies the activity absent external rewards (for example money, recognition, etc.).
Faculty Motivators

External incentives in the form of tenure and promotion reportedly would increase the level of job satisfaction as well as the amount of support and recognition faculty receive from peers (Rockwell et al., 1999). Faculty relied on their peers to be role models in using distance education technologies and sharing their online experiences. O’Quinn and Corry (2002) noted that a majority of their faculty respondents “would like more faculty showcases in instructional technology that demonstrate real-world applications in the classroom” (p. 22). In Jones’ (1997) study, “role modeling was a primary motivational factor in the adoption and diffusion of technology” (p. 6).

Furthermore, faculty reported interest in online collaboration opportunities with faculty from other institutions and would welcome the institution's support of this type of collaboration (Dooley & Murphrey, 2000). It is important to note that these extrinsic factors could also be categorized as institutional motivators. Opportunities for peer modeling and sharing technology best-practices could be instigated by administrators, and thus be seen as administrative support.

Much of the literature supported the idea that intrinsic motivators are stronger than extrinsic motivators when it comes to participation of faculty in distance education. Intrinsic motivating factors were a personal motivation to use technology (Betts, 1998; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000) or perceiving teaching via distance education as an intellectual challenge. Some faculty stated that teaching via distance added to their overall job satisfaction (Betts, 1998;
Schifter, 2000) and provided optimal working conditions, as they were able to teach at any time and from any place. Faculty also stated a feeling of self-gratification from teaching online (Rockwell et al., 1999).

Peer pressure can be seen both as a motivation or deterrent. Peer modeling, inter-institutional collaborative teaching opportunities, and union incentives would be motivators. In comparison, distance education not being seen as important in the promotion and tenure process would be a barrier (Rockwell, 1999). “The aggregate effect of these institutionally embedded disincentives is to deter faculty participation in and adoption of distance teaching” (Olcott & Wright, 1995, p. 287). Peer pressure exists at the academic department level, and departmental support is essential for increasing faculty participation in distance education (Olcott & Wright, 1995). Peer pressure in the form of competitors, such as other faculty and programs within higher education institutions and other markets, was also a source of pressure, according to faculty (Betts, 1998).

Some motivators are not related to personal motivation, but are instead institutional where the administration is perceived to have the ability to alter distance education policies or procedures to meet the needs of the faculty. These needs are addressed within the following list of institutional motivators.

When faculty described the support issues that would motivate them to teach via distance, the support issue most noted was that of administrative recognition and encouragement for distance education. Betts (1998) indicated
that when faculty members felt institutional support, their levels of motivation and dedication were increased.

Faculty indicated that this support can be demonstrated with credit towards tenure and promotion (Betts, 1998; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000). Jones and Moller (2002) also agreed with this type of incentive but cautioned that those determining tenure and promotion “may never have taught distance education courses, and therefore are ill-equipped to properly assign merit and worth to efforts of a faculty member who may have redesigned a course to be delivered via the internet” (p. 14).

Another type of administrative support was monetary incentives. In Schifter’s (2002) study, faculty over the age of 60 indicated more concern over monetary factors than did faculty of any other age category. Faculty, both current participants and non-participants, and administrators indicated that monetary support, either in the form of stipends, continuing education or overload pay, or increased salaries would motivate faculty to teach via distance (Betts, 1998; Jones & Moller, 2002; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000; Schifter, 2002).

Technological support was also a major motivator for faculty interested in teaching via distance. Faculty noted the importance of the institution in providing training in how effectively to teach via distance (Bonk, 2001) and to respect the decisions of faculty in deciding what are the most appropriate subjects or courses to teach. In addition, instructional design and development support was essential
for faculty who do not have the time to develop and maintain courses (Dooley & Murphrey, 2000).

Faculty noted their interest in getting more of their students involved with technology, as they realize the importance of technology in all areas of today's world. At the same time, they perceived teaching via distance as a benefit to them in that it is an opportunity to use technology more innovatively and to enhance course quality (Betts, 1998; Dooley & Murphrey, 2000; McKenzie et al., 2000; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000).

In addition, technology can lead to the development of new ideas and diversification of academic programming. Furthermore, faculty noted that technology helped them in meeting the needs of students at a distance, thus increasing student access to college courses and/or degree and certificate programs (Betts, 1998; Dooley & Murphrey, 2000; Jones & Moller, 2002; McKenzie et al., 2000; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000).

Finally, faculty reported they were unclear about the policies surrounding copyright issues and were concerned about the absence of intellectual property rights (Berge, 1998; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002). There was little data collected in the seven studies about copyright.

Faculty Barriers

Concerns of faculty regarding participation in distance education include a lack of standards for a distance-delivered course, the threat of fewer jobs, and a decline in the usage of full-time faculty (Rockwell et al., 1999). In addition,
faculty note lack of time, lack of institutional support, lack of scholarly respect in
the areas of promotion and tenure, and a lack of training as other obstacles to
participating in distance education (O’Quinn & Corry, 2002).

Just as faculty indicate personal factors that motivate them to teach via
distance, there are also factors that deter them. These factors occur less often
than motivating factors, typically because deterrents are more extrinsic than
intrinsic. The intrinsic factors that do deter faculty participation include resistance
to change (Berge, 1998; Betts, 1998) and intimidation of technology (Betts,
reluctance or inability to deal with the…changes often engendered by online
teaching” (p. 4). These instructors typically had not used much technology in
their face-to-face classrooms and had found a way to avoid using email. Thus,
teaching an entire course online would be a daunting task.

Other faculty were concerned that online courses and programs would
replace the on-campus learning experience. They worried about their career and
the changes within the field and what those changes may do to their job security
(Dooley & Murphrey, 2000). Furthermore, they had concerns that “capturing their
intellectual property through multimedia might eliminate positions” (Dooley &
Murphrey, 2000, p. 5). Another concern regarded fully understanding distance
education and what subject areas were most appropriate for an online
environment (Berge, 1998; Betts, 1998).

Finally, the issue of competition from peers at private and public
institutions was a concern to some faculty. The classroom walls are no longer
borders for students. They can pick and choose online courses from one or more institutions, and they will register for courses at institutions that will ensure their needs are met. Thus, some faculty from traditional institutions worried about the increased competition from those that offer online courses and programs (Dooley & Murphrey, 2000).

According to faculty, many more obstacles to teaching via distance education were found within the institution itself and were not considered to be personal deterrents. The majority of barriers to distance education were found in the areas of administrative support. One deterrent noted repeatedly was the issue of faculty workload (Berge, 1998; Betts, 1998; Schifter, 2000; O’Quinn & Corry, 2002). According to Schifter (2000), the majority of faculty respondents indicated that “the main obstacle to using the web in teaching was the preparation time required” (p. 8). Time is considered to be an administrative issue because of the institution’s ability to offer release time for development and maintenance of online courses. In Betts’ (1998) study, the deans that were surveyed also indicated that the lack of release time would be an inhibitor for faculty participation in distance education. Faculty felt that time spent on course development alone took away from time that could be devoted to research (Rockwell et al., 1999).

A second administrative deterrent was the lack of recognition for teaching via distance education. Time devoted to teaching or developing online courses was not as highly regarded as time spent on research or even time spent teaching face-to-face courses. Thus, the lack of recognition from the
administration and peers in the form of credit towards tenure and promotion is another large barrier to distance-delivered education (Betts, 1998; Rockwell et al., 1999). Faculty also saw the lack of grants for materials, software expenses, and design and development of courses as another barrier (Betts, 1998; Dooley & Murphrey, 2000; Schifter, 2000). Furthermore, faculty cited the lack of merit pay or financial stipends for faculty who develop or teach distance courses (Berge, 1998; Dooley & Murphrey, 2000; Schifter, 2000; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002).

Of all of the barriers identified by faculty and administrators, the one mentioned most frequently was the lack of technical support (Berge, 1998; Betts, 1998; Jones & Moller, 2002; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000). This included concerns about the lack of systems reliability and access to the online courseware as well as inadequate infrastructure, hardware, and software. Faculty were concerned about the lack of training in the technological skills required to teach a distance education class. In addition, there was a lack of knowledge regarding where to go for technical support. Dependence on developers and programmers, as well as security issues, were also mentioned by faculty as troubling issues.

Concerns in the area of technology and teaching are mostly in the area of course quality. Yet in the studies reviewed, it was found that many of the concerns regarding the quality of online courses originated from faculty who had yet to participate in online teaching (Betts; 1998; Dooley & Murphrey, 2000; Jones & Moller, 2002; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002; Schifter, 2000). These faculty members perceived online teaching as sacrificing quality and therefore would
rather not teach via the medium. Faculty were also concerned about the misinformation found on the internet (Dooley & Murphrey, 2000) and would rather not take the chance of being perceived as having similar content online.

Furthermore, some faculty believed that distance education was inappropriate for traditional-aged students (O'Quinn & Corry, 2002) and supported the need for face-to-face, on-campus classroom experiences. They believed that online courses could foster a decrease in student interaction (Dooley & Murphrey, 2000; Jones & Moller, 2002).

Research Implications

By grouping motivators and barriers into groups, faculty intrinsic and extrinsic, and institutional, patterns and dominant themes become clearer. Although intrinsic factors are typically the primary determiner of faculty participation (Betts, 1998; Rockwell, 1999), one could argue that if the necessary extrinsic and institutional factors are in place, then intrinsic deterrents may be less influential. Institutional pressures can manifest themselves in mission statements, strategic plans, and technology augmentations like additional computer labs, technology enhanced classrooms and a variety of software. Twenty-five percent of participating faculty in Betts' (1998) study believed that there was pressure to participate in distance education and one source of that pressure was the university's administration.

All of the data from the studies was gathered via survey research methodology. This is an appropriate method to collect data on faculty and
administrators’ perceptions of distance learning. As evident in the content analysis, many of the issues that impact distance education and faculty stem from the administrative level. In the studies, there was an unrepresented or underrepresented voice of administrators. In my dissertation, both administrators and faculty were asked to provide opinions of what motivating and inhibiting factors affected faculty who participated in distance learning.

In the three studies that included administrators, the administrators’ responses were different from faculty responses. In Betts’ (1998) study, administrators listed the top five motivating factors for faculty participation in distance education as “monetary support for participation, personal motivation to use technology, increase in salary, credit toward tenure and promotion, and release time” (Betts, 1998, p. 5).

The only common motivator with those that faculty listed was that of personal motivation to use technology, an intrinsic motivator. Administrators listed barriers from this same study as lack of technical support, training, departmental support, release time, and concerns about workload (Betts, 1998). Administrators and faculty agreed on three of five of these barriers, including lack of release time, lack of technical support, and concerns about workload.

In Rockwell et al. (1999), “administrators were more likely to see monetary awards as an incentive than were the teaching faculty” (Rockwell, 1999, p. 32). Differences in responses included administrators believing that technological support was a factor that encouraged participation, whereas faculty listed administrative support as an encouraging factor (Rockwell, 1999).
Schifter (2002) found that administrators considered financial support and release time issues to be most important to faculty, while faculty noted intrinsic motivators such as intellectual challenge as their primary motivators. “Overall, the administrators in this study did not appear to truly understand what would motivate faculty who do participate in distance education, but had a clear attitude of what would inhibit faculty from distance education participation” (Schifter, 2002, p. 3).

This is significant because many of the extrinsic and administrative motivators and barriers can be directly changed by university administrators. Thus, if administrators misunderstand the faculty perceptions of motivators and barriers, they will be unable to structure appropriate distance education programs. Additionally, it is important to ask administrators whether or not they are implementing changes in distance learning policies and procedures based on the information about motivators and deterrents.

In order to meet the requests of the various types of students who prefer to attend courses via distance learning, either for convenience, preference of learning style, etc., art education administrators must find ways to motivate and support faculty in their development and teaching of online courses and programs.

As art education or any other department considers and adopts distance education models, the department needs more information on faculty and administrators’ perceptions of the distance educational model used to deliver instruction. Answers to the questions above not only have the potential to
provide administrators with the tools to increase faculty participation in and satisfaction with distance learning, but could also inform student learning, assessment of teaching and learning, and overall productivity for the institution.

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a review of the literature on many of the issues that impact the implementation and delivery of distance education courses. If distance education is to be successful, all players in the process: faculty, students, and administrators, must support the program. The findings from this study will inform administrators about what can be done to encourage more faculty members to adopt distance education and what areas need more investment. Faculty will gain an understanding of what they need to become more effective in using technology to create distance education courses, how other departments are using distance education, and how other schools view distance education in general.
CHAPTER 7

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I discuss the theoretical approach to the question of what constitutes art education administrator and faculty experiences with and perceptions of distance education. First, the mixed methods approach is introduced, followed by a discussion of pragmatism and grounded theory. Next, the pros and cons of qualitative and quantitative research are discussed. Survey method and the instrument will be reviewed, followed by case study and interview approaches.

Mixed methods research is defined as the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study (Viadero, 2004). Its logic of inquiry includes the use of induction, deduction, and abduction (Hoshmand, 2003).

My research question is: What constitutes art education faculty and administrator experiences with and perceptions of distance education? With pragmatism as the foundation and using a grounded theory approach, my study
uses survey methodology to collect quantitative and qualitative data, and one-on-one interviews to create a case study of a leading online program in art education.

**Mixed Methods**

A mixed methods approach addresses pragmatic knowledge claims and may sequentially collect both quantitative and qualitative data in order to capture the best of both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Creswell, 2003). The researcher bases this type of inquiry on the assumption that collecting diverse types of data best provides an understanding of a research problem (Creswell, 2003). The mixed methods explanatory research design consists of two parts, quantitative followed by qualitative (Creswell, 2003). In this design, quantitative data, by use of a survey, are collected and analyzed first.

When this analysis is completed, qualitative data are collected and analyzed and are used to help explain or elaborate on the quantitative results obtained in the first phase. The rationale for this type of approach is that the analysis of the quantitative data provides a general understanding of the research problem, and then the qualitative data analysis refines and explains those statistical results by exploring participants’ views in more depth (Creswell, 2003).

In the first part of this mixed methods study, I used survey research to investigate the art education faculty and administrators experiences with and perceptions toward distance education. Even though quantitative and qualitative
data was collected, the data was coded into frequency of occurrence and analyzed from a quantitative perspective. The survey helped give perspective for the case study.

In the second part of data collection, qualitative interviews with nine faculty at The Ohio State University Department of Art Education provided information and insight on the experience of creating and managing online programs. I designed this study with the mixed methods approach so that it could provide a richer data source and add scope, breadth and validity to the study (Creswell, 2003).

Pragmatism

Pragmatism can be understood as a philosophy that looks to results. This theory provides current meaning of an expression, which is to be determined by the experiences or practical consequences of belief in or use of the expression in the world (Murphy, 1990). Peirce (1931), James (1907), and Dewey (1931) formulated pragmatism as a philosophic alternative to abstract and rationalistic science. Pragmatism has a clear foundation in empiricism, but goes beyond a pure orientation to observation of a given reality. The basis in human action gives pragmatism an orientation towards a prospective, not yet realized world (Murphy, 1990).

In 1878, Charles Sanders Peirce said the pragmatic method implies that we should consider the effects that might conceivably have practical bearings on
our conception of being (Murphy, 1990). Then our conception of these effects is the whole of our conception of the object (Murphy, 1990).

Following the works of Peirce (1978), Dewey (1948) employed pragmatic principles in developing his philosophy and practice of educating children at the Experimental School of Chicago. Dewey (1948) stated that “in order to discover the meaning of the idea ask for its consequences” (p. 132). Dewey (1931) writes “An empiricism which is content with repeating facts already past has no place for possibility and for liberty” (p. 31). This means that pragmatism has an interest not only for what is, but also for what might be. Peirce and Dewey were interested in examining practical consequences and empirical findings to help the understanding of philosophical positions and to help in deciding which action to take next as one attempts to better understand real-world phenomena.

Dewey (1948) also emphasized the value dimension in the creation of knowledge. “If we form general ideas and if we put them into action, consequences are produced which could not have been produced otherwise. Under these conditions the world will be different from what it would have been if thought had not intervened. This consideration confirms the human and moral importance of thought and of its reflective operation in experience.” (Dewey, 1931, p. 34). There is a moral responsibility in presenting knowledge that has consequences for future application.

The basic interest for action in pragmatism is not conceiving action as an end in itself. Action has, as Dewey (1931) explained, the role of an intermediary. Action is the way to change existence. To perform changes in desired ways,
action must be guided by purpose and knowledge. The world is thus changed through reason and action and there is an inseparable link between human knowing and human action. Pragmatism can be understood as a philosophy that fully acknowledges this mutual permeation of knowledge and action.

Pragmatism recognizes the existence and importance of the natural or physical world as well as the emergent social and psychological world that includes language, culture, human institutions, and subjective thoughts (Murphy, 1990). There is a high regard for the reality and influence of the human experience in action. Knowledge is viewed as being both constructed and based on the reality of the world we experience and live in (Murphy, 1990). In addition, observation, experience, and experiments are all useful ways to gain an understanding of people and the world (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2003).

Pragmatism also helps to shed light on how research approaches can be mixed (Hoshmand, 2003). Mixed methods research suits practicing researchers who would like to see methodologists describe and develop techniques that are closer to what researchers actually use in practice (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2003). Mixed methods research can also help bridge quantitative and qualitative research (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2003).

Pragmatism reacts to an over-emphasis of subjective interpretations. Not every interpretation or description is as good as the other. It is not enough to say that an interpretation makes sense; it must make sense practically. One of the foundational ideas within pragmatism is that the meaning of an idea or a concept
is the practical consequences of the idea/concept. The meaning of it is the different actions, which we conduct, based on the belief in this concept.

Grounded Theory

Since its introduction in the 1960s, grounded theory has been progressively developed in a way that is consistent with its original formulation, such that it is currently the most comprehensive qualitative research methodology available. Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss formulated and developed grounded theory perspective on social science research (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). In their work, they consistently argued for the inductive discovery of theory grounded in systematically analyzed data.

Deriving its theoretical underpinnings from the related movements of American pragmatism, grounded theory inquiry is portrayed as a problem-solving activity concerned with understanding action from the perspective of the human agent (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). Grounded theory is typically presented as an approach to doing qualitative research, in that its procedures are neither statistical, nor quantitative in some other way (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). In grounded theory, the researcher begins by focusing on an area of study and gathers data from a variety of sources, including interviews and field observations (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). Once gathered, the data are analyzed using coding and theoretical sampling procedures. When this is done, the researcher generates theories, with the help of interpretive procedures, before
finally writing up and presenting them. This latter activity, Glaser and Strauss claim, is an integral part of the research process.

Glaser and Strauss regard grounded theory as a general theory of scientific method concerned with the generation, elaboration, and validation of social science theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). For them, grounded theory research should meet the accepted standards for practicing good science: consistency, reproducibility, generalizability, etc. The general goal of grounded theory research is to construct theories in order to understand phenomena. Grounded theory must be inductively derived from data, subjected to theoretical elaboration, and judged adequate to its domain, with respect to a number of evaluative criteria (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). Glaser and Strauss do not regard the procedures of grounded theory as discipline-specific, and they encourage researchers to use the procedures for their own disciplinary purposes.

Grounded theory is a problem-oriented endeavor in which theories are generated from significant data patterns, elaborated through the construction of plausible models, and justified in terms of their explanatory coherence (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). As mentioned earlier, Glaser and Strauss clearly recognize the importance of understanding method in the context of problem-solving (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). However, although they offer some thoughtful remarks about research problems, they do not give the matter systematic attention.

For Glaser and Strauss, grounded theory is said to emerge inductively from its data source in accordance with the method of constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). As a method of discovery, the constant comparative
method is the result of systematic coding, data analysis and theoretical sampling procedures which enables the researcher to make interpretive sense of much of the diverse patterning in the data by developing theoretical ideas at a higher level of abstraction than the initial data descriptions (Glaser & Strauss, 1997). Given the pragmatist influence on grounded theory methodology, it is not surprising to find Strauss characterizing scientific method similar to Peirce’s approach as comprising induction, deduction, and verification. This method poses an exciting way to analyze the data collected from the survey.

Qualitative and Quantitative Methods

The survey will employ qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection. Gaining an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research puts the researcher in a position to mix or combine strategies, which is the fundamental principle of mixed research (Johnson & Turner, 2003). In order to mix research in an effective manner, it is necessary to first consider all of the relevant characteristics of quantitative and qualitative research.

The major characteristics of traditional qualitative research are induction, discovery, exploration, theory or hypothesis generation, the researcher as the primary instrument of data collection, and qualitative analysis (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997). The data are based on the participants’ own categories of meaning (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997). It is useful for studying a limited number of cases in-depth or for describing complex phenomena. The researcher can
conduct cross-case comparisons and analysis. It also can help provide understanding and descriptions of people’s personal experiences of phenomena.

Qualitative research can describe phenomena as they are situated and embedded in local contexts. The researcher identifies contextual and setting factors as they relate to the phenomenon of interest. The researcher can also study dynamic processes. Qualitative research can be used to generate a tentative, but explanatory, theory about a phenomenon. Data is usually collected in naturalistic settings in qualitative research (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997).

Weaknesses to be aware of are: the knowledge produced may not generalize to other people or other settings, it is difficult to make quantitative predictions, and it is more difficult to test hypotheses and theories (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997). Additionally, it may have lower credibility with some administrators and commissioners of programs. Data generally takes more time to collect when compared to quantitative research, and data analysis is often time-consuming.

Qualitative approaches are responsive to local situations, conditions, and stakeholders’ needs (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997). Qualitative researchers are responsive to changes that occur during the performance of a study and may shift the focus of their study as a result. Qualitative research studies, in the words and categories of participants, lend themselves to exploring how and why phenomena occur. One can use an important case to demonstrate vividly a phenomenon to the readers of a report (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997).
The major characteristics of traditional quantitative research are a focus on deduction, confirmation, theory and hypothesis testing, explanation, prediction, standardized data collection, and statistical analysis (Viadero, 2004). Quantitative research is the testing and validation of already constructed theories about how phenomena occur (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997). Testing hypotheses are constructed before the data are collected. Findings can be generalized when the data are based on random samples of sufficient size (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997). Also, one can generalize a research finding when it has been replicated on many different populations and subpopulations. It is useful for obtaining data that allow quantitative predictions to be made.

Data collection using quantitative methods is relatively quick. This research method provides precise, quantitative, numerical data. Data analysis is relatively less time-consuming (using statistical software). The research results are relatively independent of the researcher. It may have higher credibility with many people in power, such as administrators, politicians, and people who fund programs. It is useful for studying large numbers of people (Koroscik & Kowalchuk, 1997).

When using quantitative research, there are some issues to take into consideration. The researcher’s theories or categories that are used may not reflect local constituencies’ understandings. The researcher may miss out on phenomena occurring because of the focus on theory or hypothesis testing rather than on theory or hypothesis generation. Knowledge produced may be too
abstract and general for direct application to specific local situations, contexts, and individuals.

Survey Research

Research is a process of discovery (Babbie, 1990). Applied research operates on the premise that the decision-maker does not have enough information to make a decision (Babbie, 1990). Research design begins with a research concept. With pragmatism as the underlying theory, the hypothesis is generated first. My hypothesis asserts that faculty’s intrinsic motivation to be involved stems from a positive perception of distance education. Administrators who have a positive perception of distance education create a supportive infrastructure to engage faculty in delivering distance education courses.

“Survey research is probably the single most widely used research type in educational research” (Wiersma, 1991, p. 165). According to Babbie (1990), the purpose of survey research is to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristics, attitude, or behavior of the population. “The purpose of survey research is to describe specific characteristics of a large group of persons, objects, or institutions” (Jaeger, 1988, p. 303). Babbie (1990) cited three purposes of survey research, including description, explanation, and exploration. “Surveys are frequently conducted for the purpose of making descriptive assertions about some population; that is, discovering the distribution of certain traits or attributes” (p. 52). Surveys are used to measure attitudes, opinions, or achievements. Because survey research
can detect meaningful information about large populations, it seems appropriate for collecting data on the experience and perceptions of art education faculty and administrators towards distance education.

The data gathered from the survey allows one to identify information about the respondents’ experience. Wiersma (2000) addressed the importance of this: “Especially for surveys using questionnaires and interviews, background or demographic information about the respondent is important in that it identifies the individual in terms of classifying variables for the analysis” (p. 165). The survey data from the sample of arts education administrators will enable the researcher to gain a better understanding of key issues, as well faculty and student needs. The primary data reflected in the respondents’ opinions will give insight into certain conditions or circumstances.

*An Agenda for Arts Education Research* (1997) lists research agenda items of importance in the field of art education. The text states, “Surveys should be conducted regularly to determine the perceptions of the public, policymakers, employers, parents, school administrators, and students about arts education” (Eisner, 1997, p. 214). I used survey research methodology to gather relevant data to give insight into faculty and administrators’ experiences with and perceptions of managing art education distance education courses.

In this study, the respondents, art education faculty and administrators, will provide their information about their experience with distance education as well their perception in relationship to the field of art education. Such data are vital for determining the value of current distance education programs.
In conducting a typical survey, the researcher selects a sample of a population, designs survey questions, and administers a standardized questionnaire to each of the participants. A standardized questionnaire ensures that each participant utilizes the same technique for answering the questions (Babbie, 1998). The advantage of using a standardized questionnaire is the reduction of human error associated with the researcher and the respondents (Babbie, 1998). The disadvantage is that, because their questions are inflexible, surveys tend to cover complex issues superficially and can fail to accommodate developmental differences and individual needs (Babbie, 1998).

It is important that the researcher decides what survey approach is appropriate for the study. There are five approaches: mail, telephone, personal administration, interview and the online method. Each approach has its advantages and disadvantages. According to Rea and Parker (2005), mail surveys provide the greatest standardization of items and procedures. It is also easy to score items and is fairly inexpensive. But, the response rate may be small, and mail surveys do not allow follow-up or questions regarding unclear responses.

Personal administration is efficient if participants are closely situated, but requires time and training for questionnaire administrators (Rea & Parker, 2005). Interviews allow more complete responses, but are time-consuming, open to partiality and offer no anonymity (Rea & Parker, 2005). Telephone surveys tend to have high response rates and a quick data collection, but require phone numbers and can be expensive (Rea & Parker, 2005).
Online email surveys are easy to administer, inexpensive and less time-consuming (Rea & Parker, 1997). Other advantages are: manageable expense, convenience, no time constraints, authoritative, anonymity, and reduces interviewer-induced bias (Rea & Parker, 1997). On the other hand, the disadvantages of an email survey could include a low rate of return and longer time to complete data collecting. Poor data collection could occur when respondents are not a proper sample for the study or when respondents do not understand the meaning of particular questions. In addition, because email surveys rely mainly on respondent self-report, the researcher cannot be sure that the respondents answered the survey questions with complete truthfulness. Considering all the factors, this study will employ online email survey method for this investigation.

Stages to Developing a Survey

Developing a survey is a fairly complex process. It can be broken down into steps: defining the problem, planning the process, identifying the population, population sampling, developing the instrument and cover letter, pre-testing, administering, monitoring, analyzing, and reporting results (Babbie, 1998).

It is important to be clear on the goal of the research project when beginning the survey process. For my study, the problem is that sometimes administrators and faculty have different perceptions of distance education, budget decisions, technology strategies and teaching strategies. This can create friction within the program and become an inhibitor to growth. This study seeks
to learn what art education faculty and administrators’ perceptions are towards
distance education. Upon the completion of the study, I will have an
understanding of the 1. Art Education faculty and administrators’ perceptions of
distance education, 2. the scope of distance-delivered art education programs in
the United States, and which programs offer distance education courses, 3. what
technology is being used and is practical to deliver art education courses via
distance, and 4. what level of experience art education faculty and administrators
have with distance education.

During the planning phase, I consulted the literature as a framework for
the study. The data collection included how the survey was to be distributed,
collected, collated, analyzed, and reported. Survey research isolates a
population by identifying a target. The target population is the entire group of
possible respondents to the survey questionnaire (Jaeger, 1998). The sample is
the sub-group of selected respondents derived from the target population
(Jaeger, 1998). In this study, the population of art education faculty and
administrators will be surveyed. These individuals were identified on their
respective college or university website

The first step in this process was to define the art education higher
education sector. After a conversation with Dr. Tom Hatfield at NAEA, I
determined that there is no approved list of colleges and universities with art
education programs. Additionally, there is no universal, agreed-upon definition
of art education. The National Art Education Association (NAEA) discusses art
educators as being “from every level of instruction: early childhood, elementary,
intermediate, secondary, college and university, administration, museum education, lifelong learning… also publishers, manufacturers and suppliers of art materials, parents, students, retired teachers, arts councils, schools… anyone and everyone concerned about quality art education in our schools” (National Art Education Association, 2006, para. 2).

There is no absolute standard across universities for art education curricula. Logan felt this was a strength in the field and stated, “One of our best contributions may be not to attempt to standardize, not to propose uniform emphasis among the other component parts of our curricula, but to try, each according to the resources of our own part of the country and of our own faculty, to propose and work out programs of studies best suited to our distinctive conditions” (Logan, 1959, p. 60). This has contributed to departments developing specializations based on their faculty skills and interests.

For the purpose of this dissertation, the Art Education Program is discussed as a recognized department within a regionally or nationally accredited university or college. Art education curricula will be discussed as courses delivered by faculty who are part of an art education program, and can range from art education instruction, policy, art administration, assessment, research, criticism, or museum education.

In 1998, Anderson, Eisner and McRoire conducted a study of the scope of Art Education Graduate Program in the United States and Canada. Their study built on the original study Eisner conducted in 1963, in which he also discussed the need for a discipline to be periodically examined to identify trends and best
practices (Eisner, 1963). As stated in Eisner et al. (1998), “Fields from time to time, need to assess their status, to take stock as it were, to secure data that will provide a description of current features” (p. 8). Unlike the 1963 study of programs in the United States, the 1998 survey was sent to the United States and Canada.

In Eisner’s study, the list of colleges and universities to be surveyed was compiled from The College Blue Book (1995), The Guide to American Art Schools (Werenko, 1987), The American Art Directory (1996), and Peterson’s Guide to Graduate Programs in Business, Education, Health and Law (1995). Of 248 colleges and universities identified, they received 177 responses. Of the 177 programs responding, 124 reported having graduate programs in art education. The 1998 study ranked the top fifteen art education graduate programs as illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Ohio State</th>
<th>9. University of Arizona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Penn State</td>
<td>10. NYU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Florida State</td>
<td>12. North Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers College</td>
<td>13. Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Indiana</td>
<td>14. Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Leading Art Education programs in the United States and Canada as identified by Eisner’s 1998 study.
During the early stages of this study, I conducted a search of all of these schools’ catalogues to learn which, if any, offered distance education courses. As a result of this search, I learned that no school other than The Ohio State University offered distance-delivered art education Graduate Program and undergraduate and graduate school courses. However, course catalogues only offer insight to what the program is doing right now. The responses from the survey reflect that course catalogues are not necessarily current or comprehensive. They do not provide data on what distance education courses were taught in the past or will be considered in the future. Additionally, they do not provide information on what schools that are not on this list might be doing to make an impact on the field.

I complied a list of schools by searching The College Blue Book (2005), The Guide to American Art Schools (Werenko, 1995), The American Art Directory (2001), and Peterson’s Guide to Graduate Programs in Business, Education, Health and Law (2005). Unlike Eisner’s, I was looking at colleges and universities only in the United States. My first search generated 360 schools. Upon deeper investigation, I learned that many of the schools offered Bachelor’s of Arts in Education, and were inappropriately categorized as Art Education.

After weeding out these schools, the list narrowed to 112 schools. To verify if each of the schools had Art Education programs as defined in this study, I searched the website of the 112 schools. As a result, I qualified 60 as having Art Education Undergraduate and/or Graduate Programs that granted Art
Education Degrees, and were recognized as programs by their degree-granting institution. The method used to identify the schools was detailed and thorough; however, there may be a small number of schools outside of this list which offer art education degrees. The population surveyed was faculty and administrators in Art Education Programs in the United States. Purposeful sampling selects information-rich cases for in-depth study. In purposeful sampling, size and specific cases depend on the study purpose (Patton, 1990)

The survey invitation was emailed to over 60 administrators and over 200 faculty on February 1, 2007. Some faculty self selected out of the survey by notifying me that they did not consider themselves part of art education. After reviewing this information the number of participants was reduced to 44 administrators and 138 faculty. Participants had one month to complete the survey. Participants were emailed a letter of invitation one week prior to receiving the survey. A reminder notice to complete the survey was automatically be generated by Survey Monkey two weeks after the survey was sent. This reminder was sent only to those who had not completed the survey. Once the participant completed the survey via the link, she could not complete the survey a second time.

The benefit of sending the pre-invitation to participate was twofold. First, it introduced the purpose of the survey and notified participants of the timeframe in which the survey was to be sent. Second, it qualified the emails I collected so that I could make adjustments as required prior to the survey launch. Emails that were bounced back as invalid were researched and removed or edited. Any
questions regarding the survey were answered prior to its launch. Again, it impacted the number of participants being asked to participate by reducing the number to 44 administrators and 138 faculty. Contact information and the response of each participant was, and will be, kept confidential.

During the research and planning process, once the population was identified, the next step was to write the instrument and cover letter. The survey was a combination of open-ended questions and Likert-scale, closed statements. The survey was fewer than 40 questions long (the administrators’ survey is longer than the faculty survey), and took 25 to 30 minutes to complete.

Open-ended questions allowed the respondent to express herself freely and provide details or nuances to a response which may not be provided in more limited-choice questions. Free-text was carefully reviewed and coded to transform the information into data which can be counted, analyzed, and interpreted.

The Likert-scale is a measurement scale popular in social science surveys to not only measure direction of opinions, but also the magnitude or levels of beliefs. The more popular scales use 5- or 7-points. The most common scale ranges from “extremely satisfied” to “extremely unsatisfied” with the middle option as “neither satisfied nor unsatisfied.” It is important to keep the scale balanced. There needs to be as many positive options as negative options and the middle option is neutral. Concepts such as “don’t know,” “don’t care,” or “not sure” are not neutral options. If the Likert-scale is used properly, it can be considered
important data for statistical purposes, and offers many more sophisticated analysis options.

A pilot was executed with a small sample prior to the full survey, to ensure construct and content validity. The pilot was conducted on faculty at the Ohio Institute of Photography (OIP) in Dayton, Ohio, with a group size of 6 participants. Though OIP does not have an art education program and is not part of the target population to be surveyed, a group of faculty at this school has volunteered to be the pre-test to ensure construct and validity.

Since the survey was to be administered via email, a software provider needed to be selected. I have used Survey Monkey, WebSurveyor, Zoomerang, Super Survey and InSite. Survey Monkey was selected because of ease of use, flexibility, low cost, and prior positive experience using this survey tool. Survey Money is an online survey tool that enables researchers to easily deliver their survey via email. Survey Monkey costs $19.95 per month for up to 1,000 survey responses. There are no limits on the number of questions or pages, thus enabling the researcher to create a user-friendly survey.

When the survey was launched, 138 faculty and 44 administrator participants received an email with a letter explaining the survey purpose, participation and confidentiality. Participants also received my contact information in case there were additional questions; however, no participants had questions. Participants were also able to contact me to request a summary of the data. Two weeks after launch, individuals who had not completed the survey were sent a reminder. The survey remained open for four weeks to allow
individuals who are traveling or out of the office enough time to complete it, and the survey closed on February 28, 2007.

The survey was monitored by me to track the completion percentage and respond to any questions or technical issues. Monitoring the survey closely minimized potential errors which could have compromised completion of the survey or the integrity of the data collected. The response rate to my survey was 28% for faculty and 18% for administrators. In comparison to the studies discussed in the literature, four of the studies received a response rate less than 28% (Berge, 1998; McKenzie, 2002; O'Quinn, 2001; Schifter, 1999) and three had a response rate higher than 29% (Betts, 1998; Jones, 2001; Rockwell, 2002). The most significant aspect of the responses is that 55% of the schools surveyed are represented in the data collected.

There are a number of reasons that could account for the response rate. Art Education Departments could have asked one faculty member to complete the survey rather than having everyone participate. Faculty not interested in distance may have self-selected out of the survey if they felt they had little to contribute. Disinterest in the topic is another potential reason.

Data Analysis

Grounded theory is regarded as the basis for theory building and coding. It is also referred to as the prime technique for achieving the ‘constant comparative method’ (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Comparative method is defined as comparative analysis to identify similarities and differences in the data (Strauss &
Corbin, 1996). Coding involves refining the data into categories, for example conceptual constructs that emerge from the data and appear pivotal. This is organized into three categories. Open coding is labeling the emergent concepts and grouping them into categories. Axial coding involves identifying relationships between categories. Finally, selective coding is developing theory to fit the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). This activity leads to the emergence of core categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Difficulties associated with coding in grounded theory have been identified and outlined as follows: 1. can the codes be interpreted the same way by other people, 2. it is difficult not to be influenced and resist applying concepts from elsewhere and 3. it becomes difficult to decide on what level to chunk the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1996).

A central approach to data reduction and data display is the process of coding, which was first used by sociologists and appeared in the Chicago School in the late 1920’s (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Around this time case descriptions were also emerging as a method of data reduction (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). In marketing research, the use of coding for classifying responses to open-ended questions on surveys appears to have been in use since 1937 (Creswell, 1997). Likert, who also created the Likert-scale led the program, which was committed to open-ended interviewing and used a simplistic coding scheme to analyze the verbatim transcriptions (Creswell, 1997). Another product of grounded theory is a data display or visual representation of the theory. This is defined as an organized assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action (Miles, 1994). From the start of analysis the researcher is trying to determine
what things mean by attempting to identify regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows, and propositions (Miles, 1994).

Statistics and descriptive research are additional methods of data analysis used in this study. Descriptive research is non-experimental. As defined by McMillan and Schumacher (1989), the purpose of descriptive research is to provide a snapshot of a current population for the assessment of the existing conditions, behaviors, attitudes, etc. to identify a relationship.

Descriptive research can only describe who, what, when, where and how of a situation, not what caused it (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989). Therefore, descriptive research is used when the objective is to provide a systematic description that is as factual and accurate as possible. It provides the number of times something occurs, or frequency, lends itself to statistical calculations such as determining the average number of occurrences or central tendencies (Gall, 1999). Case study was then used to provide more detailed information to compliment the results of the survey.

Case Study

A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, permitting uses of multiple sources of evidence by the researcher (Yin, 2003). A case study may be used to explore situations where no clear, single set of outcomes has been established (Yin, 2003). The defining quality of the case study is that it focuses on the case
itself as the unit of analysis, not the research topic, and it has specific boundaries and limits based on time and space (Yin, 2003). The case study relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis (Yin, 2003). The use of multiple sources of evidence in case studies allows the researcher to address a broader range of issues. Any finding or conclusion in a study is likely to be more convincing and accurate if it is based on several different sources of information (Yin, 2003).

Case studies are preferred when examining contemporary events in which the relative behaviors cannot be manipulated. Case studies are advantageous when the study is asking why or how questions about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control (Yin, 2003). The case study is a means for gaining understanding of and meaning for a phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). Although case studies generally do not predict future behavior, results have proven to be effective for informing policy. Holistic, rich descriptions of real-life situations described by the participants’ experiences help others to understand the impact of and gain insight about a particular phenomenon.

Case Study Interviews

Conducting interviews is a powerful method of data collection that provides one-to-one interaction between the researcher and the individuals being studied (Yin, 2003). It provides an opportunity to ask for clarification if an answer is vague or provides clarification if a question is not clear. Open-ended
interviews result in abundant information about issues that might lead to conceptualizations of the issues in ways totally different from what was anticipated (Yin, 2003). Yin (2003) described interviews as “guided conversations rather than structured queries” (p. 89). Data collection for the case study consisted of one-on-one interviews conducted by myself with nine purposively selected participants who are faculty in The Ohio State University Department of Art Education.

The purpose of interviewing is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective. Qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit. Researchers interview to find out what is in and on someone else’s mind (Patton, 2002). Kvale (1996) detailed the purpose of the interview as finding out how people understand their world and their life from their point-of-view and described the interview as “the construction site for knowledge” (p. 14). He cited six criteria of a quality interview:

1. The extent of spontaneous, rich, specific, and relevant answers from the interviewee.
2. The shorter the interview’s questions and the longer the subjects’ answers, the better.
3. The degree to which the interviewer follows up and clarifies the meanings of the relevant aspects of the answers.
4. The ideal interview is to a large extent interpreted throughout the interview.
5. The interviewer attempts to verify his or her interpretations of the subject’s answers in the course of the interview.
6. The interview is “self-communicating,” meaning that it is a story contained in itself that hardly requires extra descriptions and explanations (Kvale, 1996, p. 145).
The three main purposes for these interviews were to help provide a fuller, more in-depth picture of the actual practices of the leading online Art Education Program, examine the perceptions and experiences of the individuals who are leaders in this field to find patterns, and describe or define the actions administrators or faculty take when utilizing distance education technologies to teach online. Overall, the interviews were to assist in identifying differences or gaps discovered in the survey analysis.

Interviews can vary from highly structured, with specific questions in a specific order, to unstructured forms that only include topic areas for the researcher to explore with participants (Kvale, 1996). The largest percentages of qualitative interviews are semi-structured (Kvale, 1996). Kvale (1996) stated that a semi-structured interview was “neither an open conversation nor a highly structured questionnaire” (p. 27). Yin (2003) encouraged the developing of how and why questions since answers are likely a description of the experience and generally initiate a thick, rich description. I used the same questions asked in the survey, and a semi-structured approach.

Semi-structured interviews combine the structure and direction of the survey instrument with the flexibility of the unstructured, open-ended interview to produce focused qualitative data. Questions are pre-constructed but the answers can be open-ended in order to be expanded upon by the interviewee with probes used by the interviewer (Yin, 2003). This type of direct administration of interviews can help obtain more valid responses because of the improved rapport created between interviewer and interviewee. This method can also give
the interviewer a better intuitive understanding of the responses.

Kvale (1996) emphasized the importance of gaining an understanding of the concepts and how those concepts are interpreted, the verification of the meaning, and how the data would be reported during the interview. Probing questions that generate in-depth answers are vital because they enhance this verification process.

After my interviews were transcribed, I conducted the analysis of the data. Since the interview questions elaborated on data previously collected in the survey phase, only one interview per participant was conducted; however, I requested permission to return for further clarification on responses and follow-up clarification was obtained by email as needed.

There are drawbacks to interviews. Following specific guidelines can help produce an ideal interview, but errors can still occur. These errors commonly evolve from three sources: 1. the behavior of the respondent, as when the respondent purposely omits some pertinent information or gives a response meant to please the interviewer; 2. the questionnaire type or wording of the questions; and 3. flawed questioning techniques by the interviewer, such as rewording of questions during the interview (Yal, 2003). I kept these potential errors in mind as I conducted the interviews. I attempted to avoid interview errors by cross-referencing interview responses with other collected data, and asking follow-up questions via email if clarification was needed.

Participants were interviewed once in April 2007. Each participant agreed to be interviewed and participated in one semi-structured interview that lasted
approximately 35-60 minutes. I used an interview protocol that included an introductory statement followed by the key questions to be asked.

In the next chapters, the results of the survey and the interviews are presented. For the survey results, qualitative results were compared with those from the quantitative analysis to identify consistencies or inconsistencies. The open-ended responses and Likert scale statements were reviewed to establish themes. The case study provided in-depth information on the practices of the leading department in the field. Finally, recommendations for practice and future research are discussed.
SURVEY FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to collect data on art education faculty and administrators’ experience with and perceptions of distance education. Gathering qualitative and quantitative data enable me to analyze the validity of the responses by comparing similar questions to each other. The data was constantly reviewed to check, or triangulate, the results. Triangulation is a strategy commonly employed by the researcher to ensure the internal validity of a qualitative study (Denzin, 1970). Denzin (1970) discussed the four common types of triangulations: multiple investigators, multiple data sources, multiple theories, and multiple data collection methods to confirm findings.

Even though I am the main researcher, I constantly sought advice from Dr. Pat Stuhr to validate data materials and to confirm emerging themes from the study. Additionally, I communicated with faculty and administrators from The Penn State University, Florida State University, Boise State University, University of Arizona and Arizona State University. Throughout this process, I checked the validity of the responses against the literature. I also checked the information
provided in the surveys against program and course information posted on the schools’ websites.

The total number of participants in the faculty study was 38, a response rate of 28% for faculty. Administrator responses were 8 for a response rate of 18%. In total, 46 art education faculty and administrators participated in the survey for an overall return rate of 26%. The faculty responses sometimes provided better insight into experience with and perceptions towards distance education than the administrator responses. No administrators had experience teaching or taking a distance education course. Though they were generally supportive of distance education, response sometimes did not have significant data when compared to faculty responses. Frequently, there was consensus between the faculty response and the administrator response. Unless specifically noted in the analysis, the data collected reflects similar experience with and perceptions of distance-delivered art education from both administrators and faculty.

Demographic Data

The first question I asked participants was to identify what institution they were part of so that I could track what schools were responding to the survey. Earlier in this study, I discussed approximately 60 colleges and universities that offered art education degrees in the United States. Thirty-three schools responded to the survey for a 55% response rate. The data below reflects the faculty and administrators who responded to the survey.
Next, I gathered basic data on gender and age to use in the analysis to determine if there was any correlation in the responses. Respondents were predominantly female. Most participants were 56-65 (n=18) or 46-55 (n=12) in age range. Almost all participants had a Ph.D. (n=28), and no one reported holding a degree lower than a Masters. The average number of years teaching experience ranged from 15-20 years. Participants were also asked to identify what degrees their school offered. The data collected reflects 35 schools offer a bachelor’s degree in art education, 38 schools offer a master’s degree in art education, and 15 schools offer a doctor of philosophy degree in art education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Tennessee</th>
<th>University of Arizona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>Minnesota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutztown University</td>
<td>SUNY at New Paltz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Graduate School</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Towson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Fitchburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>Maryville University, St Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Towson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College Chicago</td>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo State</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: List of schools who responded to the survey.
Qualitative Data Responses

Before conducting the analysis of data, it was necessary to review the results. In the first opened-ended question, participants were asked to name the top 3-5 goals of their department. Meeting State or National standards was the most frequently cited response (n=18), followed by art (n=9) and teacher education (n=7). Technology appeared in a few responses (n=4).

It is logical that standards were frequently cited by participants. Standards are closely tied to accreditation and ranking at higher education institutions. If State or National standards changed to include distance education, then art education departments would need to adjust to meet this requirement.

Faculty response: Serve the state of Georgia by preparing teachers for contemporary classrooms that meet the needs of all students and allow all students to succeed in historical and contemporary issues in art education; teaching as reflective practice; language that is specific to art, visual culture, education, and art education; technology; opportunities for continuous professional and intellectual growth; interdisciplinarity; critical pedagogy; varied teaching and assessment strategies to help diverse learners; diversity of social, emotional, cognitive, and physical characteristics of learners; inquiry in visual culture; and collaboration with colleagues and communities.

Faculty response: Prepare outstanding (1) art teachers, (2) art museum educators, and (3) community-based art educators at the undergraduate, and graduate levels. The top goals for the art education masters' degree program are the following: 1. Provide a scholarly approach to the theory and pedagogy of art education; 2. Provide the coursework and clinical experiences necessary for State of Illinois art certification; 3. Provide skills that will enable our students to be successful, and effective art educators.
Administrator response: Our College of Education's conceptual framework is based upon educators as leaders. Our goal in the art education program reflects the NAEA standards for teacher preparation:

1. Content of art: Help all art education students strengthen their content and pedagogical knowledge in order to foster confidence and leadership qualities.
2. Knowledge of Students: Demonstrate effective leadership qualities by establishing a relationship with students that fosters an atmosphere of acceptance and respect for all learners.
3. Curriculum: Design curriculum that engages and supports age appropriate learning, accreditation and current art educational theories.
4. Instruction: Engage in practical instructional field and internship experience.
5. Assessment: Learn and practice creating art assessment tools, such as portfolios and rubrics that are equitable and utilize higher-order learning.
6. Personal Responsibility: Involvement with professional development, such as NAEA and TAEA, and volunteer experiences, such as Full Service Schools, Very Special Needs Festival, etc.

Other responses from this question included a focus on museum education, arts policy, community engagement, curriculum design, assessment, art making and research. One interesting observation was that respondents whose department is part of the College of Education described their focus as teacher education, professional development, meeting National and State standards and assessment strategies. In comparison, respondents whose departments were a part of the College of the Arts were more community, museum education, art-making, and arts policy focused.

The next question asked participants to describe how curriculum and budget decisions were made at their department and college. Most of the participants described the decision-making process for curriculum as being different from budget decisions (n=38). All respondents described the curriculum process as a committee or group experience. This could be an obstacle to the creation and delivery of art education courses. An individual faculty member who
is interested in teaching a new course via distance education could face barriers if other committee members do not support distance education initiatives. Conversely, an administrator who supports distance education and is proposing new curriculum may experience committee resistance.

In comparison, the budget process responses had a different structure. The majority of the respondents described the budget process as a top-down model. Generally, the responses represented three models of decision-making: by committee (n=14), by the Department Chair (n=11) or by a college administrator (n=9). Therefore, in an organization with top-down budget making authority, the leader would need to be sensitive to her instructional leadership behavior. To bring about change, administrators would need to demonstrate behavior described in the leadership section to mitigate resistance.

Faculty response: This is a faculty governed institution. Therefore, money is turned over to the faculty of Curriculum & Instruction, who through the Policy Council made up of faculty, determine where certain amounts will go. There are also monies made available through the Dean's office to special projects which faculty may propose and the Dean either approve or veto. When faculty became concerned that some of the classroom technologies were becoming outdated, a group of interested faculty [including me] and the technology personnel were able to convince the provost's office & Dean to set aside 1/2 million dollars per year over the next four years to equip several classrooms per semester with up-to date technology. The two art rooms and one math room on the C & I floor were among the first to receive these improvements.

Faculty response: Head of the school of visual arts and the Art Education Chair make budget decisions. Curriculum is determined by individual faculty teaching a course, or in more general terms, but the entire faculty through consensus.

Administrator response: We have a large department: Theory and Practice in Teacher Education. We submit our instructional budget to our instructional team leader and she/he submits it to our department head.
Within the art education area, I work with the two part-time lecturers to discuss their budgetary needs and do most of the ordering and going to stores to purchase supplies. I too am a lecturer and coordinate the art education area. Changes in the art education curriculum begin with our discussing a new concept and/or idea and then I submit suggested changes to the department head. She places it online for comments by departmental faculty, and then reviews it. Following her approval, the curriculum change is rewritten and officially submitted to the CRC (Curriculum Review Committee).

To understand motivation, participants were asked to explain why they chose education as a profession and for a description of their teaching goals. Many of the participants chose their career as a result of their interest in art (n=20). Teaching (n=15) and students (n=13) were the next most cited responses. Other themes that emerged were to make change, lifelong learning, social interaction, intellectual stimulation. Only two respondents cited financial reasons for their professional decision. These responses reflected an intrinsic desire to make a positive impact on others’ lives. If an art education administrator was reviewing these responses, she might create a strategy to tap into personal satisfaction drivers to promote a new distance education program or course. Though none specifically said that she taught from a constructivist perspective, the language used, such as students create meaning, demonstrated that this was important to faculty.

Faculty response: I believe education is the way to create change and work toward equality and justice. I enjoy the process of learning and teaching in an environment that supports exploration. To prepare students to be contributors to the world. To challenge students to see their cultural make-up in order to recognize the joy of diversity. To encourage students to be critical investigators.
Faculty response: I chose education as a profession because I value knowledge and teaching. My central goals as a teacher are to empower students through new ideas and experiences. I do not see my role as a teacher as transmitting knowledge, but encouraging students to actively create their own knowledge.

Faculty response: I want to make the world better. I feel, given my skills and aptitudes, I can best do this through art education. I want to educate students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels to be successful in their careers and in their lives.

Administrator responses were similar to faculty responses. One could infer that the administrators who responded did not start with the goal of becoming a Program Chair or Dean when they chose education as a career. One could also conclude that an administrator who is has similar teaching goals as their faculty might be more supportive and responsive to new curriculum ideas and instructional strategies.

Administrator response: 1. I thrive on learning, discovering, and thinking in different ways. I have held many different jobs over my life, I think because I get bored easily. But teaching is like a new job every semester and I learn and discover so much daily through the challenges, varied personalities, approaches, and belief systems of my students. 2. It is an empowering profession, but I try to not let that go to my head. But, I never tire of the joy of seeing that my efforts have made a difference in the lives of people. 3. I love schools and the fact that there are so many 'experts' literally everywhere who can either answer my questions or send me in a good direction for help. 4. I believe so strongly in the power of visual art to promote thinking, learning and knowing. The job, the goals, and the daily highs and lows make getting up in the morning a blessing every day.

An understanding of the emerging foci in the field of art education may give perspective to where attention within a department might be focused. There was no consensus among the participants of what the major emerging foci are in the field of art education. Responses included technology (n=13), diversity
(n=12), visual culture (n=12), and assessment (n=10). As an administrator of a
department that is highly technology-focused, it would be significantly easier to
adopt new instructional technologies in comparison to a department that does not
place a high priority on technology.

Faculty response: We have been able to live in a very insulated and self-isolating & privileged context, but this is ending in the 21st century. Add to this the growing global consciousness of youth via cross-cultural socio-aesthetic interactions [online fan groups, culture convergence, etc.] and out vision must be incredibly broader! Yes, media technologies-not just as 'tools' but as extensions and manipulated conceptualizations of self and community - as cultural creation, convergence, and collective consciousness is VERY important to the future. . . and must be the new direction of art education. Art educators must become globally conscious, experts of multi-disciplines, and techno-savvy SHAMENS of the future.

The question of theoretical orientation of your program elicited a wide
range of results. Responses ranged from uncertainty to DBAE to
comprehensive. One respondent reported that they have eleven faculty
members in their program and each has a conflicting theoretical orientation.
While different perspectives lend themselves to a diverse department, it could be
a barrier to gaining consensus, specifically with curriculum changes or additions
since most decisions are made by committee. Administrator responses were
similarly diverse and reported having a ‘melting pot’ representation of theoretical
orientations which each faculty embraces.

My survey asked participants for their perspectives on distance education,
specifically if distance education was important to society. The majority of faculty
participants recorded that they did not think distance education was important to
society (n=17). Of those who felt it was important, the primary reason was to
serve geographically dispersed populations and individuals who do not have access. One respondent felt it was appropriate for graduate student, but not undergraduates or unmotivated students. Another respondent felt it was appropriate for graduate advising, but not necessarily the best method to teach.

In comparison, almost all the administrator respondents felt it was important to society (n=6).

Faculty response: This is a complicated question because to participate in distance education, students must have access to a computer. Less advantaged community members may not have this access. This is a problem that needs work. Everyone who wants an education should have access to one - and it should not depend upon their economic status.

Faculty response: Some aspects of the visual arts are more conducive to the distance learning than others. Conceptualization, blogging and discussion boards will work fine, but you can't teach a teacher how to make a painting or do a scratchboard online.

Administrator response: Art education is important to society, so distance-delivered would also be. What ever it takes to 'get' out the concept that art education is a vital component of our lives is fine with me. Of course it should be important because our society is becoming technology driven. Similar to Walter Smith's technological blackboard drawings, distance-delivery is just another way of educating the 'masses'.

Art education faculty perceptions that distance education is not important are a significant explanation for the void of course or programmatic offerings. With competing agendas and interests, it may be that distance education is often overlooked due to a perceived lack of significance. Time and teaching loads compel faculty to make decisions on how they spend their efforts and energy. Building or teaching a distance education course is very time-intensive, and if it is not perceived as important to personal educational goals or society, then faculty
will not engage in this type of activity. What is interesting is that administrators who responded to the survey reported an understanding of the importance of distance education to society. However, from research of online course and degree options, it is evident that administrator perceptions have not impacted faculty perceptions of distance-delivered art education.

Motivators to teaching distance education give valuable information into why an individual would or would not become involved in teaching or creating an online course. Similar to the responses to the question about distance education’s importance to society, respondents identified reaching broader audiences more than any other reason (n=11). This data reflects that art education faculty members are generally intrinsically motivated to engage in distance education practices. In addition, other faculty reported that their motivator would be to meet student needs (n=6). The most important extrinsic motivator discussed by art education faculty was additional time (n=5). Training and decreased workload were other extrinsic motivations that were reported.

Respondents felt that teaching quality was significant, as was the ability for students to have an interactive learning experience. Since faculty used language that suggested they taught from a constructivist approach, if they perceived distance education technology as not being supportive of constructivism, then they would have concerns about the quality of student interaction with the content and other students. Only one respondent cited financial award as motivation. 16% of the faculty respondents reported that nothing would motivate them to teach distance education courses.
Faculty responses: The top decisions to teach a distance education course would be the following; 1. The effectiveness of the course related to the needs of the constituents using the course. 2. The up-to-date technology available to deliver a quality distance course. 3. The infrastructure necessary to sustain the quality of the distance education course.

Faculty responses: Reaching non-traditional students or reaching students who are far away from my campus. Facilitating the professional development of teachers and others who want to invest this way.

Faculty responses: I do teach a distance education course, an introductory art course that is offered as a general education course. My main motivation is teaching a course on art to mostly older students who come from all over the country and the world (literally). I enjoy the diversity of the students I teach, and I like the idea of introducing them to art.

Administrator responses were similar to faculty responses. One administrator expressed that she would be surprised if any art education faculty member were interested in teaching a distance education course. Other key themes from administrators were the ability to offer global experiences, encourage team teaching and expand the student population. None of the administrators reported an interest in growing revenue or competition with other departments or institutions.

Next, participants were asked about their personal experience as a distance education student. Most faculty who responded to my survey had never taken a distance education course (76%, n=25). One respondent reported having tried but lost interest and did not finish the course. None of the administrators had experience taking a distance education course. The lack of experience as a student in a distance education course could be a reason behind the perceived lack of quality and inadequate learning experience.
In response to the question of whether or not each participant had ever taught a distance education course, 68% of the faculty had not taught a distance education course, and 15% had taught a distance education course. None of the administrators had taught a distance education course. The courses that had been taught were predominantly art history, art criticism, history of art education, art for elementary teachers, art appreciation, multi-cultural art education, and art education assessment. No one reported teaching a studio or classroom management course.

None of the administrators had experience teaching a distance-delivered art education course. One responded that one faculty member taught a graphic design course, and two reported that no distance education courses were offered at their institution. Finally, one administrator was not sure if anyone taught distance education courses in their program.

Of the faculty who had distance education teaching experience, most had positive feedback. Specifically, they noted the richness of conversation and ability for students from various geographic locations to engage in learning.

I believe online learning allows students the opportunity to 'speak' and converse in a much deeper, more meaningful way, as all students have the opportunity to participate. Students who may be shy or quiet in a classroom setting, often open up much more in an online environment. Also, there are more opportunities for diversity in an online situation as students literally come from all over the world with wonderful experiences to share.

I enjoy the conversation with students online; it is different than in a day course. In some ways they run the discussion, while the teacher has more control in day classes. The textbook we use has developed many tests and quizzes that I use as well as many areas for discussion. So the
course is less about the chronological development of art (as I teach it in class) than about discussion of issues and artworks in particular.

Faculty members were also asked to provide more detail of their experience teaching a distance education course. One faculty member described her experience as rewarding because of the student feedback. Other descriptions included: eye-opening, meaningful, multi-cultural, and adaptive to multiple learning styles. Another faculty member said her experience was time-intensive and required a significant amount of work. This data suggests that distance education could be a compelling learning tool to reach students in geographically dispersed areas and maintain a quality education experience.

Those who had experience with distance-delivered art education were asked to describe the amount of time required to prepare and deliver the course. The amount of time reported range from same (n=1), to more time (n=3), to significantly more time (n=1). None of the respondents reported less time working on distance education in comparison to a classroom-based course. This data correlates with the extrinsic motivator of more time and the expressed concern with the quality of distance education courses. If faculty perceive distance education courses to be more time consuming, then they will not engage in teaching these courses unless the right programs are in place and technology is available to mitigate the time and quality factor.

I spent approximately 40% more time in the preparation of the course. I would estimate that 20% of that time was dedicated to the institutions online course protocol.

Distance education courses require MUCH more time than resident courses. Other instructors have said the same thing. For that matter, so
have the students who have discussed this: They say online courses are far more demanding, on average, than resident courses.

The type of technology used by faculty members engaged in distance education gave insight to faculty knowledge of technology and potential best practices in the field. The LCMS systems being used by art education departments were Blackboard, WebCT, Angel and Carmen (D2L). Others reported using the Internet, video, podcasts, and animations. PowerPoint presentations, which can be a very linear way of learning, were also cited as a type of technology used by the department to teach distance education courses. One participant explained that they had a virtual classroom set up for faculty to create and deliver distance education courses. The administrators who responded did not know what types of technology were being used to deliver distance education courses.

The last two questions I found to be the most interesting. The two questions asked what art education courses could or could not be taught effectively via distance education. Participants felt visual culture (n=7) and theory (n=6) could be taught effectively via distance education. Other courses identified were assessment, curriculum, aesthetics, contemporary art, art philosophy, writing courses, and art criticism. One participant responded that all classes except studio could be taught effectively via distance education. Five respondents felt that no courses could be taught effectively using distance education. A few participants were unsure, due to lack of experience with and knowledge of distance education technologies. Another faculty member
described her role as teaching clinicals, which could not be translated into a classroom environment.

In response to what could not be taught effectively via distance education, the highest response was studio (n=6), practicum (n=6), methods (n=3), and classroom management (n=3). Many respondents felt face time was critical in the instructional process. Earlier in the survey, data was collected on individuals’ teaching philosophies. If faculty felt that interaction and face-to-face, shared classroom experiences were important in the learning process, then these same individuals would not see equal or greater value in the effectiveness of distance education.

Overall, the data collected provided interesting insight to art education faculty and administrator experience with and perceptions toward distance education. This section was a summary and comparisons of the responses. In the analytical process, I will review themes and patterns in greater detail.

Qualitative Data Analysis

As discussed in the methodology chapter, the data was collected and analyzed according to qualitative research guidelines for grounded theory research. The mode of inquiry in grounded theory is inductive with an interest in theory generation rather than theory testing (Charmaz, 2000). Strauss and Corbin (1998) defined grounded theory as, “Theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process. In this method, data collection, analysis, and eventual theory stand in close
relationships to one another" (Corbin, 1998, p. 12). An important aspect of conducting a grounded theory study is that the researcher does not begin with a grand theory in mind to test the data. Rather, she allows the theory to emerge from the data to resemble the reality of those who live it (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

The basic data analysis procedure in grounded theory is the constant comparative method. Meaningful units of data identified after data collection are compared to generate tentative categories and properties, which are the basic elements of a grounded theory. A key to this approach is the idea of theoretical sampling. Theoretical sampling indicates "maximizing opportunities for comparing concepts along their properties for the similarities and differences enables researchers to define categories, to differentiate among them, and to specify their range of variability" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 149).

My study specifically implemented the procedures of open, axial, and selective coding. Data started to emerge from the first review of the survey responses. Next it was coded in a sequence of analytical steps. As initial and continuous insight occurred during open, axial, and selective coding, connections were identified between and among categories and properties (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), in using open coding, the data should be first analyzed line by line to discover the relationships among concepts, events, and themes and to sort them into appropriate categories based on the relationships. Next, properties and dimensions are determined.
Properties are "the general or specific characteristics or attributes of a category" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 116) whereas dimensions refer to "the location of a property along a continuum or range" (p. 116). The process of open coding continued as I developed analytical categories in terms of their specific properties and dimensions.

Through careful analysis of the responses, I differentiated each analytical domain derived from categories which emerged from the initial open coding process. Dimensions of levels of the use of technology range from personal technology skills to instructional use of technology. Following that was the axial coding process. In this stage, my analysis involved the process of reassembling data that was fractured in open coding and identifying relationships (subcategories) around the axis (the overarching category). The following table presents an overview of the axial coding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Emerging Concepts and Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy Support</td>
<td>Ability to learn from an online experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Student interaction and ability to create meaning in a virtual environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student ownership of knowledge. Inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructivist teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>Reach students in underserved or dispersed geographic regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to connect diverse students across time and geography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Face-to-face interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Deliverable art education methods, research, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not deliverable online studio, classroom management, practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for any content to be delivered via distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>More appropriate for graduate students than undergraduate, student motivation and expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Support</td>
<td>Limited training on how to use technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited knowledge of technology available to deliver content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University provided technology support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Technology</td>
<td>Blackboard, WebCT, Angel, D2L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Technology</td>
<td>Email, websites, blogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Extra time allotted to build course. Equal to more time allotted to deliver the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2: Initial coding from the open coding process.
Analytic Domains | Dimensions
---|---
**Theoretical Orientation**
Department foci | DBAE, visual culture, multiculturalism.
Personal teaching philosophy | Diversity, aesthetics, technology, community.
Technology | Instructional use of technology.

**Act of Teaching**
Use of technology | From low technology to high technology.
Knowledge of pedagogy | Linear to nonlinear, teacher-centered to student-centered.
Student populations | Graduate students vs. undergraduate students.

**Constructivism**
Inquiry mode of learning | Discussion boards, blogs, streaming video, two-way video, digital images.
Student ownership of knowledge | Passive to active.

**Organizational Support**
Leadership | Degree of experience with distance education.
Technology | Training, time, reduced teaching load, experience, quality of learning experience.
Quality | Classroom experience better than distance education experience.

**Faculty Motivation**
Diversity | Expand geography, increase access.
Teaching | Education and student success.
Art | Artist, art community, visual culture.
Students | Produce teachers, leaders, meet standards.
Research | Learn, contribute to the field, impact, change.

Table 8.3: Analytic domains derived from open coding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Categories</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected Support</td>
<td>Technology Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer and Leadership Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Knowledge of Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Application of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4: Overarching categories and subcategories derived from axial coding.

To organize relationships among categories, Strauss and Corbin (1998) suggested an organizational scheme or a coding paradigm that allows the researcher to analyze the data under a framework in which structure and process are integrated. The basic components of the paradigm are conditions, actions,
and consequences. There are three types of conditions: causal, intervening, and contextual. It is most important to focus on the complex conditions that lead up to a problem or issue. The responses people give to the issues, and the incidents or problems they experience are referred to as actions or strategies. Consequences are outcomes of actions and interactions as individuals employ strategies to respond to issues that arise. This organizational scheme also guides the process of the axial coding to systematically develop and relate categories.

A visual coding paradigm illustrating the process of how a department adopts a distance-delivered art education program or course might be structured. The visual coding paradigm was developed as I integrated and refined the major categories in the stage of selective coding (see Figure 8.1).

Next, one must identify a central idea (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The central idea or the central phenomenon, constructivism, which speaks to the teaching experience, was determined based on the guidelines proposed by Strauss (1987), who emphasizes that the central category is the central concept under which all other categories can be related, subsumed, and integrated to grow in depth and in explanatory power. After the outline of a visual model was proposed, I began to minimize the excess and maximize developed categories.
Figure 8.1: Visual coding paradigm of central phenomenon.

Central Phenomena and Conditions

The central phenomenon is centered on constructivism in distance education, which involves the act of teaching and the knowledge of constructivism. Constructivism as a learning theory stresses the importance of the individual's own building of knowledge. It is grounded in the philosophical paradigm that there is no absolute truth. Truth or knowledge is relative and subject to each individual's experiences within his or her own context. As discussed in the literature review, both Vygotsky's focus on social interaction and Piaget's ideas on cognitive adoption have contributed in grounding constructivism by providing a psychological theory of learning (Fosnot, 1996).
When applied in teaching, constructivism emphasizes that there is no ready-made knowledge, and learning is a constructive activity that the students themselves have to carry out. In constructivism, the human mind is viewed as a creator of symbols used to represent reality constructed by each individual. For social constructivism influenced by Vygotsky, constructivists believed that knowledge is constructed socially using language, and thus different social experiences result in multiple realities (Fosnot, 1996). Constructing knowledge is a social linguistic process with a gradual advancement of understanding built upon prior knowledge resulting in multiple dimensions of the truth (Fosnot, 1996). Vygotskian principles emphasize that learning and development are social and collaborative activities and therefore learning should take place in meaningful context in which knowledge can be applied.

In comparison, Piaget's theory of intellectual growth had the primary influence on the development of the current constructivist position. Piaget first emphasized the process of conceptual change as interactions between existing cognitive structure and new experiences (Wadsworth, 1978). Piagetian principles focus on the freedom given to learners to understand and construct meaning at their own pace through personal experience with assimilation and accommodation stages to achieve equilibrium (Wadsworth, 1978). Piaget also emphasized learning should take place among collaborative groups with peer interactions in natural settings (Wadsworth, 1978). Both principles encourage educators to recognize that learning is an individual process (Wadsworth, 1978). Thus, students should be able to declare their ownership of their knowledge.
There are three types of conditions in the visual model: causal, intervening, and contextual. Conditions formed the structure in which a phenomenon was embedded and helped to explain why one person had a certain outcome or chose a certain set of strategies. It was most important to focus on the complex interweaving of the conditions that led up to a problem or issue that a person responded to with strategies, and that resulted in the outcomes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Causal conditions represent a set of events that affect the phenomenon and may have direct or indirect influences on strategies that the respondent employed. Causal conditions may affect one another and may combine in various ways along different dimensions. The primary types of causal conditions that emerged from the data were technology support, pedagogy support, and peer and leadership support.

Faculty identified the lack of technology support as an issue for distance-delivered art education. Technology support provides solutions to hardware and software problems. Although technology support seems significant in the process of technology integration, pedagogical support is the other important half necessary to realize the vision. The organization is impacted by peer and leadership support. Successful technology integration does not result from isolating and focusing solely on technology issues, but rather from infusing technology into the overall department, program and curriculum.

Intervening conditions mitigate or alter the influence of causal conditions on the phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Examples of intervening
conditions are the discovery and use of new technology and feedback from students. Emerging and experimental technology approaches will provide a model for technology adoption. As technology becomes easier to implement and use, it will create the need for various types of support. New technology not only means hardware and software infrastructures, but also provides a potential human infrastructure (Berge, 1998) that creates instructional environments. Much like new technology developments, student feedback will inform the field of what works and where opportunities exist for additional support.

My study sought to understand perceptions of art education faculty and administrators toward distance education. It is obvious that the process is complex, multifaceted, and dynamic due to the interwoven relationships of leadership, organizational change, technology, curriculum and faculty motivation. I chose to survey perceptions because they have a major impact on curriculum and technology change and success.

The change model, discussed earlier, that helps understand change and technology innovation is the Integrated Technology Adoption and Diffusion Model. Technologies have evolved faster than traditional research change models can deal with them. Traditional change models often ignore external factors such as rapid worldwide evolution of technology and change agents. Thus, the Integrated Technology Adoption and Diffusion Model, discussed in the literature review, describes a cyclical process of technology adoption in which faculty evolve from learners to adopters, to co-learner, to a reaffirmer rejecter, then finally leaders.
The results from the qualitative data illustrate several cyclical processes of change with difference levels of technology and perception of distance education. Some art education faculty and administrators can be categorized as being in the learner stage of change. In comparison, others skipped stages of adopter and co-learner and reached reaffirmer stage, continuing on as a leader among colleagues in the use of distance education technologies. For art education faculty and administrators, there are a few ways this model might be approached.
Figure 8.2: Single art education faculty member wanting to teach distance education course.
Figure 8.3: Administrator interested in engaging their department in distance education courses or programs.
As evident from figure 8.2 and 8.3, the process of creating and implementing a distance education course is complex and has the potential to be costly. A single faculty member, who is intrinsically motivated to engage in such technology, may be more successful than a large group. However, for institutions which have embraced distance education as part of their mission, they will need to refine these processes to ensure programmatic success.

Quantitative Data Analysis

The second part of the survey collected quantitative data. The data was analyzed for all the variables using the appropriate SPSS 11.0 statistical procedures to determine descriptive statistics with respect to respondents' personal and professional profiles. Descriptive statistics were used to present measures of central tendency such as mean, median, and standard deviation for each item of the survey instrument (Babbie, 1998). The quantitative data identified issues and barriers in contexts based on the categories identified in the qualitative data analysis (Babbie, 1998).

The purpose of the survey questionnaire was to assess the perceptions of the respondent. The directions asked the participant to identify varying degrees of agreement or disagreement. Thus, the motivators and barriers towards distance education could be determined from the results (Babbie, 1998). To ensure the validity of the responses, questions determining barriers were asked to compare against motivator questions. For example, teaching load as a barrier
confirmed the accuracy of the teaching load as a motivator. Chi-squared tests were conducted to identify statistically relevant data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compete within College</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compete with Other Colleges</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed Success</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Distance Ed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Stipend</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Teaching Load</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Financial Reward</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5: Qualitative data results.

The first question asked was whether or not art education would need to embrace distance education to compete with other programs within my college or university. The mean response was 31% (n=3.2), however, 24% responded neutral (n=7) and 31% (n=9) responded that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. To gauge faculty and administrator perceptions of competition in their field, a question was asked if art education would need to embrace distance education to compete with other art education programs at colleges or
universities in the U.S. In comparison to the first question, the respondents felt that art education would need to embrace distance education to compete with other colleges and universities, which reflected 31% of the total respondents. Therefore, participants felt that distance education would not impact their standing within their college or university, but did recognize external competition and a need to be responsive to it.

Next, the question was posed to determine participant perception of the statement that distance education will play a critical role in the long-term success of my institution, and 38% (n=12) participants disagreed with this statement. In the next question, 52% (n=15) felt the college or university they are a part of is supportive of distance education initiatives.

Student support services, such as advising, registration, advising, were rated adequate by 49% (n=14) of the respondents. In comparison, faculty support services such as technology, help desk, and training were rated as adequate by 55% (n=16) of the respondents. Recognition by superiors or peers as a motivator rated high at 49% (n=14), which reflects the data collected in the qualitative section.

Additional time rated the highest at 63% (n=18) as a motivator to faculty teaching a distance education course, followed by a reduced teaching load at 58% (n=17). McKenzie (2001) identified that development time for distance education courses is nearly double that of traditional course development. The trend from colleges and universities is not to give release time, but instead provide teams of designers and technical support staff to assist with the course
development. The additional money for payroll and infrastructure for these teams has proven in most cases to be more expensive than the cost of release time to faculty (McKenzie, 2001).

The literature points out that less rigorous teaching load was the second most requested extrinsic reward (Betts, 1998; Berge, 2001), which is supported by the responses from my survey at 58% (n=17). Due to budget constraints, this can be difficult to fulfill. Few colleges have responded to the request to reduce load when teaching or developing distance education courses.

Teaching load can also be considered class size. Class size policies are widely diverse and have a direct tie to the budget. Although numerous studies reflect the incentive of smaller class size, colleges are reluctant to limit registrations. In comparison, the literature demonstrates that faculty members question the quality of the learning experience when the class is over twenty-five students. Berge (2001) suggests that class size policies remain consistent between online and traditional, while Betts (1998) suggests a sliding scale of stipends for faculty who teach in excess of twenty-five students. The latter would not be the best decision to motivate art education faculty to participate in distance education. The question of class size remains unanswered and a topic of heavy controversy throughout the academic world. Administrators seeking to motivate art education faculty to teach distance education should address this concern and determine an appropriate solution. Lack of policy or teaching load adjustment creates hesitation for distance education adoption.
Contrary to the literature, additional financial reward was not a strong motivator for art educators at 31% (n=9). Within the literature, monetary stipends or additional financial compensation rated highest (Betts, 1998; Rockwell, et al, 1999; Berge, 2001). Although in other departments, the biggest motivator for teaching distance education is financial, this model would not fit the art education field as the most compelling way to get faculty involved with distance education.

Insufficient technical knowledge as a barrier to faculty involvement in distance education was a significant factor in the survey results at 86% (n=25). I thought this was interesting to compare to the results of the question regarding support services to faculty. Though the access to increased technical knowledge may be provided on campus, time and teaching load may be barriers to taking advantage of these services.

It is no surprise that one of the largest line items on a college budget is technology. The need for constant upgrades and new hardware can be expensive. What makes technology even more complicated is that what might be cutting-edge to one faculty member could be out-dated to another. While colleges struggle to keep up with advances in technology, it is important to consider different needs of someone teaching distance education courses versus traditional courses. Distance faculty would need a laptop with Internet connection allowing them to teach 24/7, whereas this is less of a necessity for faculty teaching a traditional class.

Art education faculty members do not think distance education is an effective way to deliver post-secondary degree art education courses. This is a
major barrier to faculty adopting distance education, or other technology. More respondents strongly disagreed (24%) with this statement than any of the other statements listed. Since quality and constructivism were two key themes that emerged from the qualitative data, this would reflect a perception in the field that art education may not be appropriate subject matter for distance education delivery.

Finally, art education faculty disagreed with the statement that art education has greater challenges in creating distance education courses due to copyright law. Although copyright law and issues in art have become increasingly important in the past decade, copyright and distance-delivered art education was not perceived as a barrier to creating a distance education course.

The top motivators identified in the survey were additional time to prepare, teaching load reduction, and administrator and peer recognition. Barriers were knowledge of technology, perception of importance in the field, and most importantly, the effectiveness and quality of distance education to deliver art education. This could be resolved by clear policy created, written for local and national standards, that solicits feedback from art educators and supports their needs.
Categories of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators/Barriers</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Current lack of policy regarding distance learning in the field will be an ongoing issue for art education faculty interested in teaching distance education courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Adjusted ratio of teaching time to prep time specific to art education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load</td>
<td>Appropriate workload when creating or teaching a distance education course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>Technology that supports constructivist instructional methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Assessment methods to measure quality and outcomes against traditional methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.6: Categories of motivators and barriers.

In response to political and marketplace pressure, art education departments must find ways to train and encourage more faculty to deliver distance education courses. In order to develop effective training and support programs, identification of technology leaders can help provide support and feedback to key decision-makers. A national survey of higher education institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006) reported that over half of higher education institutions offered distance education in the fall 2005. These plans are in part driven by top-down mandates from government and university administrators. In comparison, course development is bottom-up. If distance education is to be successful, then institutions must provide instructors with
administrative and technical support as well as the right incentives to develop courses.

Research has repeatedly identified lack of time as a major barrier that hindered the faculty use of technology (Berge, 1998; Betts, 2000; Schifter, 2001), and time required is also the number one barrier most faculty face when attempting to create distance education courses. The results of this study indicate that the art education faculty who responded to the survey perceived this barrier as a prominent issue. Creative and flexible solutions are needed to provide more time for art education faculty to use technology in their courses. The art education faculty also need to be situated in an environment where they are provided with supportive staff and administration, reliable technologies, shared resources, and pedagogical ideas (Jones et al., 2001).

The survey data reflects low levels of technology knowledge among art education faculty. This issue could be addressed by an institutional support system for technology and improved levels of knowledge. This knowledge could include troubleshooting skills. Berge (1998) argues that hardware and software troubleshooting is one of the useful skills for art educators with respect to technology use and distance education.

Curriculum integration was also a challenge for art education faculty members who participated in this study. The transformation stage of achieving a higher level of technology integration takes more than good technical skills and reliable technologies. The amounts and kinds of collaborative structures available, opportunities for observing and interacting with peer faculty and
disseminated exemplary models contribute greatly to successful distance education curriculum.

Barriers and motivators identified by the respondents reflected the nature and complexity of distance education in art education. Art education faculty's personal beliefs can be changed as they experience the power of teaching and learning with technology when provided with modern technologies that support constructivist teaching techniques. Meanwhile, their personal commitments might also be diminished as they encounter unfriendly environmental barriers. Although skill training may initiate changes in faculty uses of distance education, additional models are needed to support and sustain the types of meaningful changes being promoted and the opportunities to reflect on current practices and beliefs. These supports will enhance the faculty commitment to sustain the desired changes made in their teaching.
CHAPTER 9

CASE FINDINGS

A case study was conducted with nine faculty members who had experience with The Ohio State University’s (OSU) Online Art Education Degree Programs. This qualitative case study revealed what these nine faculty members saw as issues in their continued use and integration of technology. These issues were time, meaningful use of technology, and the need for a community of support staff and faculty. Data collected for this case study will better inform other art educators who are interested in distance education.

Data was collected through interviews with nine faculty members who have taught or are planning to teach in OSU’s Art Education Mostly Online Master’s Degree Program and the Edna Manley College of the Visual Arts (EMCVA) Jamaican Program. The purpose of the interviews with faculty and administrators was to ascertain their perspectives on the nature and scope of their experiences with teaching online. Eight faculty members and one administrator were interviewed. Six of the interviews were face-to-face and three were over the phone. The questions were semi-structured and were based on
the questions asked in the survey. Faculty are identified as Faculty A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I for confidentiality purposes.

Planning and Developing Online Courses

The Department of Art Education at The Ohio State University offers a master's degree online through two programs: the Mostly Online Master’s Degree and the Edna Manley College of the Visual Arts (EMCVA) marketed to Jamaican Art Teachers. Approximately five years ago, the Department’s foray into distance education started with a top-down decision to explore new technology as a means to increase higher education access and professional development opportunities for art educators (Faculty A, Interview, April, 26, 2007). Parsons had been one of the early adopters involved in distance education courses at The Ohio State University Department of Art Education (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).

The creation of the first online courses was partially driven by an economic issue and a need to recruit more students and increase enrollments. In the local market, enrollments were flat (Faculty E, Interview, April 25, 2007; Faculty F, Interview, April 25, 2007). Most of the Art Teachers in Central Ohio had completed their degree, and there was a need to serve a larger geographic area (Faculty C, Interview, April 25, 2007).

The initiative to create an online program was also largely a top-down initiative championed by the Dean of College of the Arts and supported by a new Chair of the Department (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty G,
Interview, April 26, 2007). From the beginning, the purpose of developing and delivering online courses was part of a vision to offer degrees via distance education (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Individual courses did not have real value unless organized into a degree program.

The College of the Arts paid for the development of the first series of courses. Once the investment was made, there was a focus on continuing the momentum and sustaining the Programs. I talked with three faculty members who had been hired in the past 2-4 years (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty F, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). Each of these individuals was hired with the understanding that they would be responsible for teaching online. I also interviewed six faculty members who had been employed by the Department during the design and development of the online courses (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty B, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty C, Interview, April 25, 2007; Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty I, Interview, April 30, 2007). Five had taught online and one was in the process of preparing for the experience. All faculty who teach in the online programs are tenure-track faculty.

Since this was a new endeavor, there was little history to draw from in the planning phase. Fiscal considerations, developmental and implementation timelines, goals of the project and assessment strategies emerged and much of the early process was trial and error. The project began without a clear strategic plan or methodology. There was no clear structure assigned to resources for the development (Faculty B, Interview, April 26, 2007). Limited time, financial
resources and staff support added more layers to the complexity of the planning process (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Both programs, the Mostly Online Master’s Degree and the Edna Manley College of the Visual Arts (EMCVA), are blended, meaning a combination of face-to-face and online methods of teaching. However, the majority of the courses are online. The online components of the program are delivered using Carmen, which is the learning content management system currently used by The Ohio State University (OSU). Unlike WebCT, the system first used by OSU, this platform’s intuitive interface is easy to navigate. Instructors do not need to be an expert in hypertext or HTML, and they can build a class website with lecture notes and discussion questions. (Faculty B, Interview, April 26, 2007, Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007) Students can use the system to post assignments, work with classmates, check grades and access resources assigned by the instructor.

The intent during the design phase was to build a site with high aesthetic quality (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). The course sites had to be unique and competitive with other commercial websites rather than competitive only with other educational providers’ sites. Specifically, students have many options to be entertained, gather information, or interact with each other. Facebook and MySpace have demonstrated the power of and demand for online interaction. With the myriad of options available, the goal was to create a site that users would want to use over other sites that might be competitive for a student’s time and attention.
One faculty member described their experience building their first course. A team was assembled to build the site and was comprised of a graphic designer, content expert, two technology programmers and some volunteers or teaching assistants who were interested in the project (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). The course development benefited from having the author of the course texts on the team to guide activities that would or would not make sense in the online environment (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Once the online course was built it took less time to teach online in comparison to face-to-face. However, development for the initial courses took up to one-year (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007).

During the planning process, decisions needed to be made on what content and activities were appropriate online versus face-to-face (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007). One common mistake in creating online courses is to take the classroom content and to force it into an online course (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). In developing the online course faculty were careful to make the interface intuitive and blend linear and visual solutions to meet the learning needs of different students. One frustrating aspect of creating the online course was the dependence on technology support. This was lessened in the move from WebCT to Carmen.

Early in the program, the first online courses were launched to an audience in Florida (Faculty D, Interview, April 25, 2007). The launch did not meet expectations due to a tech support individual who neither had the
appropriate skills nor asked for assistance when it was needed (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). Most all of the courses were test piloted to troubleshoot for issues such as technology support, interface use and student satisfaction.

The Mostly Online Master’s Degree

The development of the Online Master’s Degree in Art Education began in Summer 2004. One important aspect of the Mostly Online Master’s Degree is the face-to-face interaction shared at the beginning of the Program. Students travel to Columbus and spend a week together. During this time, they meet with faculty, staff and each other to build relationships, discuss expectations and kick-off the Program. This is a very intense process and students spend time together in class as well as during breaks and meals (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Friendships are created that help support the online experience after students return home and continue in the Program. The first group had students from the United States and Saudi Arabia (Faculty F, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Courses are offered by the Office of Continuing Education at The Ohio State University. Tuition through this department is less than in-state tuition, and keeps costs down for the student (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Each year a contract is signed between OSU Art Education Department and the Office of Continuing Education with a minimum guarantee of enrolled students. Since first launching the program, only one student has dropped after enrolling (Faculty
G, Interview, April 26, 2007). The Office of Continuing Education cites the Mostly Online Art Education Master’s Degree as an example for other administrators or faculty who are interested in learning more about how to create a great online program.

The Program is similar to the Art Education Program offered face-to-face at OSU (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Students receive the same readings and visual content as face-to-face students (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). The Department is committed to ensure that the same standard and quality exists for the online courses as provided by the classroom experience (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). The table following is an overview of the courses, mode of delivery and credit hours students must complete to earn their degree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number / Title</th>
<th>Mode of Delivery</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE700 Issues in Graduate Studies in Art Education</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE640D The Studio Process</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE604D Criticism, Aesthetics and Education</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE607D Designing Meaningful Curriculum</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE705D Action Research</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE705D Action Research</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE731D Assessment in Art Education</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>Online or classroom, can be transfer credit.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Review and Reflective Paper</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF CREDITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1: Program Outline - Mostly Online Master's Program

This program has experienced early success and is the trailblazer in the field of Art Education.

Jamaica Master's Degree Online Project

Similar to the Mostly Online Art Education Master’s Degree, OSU has entered into a partnership with a Jamaican college, and is using its online courses to fulfill a market need in this geographic region. Edna Manley College
of the Visual Arts (EMCVA) in Jamaica was chosen as the partner institution to offer distance education courses. The mission of EMCVA is:

"The institutional objective of the College is to plan, implement and supervise the artistic, technical, theoretical and conceptual training of students in the visual or performing arts for the development, enrichment and preservation of the culture of the entire Caribbean region; to provide performers and art administrators with marketable skills for service in the entertainment industry and other professional sectors of the region; to form a link with those industries requiring the services of quality designers; to research, document and disseminate knowledge of the region’s art forms" (EMVCA, 2007, para. 1).

In 2005, the need for art teachers, especially at the secondary-level, led to the development of art education as a specialist area of concentration within the EMCVA (Hill, 2005). The relationship with the OSU Art Education Department was the first venture into the development and delivery of distance education courses. Dr. Michael Parsons and Phyllis Hill submitted a proposal to both The Ohio State University Department of Art Education and EMCVA. The proposal outlined a collaborative effort between the two institutions. The goal was to assist EMCVA in the area of institutional development, primarily in staff development. The original idea was to upgrade its staff to the Masters and Ph.D. level, and then the institution could develop and accredit its own graduate and post graduate programs. Ultimately, the institution would be better equipped to provide training to art educators who had no access to this level of professional training (Hill, 2006).

The proposal was endorsed by both institutions, and they began the process of determining the structure of the program. Following two years of planning and working through the details and expectations of the partners, the
M.A. program was scheduled to begin in the Summer of 2006 (Faculty B, Interview, April 25, 2007).

Writing the goals of the program was a collaborative process between EMCVA and OSU’s Department of Art Education. The short-term goal was to develop a distance education program (originally called The OSU Jamaica Masters Online Project) (Faculty B, Interview, April 25, 2007). The program outcomes were specifically focused on providing professional training for EMCVA staff and art educators in Jamaica. The long-term goal was sustainability, which included teaching and supporting EMCVA’s development of its own graduate and post graduate programs.

OSU’s Art Education leadership committed to support the online program until EMCVA could create its own infrastructure to manage the program. The estimated timeline was 10 years, which supports EMCVA’s goal to become a full degree granting institution by 2011 (Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007). This goal was closely related to EMCVA’s upgrade of all of its teacher preparation programs from a three-year diploma to the four-year bachelor level, and subsequently the development of an in-service M.A. degree for practicing teachers in the arts.

The EMCVA is now in its third year of offering the bachelor’s degree. The college is also exploring the possibility of offering the M.A. (Faculty B, Interview, April 25, 2007). This has been slow to occur because the institution is not accredited to offer graduate-level degrees. None of the faculty members hold a Ph.D. degree, which is a necessary requirement for an institution to offer
graduate-level degrees (Faculty B, Interview, April 25, 2007). International accreditation has been evaluated as an option, but no single solution has been identified.

The collaborative effort required coordination among the academic and business aspects of the project. The two institutions were separated by distance and culture and faced numerous challenges. Specific challenges were in the areas of communication, governing and regulatory structures, fee structures, accreditation requirements, student entrance standards and faculty credential requirements (Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007).

It was agreed that OSU would be the degree-granting institution, contributing all the courses within this master’s degree. OSU would coordinate the development and distribution of the online learning materials based on its underlying philosophy of education (Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007). The responsibility for student administration, learning management system and the web-based delivery system would be shared by the collaborating institutions.

The relationship between the two schools was mutually beneficial. Using the courses created for the Mostly Online Master’s Degree Program allowed both institutions to benefit through enhanced status both in the field of art education and distance education (Faculty G, Interview, April 27, 2007). OSU’s Department of Art Education benefited through increased access to international audiences, building experience in how to conduct effective online courses, generating revenue, and expanding the scope and reach of its online program (Faculty B, Interview, April 25, 2007).
Following consultation between the institutions, it was decided that The
Jamaica Master’s Online Project would be a modified version of the current
Mostly Online Master’s in Art Education. It was decided that, where as the Mostly
Online Master’s in Art Education would offer 45 credits, the Jamaica Master’s
Online Project would offer 60 credits (Faculty G, Interview, April 27, 2007). The
rationale is that the American students usually have graduate coursework credits
that they can transfer into the program and this may not be true for the Jamaican
students. Jamaican students are, however, allowed to transfer 15 credits into the
program from an institution approved by the OSU Registrar’s Office in order to
meet the 60 credit hours required for the degree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number / Title</th>
<th>Mode of Delivery</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE700 Issues in Graduate Studies in Art education</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE640D The Studio Process</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE604D Criticism, Aesthetics and Education</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE607D Designing Meaningful Curriculum</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE705D Action Research</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE767D Caribbean Visual Culture</td>
<td>EMC workshop &amp; face-to face component</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE731D Assessment in Art Education</td>
<td>EMC workshop &amp; face-to face component</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE Community Based Art Education</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Art Education Project</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity, Culture and Curriculum</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology in Art and Teaching</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Review and Reflective Paper</td>
<td>One week workshop with online component.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF CREDITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2: Program Outline - Jamaica Master's Online Project
The faculty involved in this program are very proud of the level of student involvement and the positive feedback (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). During a few interviews, faculty expressed how impressed they were with the Jamaican students’ commitment to the course and to the community. The EMCVA and OSU partnership is a logical fit since they are both the leaders in their field for their respective geographic areas (Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007). One faculty member expressed excitement in being part of a program that produces scholars and artists for Jamaica and much of the Caribbean (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). Each institution has embraced the relationship. Even though the original plan was for OSU to turn the program over to EMCVA after 2011, administrators, faculty and students have asked for OSU to stay involved in a long-term partnership (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).

OSU Art Education Faculty Online Teaching Experiences

The nine faculty interviewed shared their experiences developing and teaching online courses. The experiences gave insight into the processes involved in online degrees. Generally, the faculty interviewed who had online teaching experience felt that they have no preference between teaching online or face-to-face; each environment has advantages and disadvantages. Some advantages to teaching online cited were flexibility, ability to engage in dialogue in a different way, expand audience reach, and challenge in creating a new course.
Courses adopted and grew to reflect the needs of the learner within the online environment (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007, Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007). For example, in one course the assignment was a heavy research project that was replaced with a reflective portfolio that connected what the student was learning with their actual practice in the classroom. Also, large writing assignments were broken into a series of essays, which enabled the instructor to give quicker feedback (Faculty A, Interview, April 27, 2007).

If something was not working for the instructor or students, it could be revised without sacrificing the quality of what was being taught. In one example, changes to the online course impacted changes to the face-to-face course. This was completely unexpected and made the classroom experience richer.

Community connections, rather than an individual focus, impact the quality of the online experience (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007).

In an Art Criticism class, students may go to a gallery and discuss the work of art and then deconstruct the discussion (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). These experiences can be replicated online through shorter, more interactive discussions over a longer period of time. It becomes clear from reading students’ postings and assignments whether or not they understand the material. Daily responses increase student motivation and feedback can be timelier than in the classroom where students are limited to class time and office hours for feedback. Making responses public as well as tracking student progress publicly helps students manage the course load and spurs competition
for those who may have fallen behind. For example, when every student can read all other students’ submissions, the quality increases because participants want to be proud of what others have access to view (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). Grades are kept private even though feedback is made public.

A progress chart mapped to the course calendar enables students to track where they are in comparison to others in the course as well as the course timeline (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). This structure also allows students to progress at a pace that is reflective of their learning needs or schedule and provides more flexibility than the face-to-face environment.

Another theme that emerged from the interviews was that teaching online changed the instructional approach in the classroom (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty F, Interview, April 26, 2007, Faculty I, May 1, 2007). After modifying an assignment, activity or discussion for the online environment, and observing its success, it could be used within the classroom. For example, changing the assignment from heavy research focus to reflective practice became a richer way for the student to experience the material.

Several faculty members during the interviews expressed the need for flexibility to change content, aesthetic control, and the ability to explore alternative delivery models. To continue to keep the quality of online courses high, it is critical to have flexibility to change the curriculum. Technology support can be a cumbersome middleman and requested changes are not always made in a timely manner (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007, Faculty E, Interview,
April 26, 2007). The course needs to be aesthetically appealing. Since the subject matter is art and aesthetics, it is important to maintain the highest visual standards.

Rather than being forced into WebCT’s or Blackboard’s infrastructure, the technology needed to be able to create dynamic sites that are competitive with popular commercial sites. In the absence of a LCMS, such as Carmen, email could be used to teach distance education (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). This is a practice used by the University of Phoenix, which is the largest provider of online education. Email is easy to use and fosters the exchange of ideas.

A few interviewees felt that control of the textbook and the ability to reference pages in the book reduced student demand for assistance and clarification of topics (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). Others found success in training a teaching assistant (TA) to teach to an objective rather than a presentation (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Tracing exam questions to objectives enable the instructor to see if the results change. Instructors who are new to teaching online need to understand that the course is not in the computer, but it is in a virtual space that is seamless. (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007)

Involvement can be fostered through field trips, interviews, research and other activities that engage students to be linked socially and makes the physical distance irrelevant (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Posting and responding is a very different educational experience than spontaneously and logistically having a face-to-face interaction (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). Both have their strengths and weaknesses, but
neither is better or worse than the other. In the online environment, there is significantly more writing than talking.

Every classroom is different whether it is online or face-to-face. Some faculty felt teaching the online course was more successful than some face-to-face classes because the audience was limited to art teachers (Faculty E, April 27, 2007; Faculty F, Interview, April 2007). Unlike the classroom program, where students from Arts Policy or other areas may participate, having a cohort of students that shared the same professional experience created a dynamic learning environment and made it a better program (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007). The online course is more practice-oriented rather than theory-driven.

It is important to create a community of learners rather than an independent study experience. The faculty interviewed felt the average class size was 20 or less, and 15 to 18 students was ideal. In the face-to-face environment, it is sometimes difficult to get people to share openly. In comparison, online courses create a level of comfort in which students are more open with their opinions or convictions. In the classroom, there are always students who do not speak either because they do not want to or during the time of the class there is only a limited number who can speak. In an online environment, everyone must read and respond, and more activity almost surely fosters better learning (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Ultimately, students pretty much do what is expected of them (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). If the course has clear goals and expectations, then
the other piece is creating situations for students to work together and show how their learning impacts their work experience.

Technology Implications

Transmission of culture, mass communication, policy, media and advertising are all interwoven through the Internet, and impact how we communicate online (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). Communication is closely tied to the study of the histories of learning and to the construction of agencies that transmit culture across the generations. These histories reveal a web of learning filters, learning ways, and learning machines (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). Within the online environment, interaction takes place quickly and differently from a face-to-face experience.

Many faculty structure courses in a model that is linear, and the student first reads then writes a response or posts to a discussion board. There is an opportunity for involving the students in an online experience to foster a different learning experience. Communication in online environments takes place in the fourth dimension and in extended learning situations (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007).

The impact of epistemology on learning and communication in online communities helps us understand new strategies and approaches to teaching using distance education technologies. How we perceive knowledge and the process of coming to know provides the basis for educational practice (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). If we believe that learners passively receive
information, then the priority in instruction will be knowledge transmission (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). If, on the other hand, we believe that learners actively construct knowledge in their attempts to make sense of their world, then learning will likely emphasize the development of meaning and understanding. This will shape the structure of the course and assignment the student completes to achieve the course objectives.

Communication varies based on whether it is self-to-many, many-to-many or one-to-one. Thirty percent of the web is built on social publishing that takes place in the form of site or product recommendations, blogs, online journals or other (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). Viral marketing and word of mouth drive traffic to different sites and enable communities to form around shared interests.

Links to search engines such as Lexus Nexus and Google enable queries to deliver information across different cultures and perspectives. Practices that are driven by deep marketing dollars, such as OCLC’s software to aggregate information from articles into a coherent abstract, will impact how we teach online (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). The education environment has an opportunity to learn from best practices in the competitive marketplace.

Second Life is being explored as an environment to engage students in a rich way (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007). As mentioned earlier in the study, Second Life allows users to build avatars and virtual places. This technology allows students to participate in viewing art or engaging in visual culture in a different way. Additionally, it enables faculty to
engage with faculty from different institutions who share common interests in art, art education, and technology (Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007).

Even in face-to-face teaching, students have come to expect some type of technology interaction, such as the use of discussion boards, posting the course calendar, or interaction via email (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007). Student demand pressures faculty to adopt technology. As a result, faculty will have to learn to adopt newer technologies and evolve their teaching strategies to keep up with change.

Organizational Structure and Change Issues

A major component to the launch of an online program is the faculty and their perception of and interest in adopting the new curriculum, specifically their readiness to accept change. When the Program was created, there was no specific organizational structure in place with roles and responsibilities or an organizational chart (Faculty B, Interview, April 25, 2007). I had the opportunity to talk with a few of the co-founders of the distance education initiatives from OSU’s Art Education Department. The Department got involved in distance education as a leadership directive driven by the former Dean of the College of Arts (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Some individuals got involved because it was a new challenge, and they liked the team that was engaged in creating the initial courses (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Had the adoption and Departmental
interest in distance education not been top-down, the Program might not be where it is today.

The two programs, Mostly Online Master’s Degree and Jamaica Online Degree each have respective program managers. From an administrator’s perspective, it is important to facilitate communication among faculty to gain buy-in. The Program Manager is responsible for recruiting students, advertising and marketing the program (Faculty F, Interview, April 26, 2007). In the Mostly Online Master’s Degree Program, the Program Manager is the advisor for the first year the student is enrolled. In the second year, each student selects their own advisor. The Program Manager serves as a central point of contact for students who have admissions inquiries or need assistance (Faculty F, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Getting faculty to change is the biggest obstacle (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007). There is a perception that teaching online takes more time, offers less control and support, and is not something one can try once to experiment. If the original courses had been a failure, then the Department would have probably abandoned the Program (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007). Since the initial experience turned out well and there was a market need, more courses and infrastructure were built to support the Program.

Even though the program was initially driven by top-down pressure, it is now governed through committee. The Department has an Online Faculty Committee, and all OSU faculty who teach online are members. At committee meetings, members discuss topics specifically related to teaching online.
Changes to the Program and course decisions are made collectively and sent to the Curriculum Committee for review.

One faculty member mentioned that support from the Department's leadership is essential to the Program's success (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). The current Department Chair is supportive of faculty ideas, not just in the case of distance education, but for any new concept a faculty member might have interest in exploring (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). When a faculty member has an idea, the Department Chair will talk through it and discuss ways to implement the idea. Also, because the Department is ranked as the top in the country, innovation is necessary to continue to be the best in research and instruction. Another faculty member explained that peers who teach at other institutions are interested in distance education but do not have the support of their Department Chair. (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007)

Another interesting perspective that surfaced during the interviews is the field of art education sometimes takes longer to be convinced of strategies that might be useful, new or uncomfortable (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). One critique of the field was that it was not creating a forward enough vision and was comfortable revisiting the same territory (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Faculty Motivation Themes

As identified in the literature review, there are a number of barriers and motivators for faculty to participate in distance education. When the program
was being developed, the Department Chair at the time offered release time to
develop and teach online courses (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).
Currently, additional time or compensation is offered for teaching online courses.
There may be benefits for those who want to create a new online course.
Compensation may be provided if the teaching load exceeds what is set for the
Department maximum (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Motivators cited were money, technical support and time (Faculty F,
Interview, April 26, 2007). One faculty member thought motivation to teach
online might be financial, but in cases such as receiving additional funds for
teaching an honors course, sometimes the pay is not significant enough to
warrant the extra time and work required to teach the course (Faculty C,
Interview, April 26, 2007).

Having a TA to make minor changes and bridge the relationship with
technical support was cited as a benefit (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).
Faculty who had this benefit felt it made a major impact on the success of their
course (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007). Additionally, ensuring technical
support was competent, available and understood the content was perceived as
a need for teaching online.

Control over time, in comparison to having a commitment to a scheduled
course, was seen as an incentive to teaching online (Faculty B, Interview, April
26, 2007). Flexibility of scheduling is another advantage and allows the
instructor to teach at a pace that is appropriate for their lifestyle and other
research interests. Other motivators for engaging in distance education were pride in the product and the satisfaction of teaching online.

The amount of time required to initially organize the class was a challenge (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). During the planning phase it was difficult to predict success for assignments or activities. Only after the students gave feedback or completed assignments could the course be evaluated and modified to reflect learners’ needs. Additional barriers included the upfront time to develop and limitations to the technology, which have been solved by moving from WebCT to Carmen (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty B, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty F, Interview, April 26, 2007).

Distance education is not new, but teaching online is a newer concept and is still a largely unknown factor. There is a fear that if one builds a course and teaches it one term, then they may be committed to continue to teach the online course even if they didn’t like it (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). Distance education has a reputation for being more work, but the faculty interviewed felt it was different work and sometimes less work.

Once a faculty member experiences the creation of his or her first online course, it becomes simpler to create additional online courses (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007). As an instructor, there is a learning curve to thinking about how to use the technology appropriately combined with how to structure the course (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). For example, short writing assignments with quick feedback have proved to be more compelling learning experiences than long, research-heavy projects.
Case Study Results

Combining face-to-face and online interaction to deliver a blended solution was perceived as the best method for teaching with technology (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty B, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007). Commercial technologies, such as Second Life, will continue to offer solutions to impact the way we deliver art education online (Interview, May 1, 2007). Faculty who were interviewed expressed a need for policy decisions from the field of art education that are supportive of distance education initiatives (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty I, Interview, May 1, 2007). A unified policy would frame the importance of this topic, and help other art educators learn from established best practices.

Results from both the initial case study and the survey study provide valuable recommendations for the leaders who wish to become involved in distance education. Those practices emphasize the need to include the technology-supportive art education faculty in leadership roles for the planning and implementation of technology innovations, and also emphasize the need to establish learning communities where faculty can collaborate, communicate, and support each other. In summary, the results provide insights to what art education faculty perceive as fundamental issues and barriers that hinder their efforts in achieving the goal of distance-delivered art education.
CHAPTER 10

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

My study examined the issues that shape faculty and administrator experiences with and perceptions of distance education. The initial chapters discussed the state of distance-delivered art education. Curriculum and instructional design, distance education technology, organizational change and leadership theory, and issues that impact faculty motivation provided the framework and guiding principles for the survey instrument, one-on-one interviews for the case study and data analysis. The following is a model of how these areas are interrelated (figure 10.1). All of these are factors that shape the adoption of distance education in the field of art education.
In the literature review, some researchers indicated that faculty had slightly positive perceptions of distance education (Clark, 1992) and had intrinsic motivation to participate in distance education (Berge, 1998; Betts, 2001). In exploring faculty philosophical positions toward teaching and distance education, Jones et al. (2002) also concluded that the majority of faculty members were not philosophically opposed to distance education. The qualitative and quantitative findings of my survey appear not to support this view. However, the participants in the one-on-one interviews who had significant experience with distance education confirmed the findings in the literature. Thus it becomes clear that since most of the respondents to the survey had little or no experience either teaching online or as an online student, the perception of the experience was significantly different from those who had previously taught online.
My survey participants from art education departments felt that distance education was not an appropriate method of instruction in comparison to faculty responses to the surveys discussed in the literature review. Art education faculty members were clear that their feelings towards distance education were not entirely positive. In comparison, the case study participants generally liked teaching online and did not have a preference between classroom or online teaching. Interviewees experienced advantages and disadvantages with both.

Perceptions of Distance Education

Art education faculty indicated a concern regarding the lack of interactivity in the online classroom. In traditional classrooms, students communicate with instructors and each other both through body language and verbally. Perceptions of distance education, as indicated by written open-ended responses, suggested that art education faculty did not have much regard for distance education nor saw its merits or applicability to their course areas and the field of art education as a whole.

The distance education environment, through online discussions and email as the vehicles of communication, has fewer visual and practically no oral cues. This makes communication more challenging for both art education students and instructors (Faculty D, Interview, April 26, 2007). Therefore, messages are more likely to be misunderstood and create confusion in a distance learning environment, thereby contributing to frustration (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).
In addition, online communication tends to be more impersonal, and students do not really know who their teachers are, what they look like or the sound of their voice (Jones et al., 2001). As discussed in an earlier chapter, Jones (2001) stated that online communication lacks the psychological fulfillment of face-to-face communication. According to Jones, students in Internet classes tend to feel more isolated, lonely, and depressed. All of this is likely to reduce the effectiveness of distance education.

Distance education communication can be equally frustrating for art education faculty. In order to maintain supportive, facilitating relationships with their students, faculty members need to understand student problems with distance education. Art education faculty need to learn how to ascertain the needs of and appropriately respond to students in a distance education environment. Managing student expectations and behavior in an online classroom can be more challenging than in a traditional classroom. McKenzie et al. (2001) identified managing volatility as one such challenge based on experiences from online distance education courses. They observed that student outbursts and complaints are easier to handle in face-to-face classrooms because of vocal cues and body language that enhance communication and guide appropriate responses.

In online classrooms, these cues are absent and the instructor "has a less moderating presence in the class" (Jones et al., 2001, p.390). Further, they suggested that online classes that use asynchronous discussions tend to be more combustible than traditional classrooms, possibly as a result of students'
frustration with using the distance education technology and with factors related to the characteristics of distance learning students such as external domestic and career pressures. It may also be posited that online students might not feel as responsible for their actions as they would in traditional classroom settings where they are more visible. Ambiguity of email messages and delayed responses to email messages were cited as other possible source of miscommunication and frustration between faculty and students (Faculty E, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).

As discussed earlier, Rockwell et al. (2002) confirmed the notion that establishing relationships and social presence takes longer in an online environment than in face-to-face interaction. Establishing social presence is important in that it creates a sense of belonging, which in turn has been found to result in more positive experiences. One solution would be to create a structure similar to the Mostly Online Master’s Degree Program where students spend the first week together building relationships with each other and their professors.

Related to the issue of absence of face-to-face interaction is that of providing an atmosphere conducive to learning, which some faculty suggested was absent from the online classroom (Faculty H, Interview, April 26, 2007). This might also be due to technology and technology related issues. Participation and communication in a distance education course requires that an individual have some proficiency and comfort with using technology (Rockwell et al., 2002). The OSU Art Education Department is requiring students with minimal technical
proficiency to take an Introduction to Computers course as a prerequisite to admissions to the online program (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007).

As O’Quinn (2001) noted, student success in a distance education environment requires possession of appropriate skills to use equipment and technology. Similarly, art education faculty need to possess the technological competency to participate effectively in distance education courses. However, most faculty only have experience in traditional classroom instruction (O’Quinn, 2001). This was also found to be the case with the current study participants, most of whom indicated that they either had limited or no experience teaching in an online environment. Therefore, some faculty may lack the skills necessary to adapt their methods of teaching and delivery of course materials to formats suitable for online instruction, thereby reducing their effectiveness in the online classroom environment and their perception of teaching in such an environment. The lack of distance education teaching experience may also make their open-ended comments less well founded and uniformed.

Organizational Change

The model of change that was employed in this study has been the four step diagnostic model suggested by Connor and Lake (1994) as follows: 1. formulate a problem statement, 2. gather information, 3. analyze the information, and 4. derive suggestions for future actions. Perceptions of distance education as measured by the survey appeared to be negative, which might be an indication of a resistance or neutrality to change or a passive reaction to change.
as it relates to distance education. The majority of the respondents in this study had no direct experience participating in distance education. Some of the expressed negative perceptions toward distance education may be regarded as resistance due to the newness of the medium: resistance is a natural response to change and may exist even when a change is considered beneficial (Connor & Lake 1994). Other sources of resistance derive from the circumstances surrounding a change. Connor and Lake (1994) categorized such resistance as emanating from either lack of understanding or lack of acceptance.

Art education faculty without distance education teaching experience may lack the necessary information to feel confident about engaging in distance education. Furthermore, Connor and Lake (1994) suggested that lack of acceptance could be due to incompatibility of change with an individual's or organization's culture. Art education faculty who only have had experience in a traditional classroom may view distance education as incompatible with their values, as evidenced by data in the qualitative responses. Moreover, faculty regarded distance education as being inferior to traditional classroom instruction suggesting incompatibility. Another possible source of resistance outlined by Connor and Lake (1994) is the perception that a change will result in a threat to security, power, or self-confidence in ability to succeed in the face of a change.

Considering that distance education is a new medium of instruction for most faculty, new or different instructional strategies are needed. Betts (2001) suggested that in designing distance education courses faculty need to think outside the paradigm of traditional formats with which they are familiar. Methods
of evaluation in a traditional classroom, such as participation, may also not be directly applicable to the distance learning environment. Faculty are also faced with the problem of maintaining academic standards and ensuring that methods of evaluation are comparable.

In comparison to the survey data, the faculty interviewed in the case study had positive experiences with teaching online. The key theme was that in developing a distance education course, the content could not be forced into the infrastructure of the online environment. Assignments and activities need to be reevaluated for relevance in the online environment. Teaching via distance is not better or worse than teaching face-to-face, it is just different (Faculty A, Interview, April 26, 2007).

**Motivators and Barriers**

The three motivators which faculty who completed the survey rated the most important were release time for course development, teaching load reduction, and recognition for course development. Time, recognition and quality, therefore, appear to be key motivators for art education faculty participation in distance education. Berge (1998) suggested that when offering distance education, faculty workload is a primary factor that must be understood and taken into consideration. However, as noted by O’Quinn (2001), workload issues are issues of governance and thus imply that higher education institutions should adopt more flexible structures to adapt to the requirements of distance education.
Faculty in this study, both the survey and case study, used language that would encourage the use of peer support or group efforts in distance education development and implementation. Support may also derive from sources other than peer groups. Schifter (1999) outlined faculty support in distance education as course redesign, curriculum development, training, and media and technical support. Thus, faculty may still desire support other than from a group of peers.

Differences were found in the role of professional and personal incentives based on gender, with these factors having greater importance for females than for males. Females were more driven by intrinsic motivational factors, whereas males cited more extrinsic factors as motivators to participate in distance education. Distance education literature could not be found that directly supported this finding. However, it could be hypothesized that the observed gender differences in perceptions of incentives could be a reflection of different experiences in the workplace.

Barriers were identified as relating to time, technical issues, and administrative issues. Time was rated as being the most relevant barrier to art education faculty participation in distance education. In the previous section, time was identified as being a motivator to participation in distance education. Thus, time may be considered as both a motivator and a barrier in distance education adoption and participation. This is not contradictory to Betts’ 1998 study.

Technology limitations (Schifter et al., 2001) are another problem facing faculty who wish to participate in distance education. Many art education faculty
may not be familiar with or competent in the use of Internet technology. The lack of distance education or online teaching experience of the participants in this study supports this view. Analysis revealed that security of online materials and perceptions of a steep instructor learning curve for online course management were regarded as being technical barriers to participation in distance education.

Differences were observed in personal incentives to participate in distance education based on perceived technology skills. Additionally, based on the survey responses, a pattern of decreasing relevance of barriers overall was observed, as experience with distance education increased. It may be concluded that technical issues may be of greater importance to those less technologically competent or experienced. Another possible explanation is that the majority of faculty in this study had no experience teaching via distance education and thus would be unaware of or lack the experience of having to cope with technical difficulties in a distance education environment and therefore be unable or unwilling to express opinions regarding technical difficulties. Thus, teaching experience in distance education appeared to have a significant effect on how barriers to participation in distance education were perceived.

Administrative issues did not emerge as a dominant theme. Faculty neutrality toward administrative issues as barriers to participating in distance education might be a reflection of the composition of survey respondents who were predominantly full-time tenured faculty and therefore assumed to have security in their professional status.
Recommendations for Practice

My study found that art education faculty with distance education teaching experience held more positive perceptions of distance education. Therefore, it is recommended that such individuals could be used as leaders to share information and communicate organizational strategy regarding distance education initiatives throughout an institution. Exploring the relationships of individuals within a department, which these individuals have with other faculty in the organization, may provide valuable information for constructing models and affecting changes in distance education adoption.

There is a need for constructivist approaches to continue to be experimented with and new theory to be formed. Regardless of personal teaching philosophies, constructivism is relevant to learning as it involves negotiation, dialogue and exchange, and operates within the context of experience. In theory, the instructor delivering a distance education course adopts the role of learning facilitator. Connections, dialogue and community can be enhanced using constructivist approaches. Additionally, the requirement and expectation of collaboration and communication among students and instructors in a distance education environment also make a constructivist approach relevant.

It has also been suggested in the literature review that through using a constructivist approach, where the instructor serves as a facilitator, the learning experience can be customized to accommodate diverse student backgrounds and learning styles (Rossner-Merrill et al., 1998). During the faculty one-on-one
interviews, it was stated that implementation of constructivist principles has the potential to increase learning in the online classroom (Faculty G, Interview, April 26, 2007; Faculty H, Interview, April 2007). Constructivist principles can also be incorporated into instructional design in distance education.

Examples shared in the literature review demonstrate that constructivist principles can be incorporated in distance-delivered art education. Through flexibility and attention to student needs, instructors can apply theoretical constructs of constructivism to a distance education environment to increase the effectiveness and quality of delivery.

Even if one assumes that principles of effective practice in art education can be applied in a distance education environment, it still leaves unanswered the question of whether students actually do learn and whether using distance learning is as effective a vehicle for achieving educational objectives as traditional classroom instruction (Rossner-Merrill et al, 1998). Unfortunately, this question remains largely unresolved and could be examined in future research (Rossner-Merrill et al, 1998).

Within the organizational change context of distance education, it may be reasoned that providing organizational structures, communication, and information disseminating systems that can inform may reduce potential sources of resistance to change. Change leaders can impact art education faculty perceptions of distance education by providing adequate information regarding processes, peer support, and advantages of participating in distance education.
Change theory suggests that participation could be improved by increasing the perceived relative advantage of distance education (Connor & Lake, 1994). This could be achieved by conducting and publishing results of studies demonstrating improved student outcomes from integration of distance education into instruction and profiling stories of successful utilization of distance education. Complexity could be reduced by providing hands-on workshops and training for faculty, by adopting technologies that are simple to use, by providing training that makes distance education use appear easy, and by providing adequate technical support. Increasing pilots and systems tests of distance education could make art education faculty more likely to adopt the medium, especially if they are part of the decision-making process. Providing hands-on workshops and possibly practice sessions for conducting online courses could render distance education instruction less threatening to an instructor engaging in distance education for the first time.

Another option could be to make practice computer labs available for faculty use at their convenience and not limiting time to scheduled training sessions. This would provide opportunities for art education faculty to try or implement instructional strategies using distance education on a limited basis before full-scale implementation.

Recognizing and publicizing success stories of distance education courses could increase the opportunity to observe best practices, thereby making it more attractive for reluctant adopters. Another method that could be used to
increase visibility would be to provide faculty with the opportunity to participate as
guests or observers in existing online courses.

Increased faculty involvement in the decision-making process would raise
the level of understanding of the change process and lead to lower levels of
resistance to change. Berge (1998) was of the opinion that although faculty
should be aware of administrators' needs for technology, faculty should have
greater involvement in the decision-making process. It was felt that the process
of technology planning and implementation should be one of collaboration
between administrators and faculty and that adequate support and training
systems as well as financial resources and compensation should be provided for
distance education faculty. Similarly, administrators can make a positive impact
by empowering instructors to teach via distance education.

As institutions implement distance education programs, they will have to
take into account the reactions of those faculty not currently engaged in distance
education, who may need to adopt it, in order to avoid or minimize resistance to
change. As described in change theory, resistance arises from those whose jobs
are directly affected (Connor & Lake, 1994). Therefore, for any change effort to
be successful, management must foresee and neutralize any resistance that may
occur. As the primary disseminators of knowledge, therefore, faculty issues and
concerns need to be addressed if resistance is to be minimized and distance
education is to be successful. This is particularly true for institutions that are
trying to introduce distance education systems into traditional settings.
Currently, existing frameworks offer no universal solutions to the issues facing distance education implementation. Traditional thinking of organizations, as reflected in the description of survey participants in the open-ended question, was described as somewhat linear. These simple cause and effect relationships might be responsible for the failure of organizational change efforts.

Attention in my study has focused on faculty challenges and issues. As identified in the literature review and data collected, the primary hindrances to progress are not product and process innovation but innovation required to take full advantage of technologies. Connor and Lake (1994) suggested that in addition to technology development and transfer, organizations need to be aware of the importance of developing an organization's knowledge of innovations required for long-term organizational survival. Engaging technological innovation is not passive; rather most adopters tend to reinvent or adapt innovations to fit their particular situations.

If distance-delivered art education is to grow and be sustainable, institutions must adapt distance education technology to suit their particular situations. To facilitate the integration of distance education in art education, administrators and organizational leaders will need to identify, assess, and address issues relevant and pertinent to art education faculty adoption and acceptance of this medium. There are a myriad of factors that can influence faculty participation. Art education leaders will have to determine which factors are most relevant to their particular situation and adopt frameworks for analyzing
them as well as models for instituting policies that will accomplish their unique institutional goals.

Connor and Lake (1994) suggested that change is more effectively implemented by modifying or reducing restraining forces than increasing driving forces. To manage faculty workload more effectively, reallocation of teaching assignments, time, and money will be necessary. The emphasis on different types of strategies will vary from institution to institution. Connor and Lake (1994) suggest that organizations take into consideration their time constraints, the extensiveness of the changes that are to be made, the level of awareness, degree of commitment and belief in need for change of the target group in selecting appropriate strategies.
Driving forces:
Motivators
• Time
• Reduced workload
• Recognition
• Support

Positive perception
• Ability to reach wide audience
• Connect with geographically dispersed students
• Supports constructivist teaching

Technology
• Easy to use
• Training on demand
• Support networks

External forces
• Competition with other art education departments
• Pressure with the institution

Restraining forces:
Barriers
• Quality of course and student interaction is reduced
• Does not support sound pedagogical principles
• Lacks relevance to certain principles

Negative perception
• Time
• Not relevant
• Not interested

Technology
• Lack of experience

Figure 10.2: Forces that would impact adoption of distance-delivered art education.

Recommendations for Further Research

There are many options for continued research on this topic. A study could be conducted on other areas of the arts, such as art history, dance, studio arts, or theater, or on student learning outcomes. More case studies of individual departments could also provide rich information. Although there is similar research on characteristics of faculty and administrators who embrace distance education, there is little known about patterns of acceptance with respect to use of distance education. Further research is recommended that would include
heterogeneous groups of respondents in the design of the survey instrument to identify the gaps in issues between different groups of art education faculty that have various comfort levels in using technology.

Findings from such studies would provide strategies for art education faculty approaches to meet student and quality needs. In addition, these findings would help to understand why some faculty members embrace distance education while others are resistant to this technology. The individual concept or definition of technology integration can vary a great deal, which could be captured in additional one-on-one interviews.

Furthermore, findings from this study reveal the complex and intervening relationship between personal and environmental factors that influence the faculty's use and integration of distance education in teaching. Future research focusing on collecting data from the respondents through additional interviews, observations, and process mapping will contribute to exploring and proposing a model to illustrate the complex relationships among personal and environmental factors that influence the faculty use of distance education.

Conclusion

My study produced three products: an analysis and presentation of findings from research reviewed, the collection of data from the field to create theory, and a case study of a distance-delivered art education degree. Qualitative and quantitative research methods were applied to locate, analyze
and interpret the data collected through a systematic review of the literature on art education faculty and administrator perception of distance education.

My study provides a first look at art education faculty and administrators’ perceptions of and experience with distance education. It also has important implications given the heavy investment in technology infrastructure in distance education and the potential importance of the effective technology integration in art education.

Results from this study on the perceptions of art education faculty and administrators reveal the potential for compelling distance education courses. The Ohio State University Art Education Department is one of the leading departments in the country which offers distance education programs and courses. Due to the perception of low quality and need for face-to-face interaction, distance-delivered art education may continue to lag in comparison to other departments.

Additionally, the results provide insights to what distance education technology is used by art education faculty. It also identified perceptions, specifically fundamental motivators and barriers that hinder their efforts in achieving the goal of creating distance education opportunities in art education. In addition to the issues that were extracted from the qualitative and quantitative data, the literature review provided a compelling source of information on distance-delivered art education issues.

The data collected provides recommendations for the leaders who wish to create distance education programs or courses in art education. These
recommendations emphasize the need to include art education faculty who are using distance education technology in leadership roles for the planning and implementation of technology innovations, and also emphasize the need to establish learning communities where faculty can collaborate, communicate, and support each other.

Future research will continue the knowledge development and growth of distance-delivered art education. Other issues that need to be examined in future research are hardware and software difficulties, support, technology integration, and time, all of which have been extensively documented in the literature. Additional issues include administration decisions in policy making, rapid technology advancement, sustainable funding, students' technology proficiency, and the effect on students' learning.
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APPENDIX B

FACULTY INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE
Dear Art Education Faculty Member:

I am writing to request your participation in a survey of Art Education faculty and administrator perception of distance education. You will receive the survey via email in the next week.

Enrollments in distance education courses have been steadily increasing at colleges and universities. This increase has generated research and interest in distance education. As a doctoral student in Art Education at The Ohio State University working under the supervision of Dr. Patricia Stuhr, I am seeking to collect data about the perceptions of Art Education faculty and administrators towards distance education. This study’s findings may provide information on the necessary support structure, incentives, technology, and copyright issues that impact the success of distance education programs.

I would appreciate your participation in this study. The survey will be emailed to Art Education faculty and administrators in the United States as identified on their respective college or university website. If you have any questions, please contact me at burma.1@osu.edu.

Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

Sally Burma
Art Education
The Ohio State University
258 Hopkins Hall
128 N Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATOR INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE
Dear Art Education Program Chair or Dean:

I am writing to request your participation in a survey of Art Education faculty and administrator perceptions toward distance education. You will receive the survey via email in the next week.

Enrollments in distance education courses have been steadily increasing at colleges and universities. This increase has generated research and interest in distance education. As a doctoral student in Art Education at The Ohio State University working under the supervision of Dr. Patricia Stuhr, I am seeking to collect data about the perceptions of Art Education faculty and administrators towards distance education. This study’s findings may provide information on the necessary support structure, incentives, technology, and copyright issues that impact the success of distance education programs.

I would appreciate your participation in this study. The survey will be emailed to Art Education faculty and administrators in the United States as identified on their respective college or university website. If you have any questions, please contact me at burma.1@osu.edu.

Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

Sally Burma  
Art Education  
The Ohio State University  
258 Hopkins Hall  
128 N Oval Mall  
Columbus, OH 43210
Dear Art Education Faculty Member:

Last week you received an email from me regarding participation in a survey of faculty and administrator attitudes toward distance education. Here is the link to the survey: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=624093208910

I am a doctoral student in the Art Education program at The Ohio State University working under the supervision of Dr. Patricia Stuhr, Chair of the Art Education Department. I am interested in collecting information on faculty members’ and administrators’ attitudes, experiences and willingness to use or support distance education.

I am writing to request your participation in this study because you are a faculty member in Art Education in the United States. Your participation entails completing the attached survey, which takes approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. The survey will remain open until February 27 at 11:00pm est.

The study will identify factors that are important in supporting faculty in distance learning initiatives and provide insight into ways to enhance communication between faculty and administrators. Your participation in the study is voluntary and there are no known risks to your participation.

Any information obtained from your answers will be kept strictly confidential. The information you submit will not be shared with anyone with your name or identity attached. I will protect your confidentiality by using a software program that only I have access to. The data collected from this study could be used in reports, presentations, and publications, but you will never be individually identified.

By completing the survey, you freely agree to participate in this research study. You should consent only if you have read the previous or it has been read to you and you understand its contents. If you have questions about the research, you may contact me at burma.1@osu.edu.

You may request an executive summary of this study to be emailed to you after the data is complied.

Thank you,

Sally Burma
Art Education
The Ohio State University
258 Hopkins Hall
128 N Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
APPENDIX E

ADMINISTRATOR LETTER OF PARTICIPATION
Dear Art Education Administrator:

Last week you received an email from me regarding participation in a survey of faculty and administrator attitudes toward distance education. Here is the link to the survey: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=767923208815

I am a doctoral student in the Art Education program at The Ohio State University working under the supervision of Dr. Patricia Stuhr, Chair of the Art Education Department. I am interested in collecting information on faculty members’ and administrators’ attitudes, experiences and willingness to use or support distance education.

I am writing to request your participation in this study because you are an administrator in Art Education in the United States. Your participation entails completing the attached survey, which takes approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. The survey will remain open until February 27 at 11:00pm est.

The study will identify factors that are important in supporting faculty in distance learning initiatives and provide insight into ways to enhance communication between faculty and administrators. Your participation in the study is voluntary and there are no known risks to your participation.

Any information obtained from your answers will be kept strictly confidential. The information you submit will not be shared with anyone with your name or identity attached. I will protect your confidentiality by using a software program that only I have access to. The data collected from this study could be used in reports, presentations, and publications, but you will never be individually identified.

By completing the survey, you freely agree to participate in this research study. You should consent only if you have read the previous or it has been read to you and you understand its contents. If you have questions about the research, you may contact me at burma.1@osu.edu.

You may request an executive summary of this study to be emailed to you after the data is complied.

Thank you for your participation and support,

Sally Burma
Art Education
The Ohio State University
258 Hopkins Hall
128 N Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
APPENDIX F

FACULTY SURVEY
FACULTY SURVEY

1. Please indicate the name of your institution:
2. Please indicate your gender:
3. Please indicate your age range:
4. Please identify the highest degree you have earned:
5. Please indicate the number of full-time faculty in your program? Please indicate the number of part-time and/or adjunct faculty in your program?
6. How many years have you been employed in post-secondary education? And, how many years have you been employed at your institution?
7. What degrees does your program offer? (BA, MA, PHD, etc)
8. What are the top 3-5 goals for your program/ department?
9. How are curriculum and budget decisions made within your department? And, at the college or university you teach at?
10. What are the top 3-5 reasons why you choose education as a profession?
11. What are the emerging important focai in art education (visual culture, technology, multiculturalism, assessment, etc)? What is their place in your program?
12. What is the theoretical orientation of your program toward art education i.e., DBAE or other content based art education, interdisciplinary, creativity or talent oriented, or studio based, etc?
13. Is distance-delivered art education important to society? Should it be?
14. What are the top 3-5 motivators that impact your decision to teach a distance education course?
15. When did your program first offer distance education courses?
16. Have you ever taught a distance education course? If yes, what have you taught?
17. Have you ever taken a course via distance education? If yes, how would you rate your experience as a distance education student?
18. How did your experience compare to in-classroom courses you have taken?
19. How would you describe your experience teaching a distance education course?
20. How much preparation time did you spend compared to classroom-based courses you have taught?
21. Please describe the types of technology your department uses to deliver distance education courses.
22. What art education courses can be taught effectively via distance education?
23. What art education courses cannot be taught effectively via distance education?
Please report the choice that best describes your agreement or disagreement with the statement

5 - Strongly agree, 4 - Agree, 3 – Neutral, 2- Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree, N/A
- No experience with this area

24. Art education will need to embrace distance education to compete with other programs within my college/ university.
25. Art education will need to embrace distance education to compete with other art education programs at colleges/ universities in the U.S.
26. Distance education will play a critical role in the long-term success of my institution.
27. I believe the college/ university I am a part of is supportive of distance education initiatives.
28. My college/ university has adequate student support services (i.e. advising, registration, advising) in place for distance education students.
29. My college/ university has adequate faculty support services (i.e. technology, training) in place for distance education faculty.
30. Recognition by superiors or peers is a motivating factor for faculty to be involved in distance education.
31. A reduced teaching load supports faculty involvement in distance education.
32. Additional time to develop distance education supports faculty involvement.
33. An additional stipend increases faculty involvement in distance education.
34. Heavy teaching load is a barrier for faculty involvement in distance education.
35. The lack of financial reward is a barrier to faculty involvement in distance education.
36. Insufficient technical knowledge is a barrier to faculty involvement in distance education.
37. Distance education is an effective way to deliver post-secondary degree art education courses.
38. Art education has greater challenges in creating distance education courses due to copyright law.
APPENDIX G

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY
1. Please indicate the name of your institution:
2. Please indicate your gender:
3. Please indicate your age range:
4. Please identify the highest degree you have earned:
5. Please indicate the number of full-time faculty in your program? Please indicate the number of part-time and/or adjunct faculty in your program?
6. How many years have you been employed in post-secondary education? And, how many years have you been employed at your institution?
7. What degrees does your program offer? (BA, MA, PHD, etc)
8. What are the top 3-5 goals for your program/department?
9. How are curriculum and budget decisions made within your department? And, at the college or university you teach at?
10. What are the top 3-5 reasons why you choose education as a profession?
11. What are the emerging important focii in art education (visual culture, technology, multiculturalism, assessment, etc)? What is their place in your program?
12. What is the theoretical orientation of your program toward art education i.e., DBAE or other content based art education, interdisciplinary, creativity or talent oriented, or studio based, etc?
13. Is distance-delivered art education important to society? Should it be?
14. What are the top 3-5 motivators that impact your decision to teach a distance education course?
15. What is the total number of distance education courses your department has offered? How many are currently offered?
16. How many faculty members in your program teach distance education courses?
17. When did your program first offer distance education courses?
18. Have you ever taught a distance education course? If yes, what have you taught?
19. How many students are currently enrolled in distance education courses in your program?
20. Have you ever taken a course via distance education? If yes, how would you rate your experience as a distance education student?
21. How did your experience compare to in-classroom courses you have taken?
22. How would you describe your experience teaching a distance education course?
23. How much preparation time did you spend compared to classroom-based courses you have taught?
24. Please describe the types of technology your department uses to deliver distance education courses.
25. What art education courses can be taught effectively via distance education?
26. What art education courses cannot be taught effectively via distance education?

Please report the choice that best describes your agreement or disagreement with the statement:

5 - Strongly agree, 4 - Agree, 3 - Neutral, 2 - Disagree, 1 - Strongly Disagree, N/A - No experience with this area

27. Art education will need to embrace distance education to compete with other programs within my college/university.

28. Art education will need to embrace distance education to compete with other art education programs at colleges/universities in the U.S.

29. Distance education will play a critical role in the long-term success of my institution.

30. I believe the college/university I am a part of is supportive of distance education initiatives.

31. My college/university has adequate student support services (i.e. advising, registration, advising) in place for distance education students.

32. My college/university has adequate faculty support services (i.e. technology, training) in place for distance education faculty.

33. Recognition by superiors or peers is a motivating factor for faculty to be involved in distance education.

34. A reduced teaching load supports faculty involvement in distance education.

35. Additional time to develop distance education supports faculty involvement.

36. An additional stipend increases faculty involvement in distance education.

37. Heavy teaching load is a barrier for faculty involvement in distance education.

38. The lack of financial reward is a barrier to faculty involvement in distance education.

39. Insufficient technical knowledge is a barrier to faculty involvement in distance education.

40. Distance education is an effective way to deliver post-secondary degree art education courses.

41. Art education has greater challenges in creating distance education courses due to copyright law.
APPENDIX H

U.S. COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEGREE GRANTING ART EDUCATION PROGRAMS
**U.S. COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEGREE GRANTING ART EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bank Street College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Buffalo State College, SUNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Carlow University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Columbia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Fitchburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kutztown University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mansfield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Maryville University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Miami University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Minnesota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>North Georgia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Piedmont College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Pratt Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Rhode Island College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>School of the Art Institute Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>School of Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>State University of New York (SUNY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Teachers College, Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Temple University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Towson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The University of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts Dartmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>University of West Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Western Kentucky University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Winthrop University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Wright State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>University South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>North Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

DOCUMENT-BASED CONTENT ANALYSIS
# CONTENT-ANALYSIS CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Berge</th>
<th>Betts</th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>McKenzie</th>
<th>O'Quinn</th>
<th>Rockwell</th>
<th>Schifter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey/Responses</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty had</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and job security concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about faculty workload</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of merit pay or monetary support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time taken away from research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal working conditions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal motivation to use technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-gratification</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual challenge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role modeling and peer observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit towards tenure and promotion; recognition of work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in salary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of DE and what will work at a distance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of student interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate for traditional-aged students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about course quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to develop and maintain course material</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to get students more involved with technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collegial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of grants for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, expenses, design &amp; development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge of where to go for assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in recruiting faculty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow action on critical issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial support and recognition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative encouragement and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated by technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to innovation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of systems reliability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing effective technology skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate hardware and software</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to use technology more innovatively to enhance course quality and develop new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copyright</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of intellectual property rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR QUALITATIVE DATA
1. Please indicate the name of your institution:

University of Tennessee           University of Arizona
Miami University               Kent State University
The Pennsylvania State University Minnesota State University
University of Cincinnati        The Ohio State University
West Virginia University        Rhode Island School of Design
University of North Texas       University of Illinois at Urbana
Kutztown university             SUNY at New Paltz
Harvard Graduate School - Arts in Education
Indiana University              Towson University
University of Georgia           Fitchburg State College
Florida State University        Florida State University
NYU                             Maryville University, St Louis
University of Texas at Austin   Towson University
Columbia College Chicago         University of Memphis
University of South Carolina    Boise State University
Buffalo State                   Arizona State University

2. Please indicate your gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate your age range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please identify the highest degree you have earned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MFA</th>
<th>Ed.D.</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Please indicate the number of full-time faculty in your program? Please indicate the number of part-time and/or adjunct faculty in your program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT/Adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How many years have you been employed in post-secondary education? And, how many years have you been employed at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What degrees does your program offer? (BA, MA, PHD, etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA/BS</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>Ed.D./Ph.D.</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What are the top 3-5 goals for your program/ department?

Faculty Responses:

Our program is in flux. Therefore the goals have not been clearly worked out as 'program' goals agreed upon by all program faculty. Nevertheless, these goals seem to be: 1. Teacher Education of K-12 Art Teachers [Undergraduate & Graduate Certification]. 2. Preparation of graduate students as researchers in
art education/curriculum & instruction and as post-secondary art educators through the Ph. D. program. 3. Delivery of courses to Masters in Art Education students. 4. Professional development classes for in-service teachers. [Three and four are currently far behind one & two in terms of our attention.] We have a new faculty member who was brought in to develop a museum art education component of our program. It is hoped that this will become a new goal [probably 3 or 4 on the list]. My interest is in the possibilities of art learning online, and would like to see this to also be high on the list.

Serve the state of Georgia by preparing teachers for contemporary classrooms that meet the needs the all students and allow all students to succeed historical and contemporary issues in art education; teaching as reflective practice; language that is specific to art, visual culture, education, and art education; technology; opportunities for continuous professional and intellectual growth; interdisciplinarity; critical pedagogy; varied teaching and assessment strategies to help diverse learners; diversity of social, emotional, cognitive, and physical characteristics of learners; inquiry in visual culture; and collaboration with colleagues and communities.

Help prepare artists to success in life as artists. Provide an environment that contributes to that goal.

Prepare outstanding (1) art teachers, (2)art museum educators, and (3)community-based art educators at the undergraduate, and graduate levels. The top goals for the art education masters’ degree program are the following: 1. Provide a scholarly approach to the theory and pedagogy of art education; 2. Provide the coursework and clinical experiences necessary for State of Illinois art certification; 3. Provide skills that will enable our students to be successful, and effective art educators.

1. Recruitment of top students 2. Enhancing learning 3. Hiring qualified and successful faculty

1. Pass NASAD review. 2. Rewrite part of curriculum. 3. New hire.

1. Train first-rate art educators for public and private schools 2. Conduct meaningful research that contributes to the body of knowledge in art education 3. Provide personal and professional service to the community and the profession through advocacy, leadership and involvement in professional organizations,

General Program Description: Teaching art in the elementary and secondary schools or community settings requires a broad general knowledge of visual art and culture, creative pedagogy, and diverse educational concepts and methodologies. Combining studies in studio art, art history, and education the
art education program fosters multicultural awareness, art education advocacy, and school and community collaboration in K-12 arts learning. While developing solid theoretical foundations art education students participate in formal, community based, and service learning teaching environments to cultivate a reflective art teaching practice.

Contribute to the development of creative endeavors. Assist students as they seek out fields of study. Prepare artists and art historians who wish to continue their study and prepare for a vocation in the arts.

Criticality & socially/culturally responsive Broad vision of 'art' and sites of art education Agents of change, moving the practice and profession Bringing together ART/CONTEXT/REFLECTIVE PRACTICE Interdisciplinarity & collaborativity

prep of art teachers for p-12 teaching prep of doctoral students for higher ed portions in art education managing resources for above two adding faculty for 1 and 2

I don't know.

We are currently working on vision and mission for our program (we are not a department).

Train art teachers. Certify art teachers. Service the community.

We are currently reformulating our central goals.

Our Humanities Department is one that mostly fulfills Liberal Arts and Science requirements for other departments. We have an interdisciplinary major and our art faculty's hopes are to establish an art major within 5-10 years. We would like to see dual licensure in Art Ed as part of our new major. academic? Easier to get them from the website. Go to FSU.edu and follow the links to art education.

To provide students with the skill, processes and content for effectively teaching in urban and suburban schools with diverse student populations. To provide breadth and depth in concepts and skills of a variety of media. Prepare students for graduate study. Engage students in the design, development, and implementation of innovative art-based initiatives to support community outreach.

Produce a well rounded student.

Educate the BFA and MAT students to enter the profession with the appropriate knowledge, skills, and experiences for success. Further the education of the
MA and IMA students to engage in research and scholarship. For all students: Becoming a leader within their school or institution.

train for new advisement requirements  course revisions  accreditation for ncate & nasad

To educate critical thinkers and socially conscious advocates of the arts. To improve the art teaching standards in the state of Arizona. To create excellent teachers committed to saving lives through the arts

1. To prepare preservice art teachers, museum educators and arts administrators to be ready for the beginning of their careers. 2. To prepare preservice art teachers, museum educators and art administrators with the foundation to continue to learn about education theory & practice, visual art & design content, and to be socially response to their students. 3. To encourage the above mentioned population of students to continue to be practicing arts & designers.

Administrator Responses:

Our College of Education's conceptual framework is based upon educators as leaders. Our goal in the art education program reflects the NAEA standards for teacher preparation: 1.Content of art: Help all art education students strengthen their content and pedagogical knowledge in order to foster confidence and leadership qualities. 2.Knowledge of Students: Demonstrate effective leadership qualities by establishing a relationship with students that fosters an atmosphere of acceptance and respect for all learners 3.Curriculum: Design curriculum that engages and supports age appropriate learning and current art educational theories 4.Instruction: Engage in practical instructional field and internship experience 5.Assessment: Learn and practice creating art assessment tools, such as portfolios and rubrics that are equitable and utilize higher-order learning 6.Personal Responsibility: Involvement with professional development, such as NAEA and TAEA, and volunteer experiences, such as Full Service Schools, Very Special Needs Festival, etc.

1. To create an exemplary learning environment for graduate and undergraduate students that prepares them for productive careers in art education. 2. To support instruction in art education that encourages the construction of meaning through interpretation, aesthetic inquiry, historical research, and art making. 3. To support art teacher candidates to engage their students and themselves in curiosity and pursuit of knowledge through their own research and instruction. 4. To enable graduates to contribute to the continuing growth and strength of the art education profession throughout their careers. 5. To support faculty in engaging in meaningful and influential research, practice, publication and service to the field of art, education, the department, school, university and community.
Urban Art Education  Contemporary Art  Community engagement  International initiatives

Access  Pursuit of Excellence  Regional and International Service  Prominence

Studying multidisciplinary application of the arts in various educational settings; examining the possibilities of 'learning in and through the arts'; encouraging students toward jobs in museums, community art centers, theater ed depts, classrooms, nonprofit arts development offices, etc.; using arts as cognitive tools in various curricula; moving students to take leadership in infusing arts in education world; taking students to an understanding of research and policy

9. How are curriculum and budget decisions made within your department? And, at the college or university you teach at?

Faculty responses:

This is a faculty governed institution. Therefore, money is turned over to the faculty of Curriculum & Instruction, who -through the Policy Council made up of faculty, determine where certain amounts will go. There are also monies made available through the Dean's office to special projects which faculty may propose and the Dean either approve or veto. [For example, 100,000 was earmarked for use in recruiting more international Students. The members of the School of Education's International Committee. Proposals for several possible ways to use the money towards the intended goal were put forth and all but a small $8,000 proposition were approved. Also, when faculty became concerned that some of the classroom technologies were becoming outdated, a group of interested faculty [including me] and the technology personnel were able to convince the provost's office & Dean to set aside 1/2 million dollars per year over the next four
years to equip several classrooms per semester with up-to-date technology. The
two art rooms and one math room on the C & I floor were among the first to
receive these improvements. Within our small 'program'-which is a sub-division of
C & I, we have a considerable amount of money from Saturday School. The
faculty of our program have jurisdiction over how that will be used - usually for
supplies, visuals, etc. - so long as the use of the money complies with regulations
of the School of Education accounting.

The art education area is in the School of Art. The School is the department
level. The School is part of the College of Arts and Sciences, which is a division
of the University.

Head of the school of visual arts and the Art Education Chair make budget
decisions. Curriculum is determined by individual faculty teaching a course, or in
more general terms, but the entire faculty through consensus.

By the people in charge of those decisions.

Art education faculty members meet regularly to discuss these issues, we review
curriculum, exchange syllabi, and discuss discretionary budget items. Some
decisions are made for us at higher levels in which case we accept them or
advocate for changes.

Finite curriculum decisions are made by the individual instructors for their specific
courses. General curriculum decisions are 'suggested' by the college
administration and department chairs. General budget decisions are made at
the administrative level, and specific budget decisions/requests are controlled by
the department chairperson.

Department: Departmental Chair and appointed committees. University: Don't
know.

Made by committee within the dept.

Dean's level (college).

The overall curriculum is conceived by the faculty working together. The
curriculum must meet criteria set by the state for professional licensure of our
graduates. Syllabi outline the content of courses, but it up to the individual
professor to develop the specific content of the course. Our department is in the
School of the Arts.

Curriculum changes are drafted by faculty/program directors and then go to the
curriculum committees in the department of art, college of arts and sciences and
then the university level. If needed, such as our recent cancellation of the BA--
they also go before the state board of education. For budget matters there are
myriad processes--again faculty/program directors advocate for funds for
equipment, supplies etc through an appropriate hierarchy. Faculty to Chair of
Dept, and then upwards if possible.

Faculty propose changes or adaptations to the department. If there are any
conflicts, a committee will discuss the issues. Then, program revisions are sent
to the College, University, then state system. We are part of a multi-university
unionized organization with one chancellor. We have a lot of 'hoops'. However,
there are seldom problems. It just takes a year to change anything.

This is a technical question. It depends upon how monies will be used. Some go
for faculty salary, some for student and faculty travel, some go for office supplies,
some go for bringing in faculty from other places to teach a course or be a guest
speaker, some goes for nation-wide searches in the event we have a new faculty
position open and so forth.

Curriculum by the faculty, budget by administrators

Chair of art ed in consultation with art ed faculty makes some decisions    director
of school in consultation with exec committee makes most decisions    budget for
school determined by dean

The Chair and the appropriate committees (undergraduate, graduate, executive)

Depends on what the decision is and at what level. Curriculum is originated by
program, reviewed by school or department and then by a College curriculum
committee with final approval by faculty Senate. Art Education has a small
budget with more resources controlled by the School of Visual Arts; other
budgets are controlled at the College level or by central administration.

The director makes budget decisions. The chair of the art department allocates
funds.

Curriculum decisions are proposed by programs, and reviewed at the school,
college, and university levels. I don't know how budget decisions are made.

We have a department curriculum committee, and courses that are approved are
then passed along to the college curriculum committee. The budget issues are
decided within the department. Our budget has remained relatively low for ages
and most of the art money goes for supplies for studio classes.
Curriculum: by committee then to the chair then to the dean and the university oversight committees. Budget is in the hands of the chair and the dean.

We have an advisory and curriculum committee consisting of program chairs. Program coordinators work with department chair to develop budget.

Deans and directors

All decisions are made in collaboration. Full time faculty and the Chair of the Department collaborate to provide a budget that is appropriate for our needs. Decisions about curriculum are faculty driven.

Curriculum requests move through: departmental curriculum committee, department chair, dean, senate curriculum committee budget requests move through: chair, dean, provost
Faculty in the art education program are responsible for curricular decisions. Budget is determined by student credit hours and full-time equivalents in each area. Budgets are determined and then allocated by unit - School of Art.

Within Dept: Head of Department, in consultation with fulltime and part-time faculty. College: Instruction Committee, senior staff

NOT SURE.

Administrator Responses:

We have a large department: Theory and Practice in Teacher Education. We submit our instructional budget to our instructional team leader and she/he submits it to our department head. Within the art education area, I work with the two part time lecturers to discuss their budgetary needs and do most of the ordering and going to stores to purchase supplies. I too am a lecturer and coordinate the art education area. Changes in the art education curriculum begin with our discussing a new concept and/or idea and then I submit suggested changes to the department head. She places it online for comments by departmental faculty, and then reviews it. Following her approval, the curriculum change is rewritten and officially submitted to the CRC (Curriculum Review Committee).

We follow state and university purchasing and financial guidelines. In addition, the department under the leadership of the chair, places priority on supporting student research and travel, community projects, faculty research and travel as well as daily costs of the department.
Curriculum is up to the program and is approved at higher levels. The budget is very small and requires few decisions handled by the faculty. We are a program in the School of Art, not a stand alone department with fiscal responsibilities. The school director and dean handle most financial decisions, with some consultation of faculty.

At the programmatic, divisional, school, and university levels (but mainly in the legislature and system offices).

Curriculum is coordinated by faculty director of program, master’s programs committee, and associate deans for prog devel and curriculum at HGSE. (We are one of 13 EdM programs at HGSE.) Budgets allocated by financial overseers of all 13 progs.

10. What are the top 3-5 reasons why you choose education as a profession? And, what are your 3-5 personal teaching goals?

[Bar chart showing responses]

**Faculty responses:**

Why I chose this profession: 1. I am curious about lots of things in the world - cultures, art, archeology, astronomy, theology, psychology, etc. No one career seemed to satisfy my desire to know all sorts of things - except teaching. Because I especially loved art, and found that it drew upon knowledges and demanded knowing in all areas - that became my career goal [after an unsatisfying stab at museum work--too much hierarchy there, which I found to thwart curiosity and intellectual growth]. 2. I liked having ‘freedom’ in the summers to pursue learning adventures along lines that interested me, without being concerned whether or not these necessarily fit with the requirements of my ‘work’. 3. I am, on the one hand, concerned about some of the problems of the world - intolerance or indifference to the plight of others, the disregard & destruction of the environmental, etc. as one voice, there is little that I can do to
make a difference in the world, but as an educator of many people - and by being an active advocate of those things I believe in through professional participation & leadership - perhaps some difference can be made. Three -Five Personal Teaching Goals: 1. To prepare/inspire teachers to be excellent in terms of their knowledge of the field, the student, and society, in terms of their pedagogic skills, and in terms of their dedication to the profession as leaders who make a difference in the world. 2. To be awake and aware of the changes and challenges of life in the 21st century. This means being aware of the human/cultural/physical impact on the earth; being aware of how changes in the physical world of natural, cultural & social environments and technological possibilities impact who we are and what is possible to know, do, and be. 3. To inspire teachers to imagine ways of guiding youth to make wise, careful and caring decisions and to act on those decisions in the future.

Teaching inquiry through art. Visual inquiry is a critical part of teaching for transformation and teaching for reinventing the social sculpture. These are my teaching goals

I am good at it. I enjoy and need the social/intellectual interactions

I chose art education as a profession because it best put to practice skills that I had and interests that I had developed through related experiences. My teaching goals are to prepare students for an exciting and meaningful life in art education.

My reasons for choosing art education are the following: 1. I have always wanted to be a teacher; my mother wrote in a letter for my nomination for the Kane County Educator of the Year, that I would come home from kindergarten, and gather my sister and brother and teach them everything that happened to me that day in school. 2. In college, the minute I started my art classes and art ed methods courses I knew this was the right path. . .the 'fit was perfect'. 3. Finally, to quote Eisner, I have 'connoisseurship', I love the arts and I have a unique ability to teach the arts. My personal goals for teaching art have evolved over the past 38 years. My initial goals revolved around working in the arts, art production and teaching students to appreciate the arts and learn about the arts. My intermediate goals in art revolved around trying to achieve the mastery of teaching high school students. I enjoyed the challenge of the age-level, the wonder of their remarkable ability to create, and the constant learning of new skills to refine my craft of teaching art. My final personal goal for teaching is to share my wonderful teaching career with new art educators, to assist them in developing a passion for teaching and to instill in them the desire to change lives through the arts.
1. I enjoy being a lifelong learner  2. I want to encourage lifelong learning in others.  3. Teachers are the smartest people in the world.  1. Enhance current research  2. Enhance student learning  3. Stay abreast of current research

1. Pays the bills.  2. Allows working as artist.  3. To be surrounded by art.  1. Survive until retirement.  2. Improve every year.  3. Lighter workload (3/2 as goal).

1. Intellectual stimulation, 2. I always enjoyed going to college; I turned that enjoyment into a career, 3. I enjoy teaching, 4. financial security  1. to produce excellent art teachers, 2. to advance my own knowledge in the field of art education, 3. to publish my own pedagogical discoveries.

It is a very intellectually stimulating environment to work in. I can focus on my research and teaching interests within a broader system of education. The fabulous flexible schedule and newness of each term/year.

Initially, I chose education because my family is full of teachers. However, after teaching a year I knew this was a good profession for me. I wish to develop future art educators who have a passion for creating art and communicating this to students. I want my students to feel prepared and to understand what it means to offer an inclusive and multi-faceted art environment to their students.

1. My father forced me into it. I did not 'choose' it.  1. To be a good teacher  2. To be a good researcher.  3. To give back to the community I serve

To educate for a participatory democracy. To serve as an agent of change for social justice. To engage people in art as an agent of change for social justice.

Why chose profession: love art, love people, mom thought I'd be a good teacher and she was right. Teaching goals: professional growth in all kinds of ways, developing new courses or course improvement, making my teaching relevant and engaging to students

I believe education is the way to create change and work toward equality and justice. I enjoy the process of learning and teaching in an environment that supports exploration. To prepare students to be contributors to the world. To challenge students to see their cultural make-up in order to recognize the joy of diversity. To encourage students to be critical investigators

9a)To make a difference in human lives.  9b) to engage students in learning

Love teaching and working with students. Income Personal Teaching goal: Make visual art a viable literacy.
I chose education as a profession because I value knowledge and teaching. My central goals as a teacher are to empower students through new ideas and experiences. I do not see my role as a teacher as transmitting knowledge, but encouraging students to actively create their own knowledge.

I love to teach and to excite students about art, whether art that they make or art history. I hope to excite more students to study abroad and to design an art major that would satisfy students at my college so that they would not have to go elsewhere for that major. We would like to see dual licensure in Art Ed as part of our new major.

I want to make the world better. I feel, given my skills and aptitudes, I can best do this through art education. I want to educate students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels to be successful in their careers and in their lives.

Loved working with youth, loved working with people, loved art. I like knowing I can make a difference. I believe when you are given a gift or talent, you have to give back to society.

Help individuals understand their personal resource share knowledge and experience advance the field teaching goals are the same

I decided to become an art teacher in the 3rd grade. I loved teaching art and have taught in K-12 settings. I returned to graduate school and fully enjoyed the intellectual involvement of conducting research and teaching in higher education. Goals: To prepare the next generation of teachers to make good instructional decisions. To instill in our students a sense of what it takes to be a professional. To help students make the transition into the profession (attending conferences, making presentations, and becoming leaders within their schools).

Liked art had aptitude for art wanted to be in social setting working with people develop student interest in research develop teachers as intellectuals in grad school develop student skills in reading and writing

I can’t possibly think of anything else I’d rather do.

Why Education 1. I am a social person and the idea of being solo in the studio didn’t interest me. 2. I am also an idealist who feels change/ transformation can occur to help make a better world and education is a venue that can be used to accomplish that. 3. Steady income 4. Summers/holidays as perks Personal Teaching Goals 1. To share my experience and knowledge at the elementary level with preservice art teachers 2. To continue to learn from my students...keep me excited and passionate about the field 3. To be a role model
for gay/lesbian students who also may be the first person in their family to go and graduate from college

NOTHING BETTER TO DO AT 19

My personal teaching goals are: 1.to inculcate in students a desire to never stop learning 2.to help students set for themselves the highest possible standards of achievement 3. to help students prepare themselves to participate in classroom teaching for a population whose diversity is multi-faceted

Administrator responses:

Profession: 1.I have always been a teacher. 2. It combines my love for art and my love for teaching. 3. Sometimes I think that 'it' chose me. Education just always seems to come back to me as a profession. I once tried to become a librarian, and teaching art still came back:) Personal teaching goals: 1. Share with others how teaching can be in synchronicity to life--how they are one and the same...not really a profession, but a way of living 2. Foster life long learning in others through hopefully sharing my passion, and through my assignments, lectures, etc. 3. Help to develop leadership qualities through reading, researching and practice

1. I thrive on learning, discovering, and thinking in different ways. I have held many different jobs over my life, I think because I get bored easily. But teaching is like a new job every semester and I learn and discover so much daily through the challenges, varied personalities, approaches, and belief systems of my students. 2. It is an empowering profession, but I try to not let that go to my head. But, I never tire of the joy of seeing that my efforts have made a difference in the lives of people. 3. I love schools and the fact that there are so many 'experts' literally everywhere who can either answer my questions or send me in a good direction for help. 4. I believe so strongly in the power of visual art to promote thinking, learning and knowing. The job, the goals, and the daily highs and lows make getting up in the morning a blessing every day.

Desire to make a difference, love of interacting with students and hope to use art to empower different groups. My teaching goals are to sensitize students in art education to their responsibility and to the possibility of using art as a critical tool for social reconstruction.

1.Working with people 2. Creating art 3. Professional networking  ditto

At first, to provide time for my research/creative work  Afterwards, to make sure something good happened. My teaching goals are about the same.
I came out of the MFA Iowa Writers' Workshop poetry program with no professional aspirations, only strong creative and vague social-action aspirations. Taught p-t English at various Boston-area schools (art schools, prison progs) till, sick of it all, I applied for full-time admin work at Harvard and by happenstance ended up at HGSE. My top 3-5 reasons are difficult to discern: 1. poetic passion; 2. escape from commercial work world; 3. attraction to alternative university constituency; 4. security of work at Harvard; 5. and social action in my work here at HGSE for a prog that advocates a social justice approach as well as in my moonlighting English teaching job for the Boston Univ. prison ed prog.

11. What are the emerging important focai in art education (visual culture, technology, multiculturalism, assessment, etc)? What is their place in your program?

Faculty responses:

Again, please realize that I can only speak for myself here because there is not a consensus yet in our program about what is to be the important foci of our program. Therefore, I can only say what 'I' think our focus should be and what I am arguing for as issues of focus being considered. First; I think we must move past visual culture-which was an important benchmark alone the path, but can no longer sustain the urgency of the future needs. Art and artists must reclaim a role as leaders in drawing attention to serious global concerns-global warming, inhumanity of one people upon another (which will only grow worse as masses of people are forced from their homelands by famine, floods, wars, disease, infanticide of females in preference of males, the orphaning of entire generations by AIDS, etc.). We have been able to live in a very insulated and self-isolating & privileged context, but this is ending in the 21st century. Add to this the growing global consciousness of youth via cross-cultural socio-aesthetic interactions [online fan groups, culture convergence, etc.] and out vision must be incredibly broader! Yes, media technologies-not just as 'tools' but as extensions and manipulated conceptualizations of self and community - as cultural creation,
convergence, and collective consciousness is VERY important to the future. . .
and must be the new direction of art education. Art educators must become
globally conscious, experts of multi-disciplines, and techno-savvy SHAMENS of
the future. Unfortunately, neither politicians, theologians, nor industrialists can fill
this role—because the world is being too torn by differences in ideologies and self-
interests to allow compromise. There will continue to be a place for the practical
pedagogies of teaching how to engage with visual images and artifacts, interpret
meaning, experience aesthetic feeling, develop craftspersonship and create new
and meaningful works of art and craft, but the new media must be larger than
paper and clay— the new media is the real and virtual (physical and social) world.
My sense is that these concerns should be the philosophical focus of our
program. How these might be approached in classrooms might be through
combining some of the better practices of modified DBAE and community-based
constructs with new ideas coming from studies of how youth learn in
spontaneously evolving participatory online communities. [i.e, - places like
deviantArt, newsgrounds, or Second Life].

Teaching inquiry through art and developing adequate assessment criteria to
improve our skills in pedagogy, curriculum, and communicating these learning
outcomes to students, parents, peer educators, and administrators. This is our
program

Historical and contemporary issues in art education; teaching as reflective
practice; language that is specific to art, visual culture, education, and art
education; technology; opportunities for continuous professional and
intellectual growth; interdisciplinarity; critical pedagogy; varied teaching and
assessment strategies to help diverse learners; diversity of social, emotional,
cognitive, and physical characteristics of learners; inquiry in visual culture;
and collaboration with colleagues and communities.

All the above, and all the above.

Visual culture, technology, multiculturalism, arts-based research, community-
based art education and assessment are all important components in our
program. Each is taught to various degrees in most of our art education classes.

The emerging topics in art education for the 21st century, the topics we embed in
our curriculum at Columbia are the following: integrating the arts into all
content areas [interdisciplinary approach to art education] visual literacy
technology and the effective use of technology in the arts multiculturalism
social consciousness student-based assessment state standards
thematic approach to student interests and needs

Primary focus is VCAE.
VC, tech, multi, asses all are a big part of our program.

Visual culture. We'll add some, but we continue to be child-centered.

Technology and assessment. Art exhibition as another ‘discipline’ I really don't think visual, material, etc culture will pan out in the long run. Kids still sign up for art because they want to make art, not change the world.

I stress community arts, working with communities, multiculturalism and visual culture in all my courses regardless of level.

Interesting question. We seem to be stuck on assuming that Visual Culture is something new and separate from other areas such as multicultural issues, material culture, technology, etc... The issue this raises is the unnecessary defensive posturing that does not assist our profession in any way. I find it frustrating and have heard similar criticism throughout our field.

We have several: Visual Culture Material Culture On Line Master's Program Community-Based Education Museum Education I teach the Material Culture Course.

Imagery contextualized and critically explored from its cultural contexts of production and dissemination; critical integration of technology in art education; learning and sharing diverse perspectives. seeking equity for all people; addressing global issues such as environment, peace, understanding.

You need to think about how art ed people in Higher ed ‘talk’ about the profession...and then think about what p-12 art teachers say and do.... I think K-12 art teachers care about kids' needs, building support for their programs, the value of art, multi-culture, assessment, and maybe technology (for the H.S teachers). higher ed faculty love to talk theory...and about what p-12 teachers should do... Here’s what I think higher ed rhetoric will trend toward: globalism will become more prominent technology will also pace with other trends social justice and multi-culture remains central issue and is found within the VCAE trend. VCAE is currently fashionable and taught by some at my unit spirituality and holistic ed are also emerging - since Blandy and others introduced it 15 years ago artography might make a big impact as it grows, because k-12 art teachers have a hard time with social theory and vcae

Community-based and service-learning methodologies that serve to support goals of social reconstruction and social justice. Multicultural art education. Visual culture can potentially support such causes. Assessment as a holistic approach to improving education and not merely auditing it. We approach all of these areas in our program directly and indirectly.
Visual literacy. This is everything in our program.

Visual culture, diversity, technology, and new media in art are important foci in contemporary art education, in my view. These are also foci in my program.

Our art program is more broadly based in terms of satisfying Liberal Arts and Science requirements. The art education faculty is part of the Education Department. I'm not sure that what I answer is valid for Art Ed. But I think training students to be visually aware is one of the most important things I do: to train them to see differently, in art and in the world around them.

We focus on helping undergrads understand all the current significant paradigms, particularly art for life and visual/material culture art education. For graduate students it's the same but with more options and broader and deeper

Visual culture, cross-culture curriculum, reaching at risk youth, the role of technology in art education, assessment in the art.

Media art art and its practical function in the culture it is represented

Our programs have long addressed multiculturalism, special needs, assessment, technology, and visual and material culture. Perhaps because of our location within an Art Department with a strong Media Arts Program, we are interested in new media and its use in the classroom setting (both for teaching and for art-making).

Multiculturalism visual culture New York standards

1. technology....big at our program....it is facilitating all aspects of our program. 2. multiculturalism......'diversity' in the broadest sense. embedded throughout the programs.

ALL THAT'S MENTIONED. KEEP ADDING CONTENT. THICKER COURSE PACKETS...

Multiculturalism, in my opinion, is the scaffold that supports all other constructs--whether it is assessment, technology or material culture if art education is going to be meaningful. I prefer material culture over visual culture, because the former encompasses all five senses and does not privilege one sense-sight. My personal philosophy is grounded in multiculturalism and all my teaching is geared toward that goal.

Administrator responses:
All of the above are 'emergent'. All of the above have also been established long ago and so are not so 'emergent'. But, all of these issues are a part of art education and the lens of each issue is constantly evolving, just as is our lives. So, yes, I do have readings, discussion, research and/or art projects in Visual Culture and Community Based Learning, Assessment, Gender Issues, Environmentalism, Ethics of Imagery, Postmodernism, Formalist and Feminist Aesthetics, Discipline Based Art Education and Neo-DBAE, Meaning-making in Art, Child-Centered Art Education, Critical Thinking and Critical Dialog, Integrated and Interdisciplinary Approaches, Museum Education, ESL and Special Needs Learners, Collaborative and Cooperative Learning, Art as Self-Reflection and Understanding. Multiculturalism is a part of every class, but also a sole required class (AE302). Technology is utilized in just about each class, mostly through PowerPoint, Internet research/online readings and use of email. Students are responsible for designed PPT's that are instructional tools.

I personally think that the changing Art World is and should have the most important focus in our field. And, because the Art World is filled with visual cultural, technological and multicultural issues, then of course, they are important. BUT, I think we should be careful to critically reflect on such issues and ask: What is it about technology that contributes to our teaching and learning in and through art, etc.

Visual culture community-based art education both are central to our program.

All are issues that need to be addressed in the program.

All are critical

I should stress again that I'm not faculty here--nor a scholar of arts ed--but in my fifth year as prog coord and umpteenth year as observer of this field, I can say that multiculturalism is a focus of the AIE program --taking 'higher culture' to the under-exposed through school programs, after-schools, museum-ed and theater-ed depts, etc., and encouraging the artistic contribs of under-rep'ed children through various ed settings. Very important to this program, with elements of 'visual culture' secondary but use of technology often paramount. Assessment a strong aspect due to this program's roots across the street in the Harvard Project Zero research on multiple intelligence and portfolio assessment.
12. What is the theoretical orientation of your program toward art education i.e., DBAE or other content based art education, interdisciplinary, creativity or talent oriented, or studio based, etc?

Faculty responses:

Our program in the past has been oriented towards modified DBAE, and community-based constructs. No new orientation has been determined due to recent changes of faculty (new program coordinator, etc.). See answer to question 10. Others in the program seem interested in museums and informal contexts of art education and less interested in those issues that concern me about the future of art education. Therefore, the future ‘theoretical orientation’ of the program, as a whole, is unclear.

Although anchored in the Georgia Quality Core Curriculum (heavily influenced by DBAE) the orientation of the program is to the cognitive and social outcomes of teaching art education. The focus is on the educational growth of the student. Education is the process of learning how to recreate yourself (Eisner, 2002). Depends on which faculty you talk to...each faculty has their own orientation.

Studio Art emphasizes the expression of individual perceptions in the public context.

Both historical and newer philosophies are presented and emphasized in our art education classes, however, more progressive society-centered approaches are emphasized in relation to state standards and school cultures.

The theoretical orientation of our program is eclectic. A plethora of theories are presented and investigated by the masters' degree students, the students are encouraged to develop a theory base that compliments their teaching goals and style. Hopefully, our students form a base that allows for growth and the flexibility to change.

Aesthetic development. VCAE in combination with interdisciplinary studies.

Eclectic

Child-centered; Lowenfeldian

DBAE, strong practicum component that includes service learning, teaching practica in schools, other volunteer experiences.
I do not set forth just one theoretical orientation...attempt to introduce them all and then strive to teach the above foci.

While I do teach DBAE at the introduction, I use Milenbrandt and Anderson's 'Art and Life' to offer a more global perspective and bring the many different issues in our field to the table. I've also taken to adapting theory from Experiential Education-A very strong program at my University.

We could probably be categorized as interdisciplinary, but at heart, we are most interested in pushing programs for social change.

Social theories, postcolonial theories, feminist theories.

This question makes no sense...we do everything.

I don't know.

Most of our courses at graduate and undergrad address visual culture in some way.

DBAE, Inquiry

There are theoretical orientations--plural--in my program. My own orientation is theme-based instruction with emphases on both interpretation and meaning, and making art.

N/A.

At the undergraduate level we focus on art for life and visual culture art education. For graduate students we offer a comprehensive program that helps them find out about what they're interested in.

We use comprehensive art ed approach, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary, thematic curriculum development.

Integrative arts has its own area.

We have a nice mix of faculty who have orientations towards child-centered, interdisciplinary, and studio-based approaches, as well as post-modern and visual/material culture and multicultural.

11 full time faculty have conflicting philosophies

While we have a history of experience with DBAE and the Getty Projects (LA, AZ, OH) of the 80s, we have a hybrid that we call comprehensive art education.
This year, along with this approach we have included the 'Enduring Ideas' model from Stewart and Walker's Davis Publication, Rethinking the Art Curriculum.

UNCLEAR

My personal theoretical orientation for art education and how I teach favors cultural/community based art in which there is room for all other orientations.

Administrator responses:

I try to not think of us as having one 'orientation'. Rather, I would hope that we try to foster understanding in all of these areas through assignments and modeling different techniques. I do know all of us lean toward one orientation more than another, but perhaps because I have been in art education for thirty years, I see all of the above as a giant melding 'pot'. Each of these areas have evolved and 'adapted' into components of each other in some ways. As you know, DBAE has shed its skin many times. I think students recognize my philosophical bent, but I think it is highly important not to 'show' all of your cards. I am not out to develop little clones of me, but rather help them to explore all of the 'orientations' out there.

We support idea-based interdisciplinary approaches to teaching. Technique and media are taught as method toward meaning. Although we include art history, criticism, aesthetics, and artmaking, we approach DBAE as a historical approach to be informed by. As ours is a BFA degree, our preservice teachers are intensely involved in theirs and others artmaking.

We expand upon DBAE, using an issue-based approach and combining many disciplines to teach art meaningfully.

DBAE and content based newer approaches that include visual culture and multicultural issues.

DBAE has been a focus, but the others are gaining prominence, particularly at the undergraduate level.

Project Zero's collaborations with practices in Reggio Emilia, Italy, noteworthy here: interdisciplinary practice, yes....
13. Is distance-delivered art education important to society? Should it be?

**Faculty and Administrator Responses**

**Faculty responses:**

Not so much 'distance education' per se, but understanding how youth think and interact in cyberspace and virtual worlds. Perhaps 'distance' education will become MUCH more important when the world becomes conscious that gas emissions must stop in order to keep the earth alive. Or-if there is a pandemic that requires that people not congregate in large areas & people may be confined to their homes to work and study, - then, distance education might be crucial. But how would it be 'required'? This would become a whole different issue to be considered!

It is part of our world and an important part of serving a state as large as Georgia-- which is an explicit part of our educational mission

How do you define importance to society…? This is a vague question that I can't answer here.

It's particularly problematic with art as art is both intimate and public

Distance delivery is important to society in that it would better democratize education.

I believe that distance-delivered art education is important to society. It should be available in all teacher preparation programs, especially programs that focus on career-changers.

If distance-art education means that students are taught via the web or a telecommunications system, I do not think that it is important. If it means that
teachers travel to other areas of the state to teach so that students do not have to travel as far, I think this is an important venture. Yes, there is more of a need now.

Of course.

It could be. We have some distance learning courses, esp for graduate work where it addresses the problems of students who are far from our site. For people not on site, they must be VERY self-motivated to get the most out of distance learning.

Sure. Some people are unable to physically get to the university as needed for non distance-delivered courses due to geographic location, job commitments or other reasons.

Not sure

Society? I suppose. This is a complicated question because to participate in distance education, students must have access to a computer. Less advantaged community members may not have this access. This is a problem that needs work. Everyone who wants an education should have access to one - and it should not depend upon their economic status.

Yes. Yes.

Yes. By the way - you shouldn't ask two questions in one...respondents sometimes only answer one... Distance ed is imp. because not everyone can live on campuses...etc you know the rest Distance ed will grow bec. universities know that there's money to be made there, and their competitors are already doing it.... Distance ed is a poor substitute for face to face in my opinion, but will soon become commonplace.

Yes! It allows us to connect with people we may have never connected with... Instead of a class full of students primarily from Ohio, or the Midwest, we have students from all over the country and world who can share their similar and different experiences.

yes; yes.

No.

Absolutely. It provides opportunities for people to take courses and earn degrees, when they would not otherwise be able to do so.
I am just trying to figure out how to teach visual courses on line. I don't think you can teach studio courses on line; I think the advice of the teacher on site is too important. And I am trying to learn how to create power points with arrows that point up what one needs to see.

Some aspects of the visual arts are more conducive to the distance learning than others. Conceptualization, blogging and discussion boards will work fine, but you can't teach a teacher how to make a painting or do a scratchboard online.

Not important to society. Is important to some grad students. I feel that undergrads need face-to-face, they need the socialization. Graduate programs can better meet the needs of these students by offering D.E.

In a way, perhaps.

Yes. If it can be done well and does not detract from the purpose/intent of the courses.

No, I think preservice art teachers need contact in groups and with children in classrooms

Yes, if access to person to person isn't available. I went to grad school in AZ and for some, that was very important. In our own department thesis advising is done via the internet....but no courses.

WHY NOT?

Yes, it is. However, I do not believe that it can or should replace face-to-face teaching.

Administrator responses:

Art education is important to society, so distance-delivered would also be. What ever it takes to 'get' out the concept that art education is a vital component of our lives is fine with me. Of course it should be important because our society is becoming technology driven. Similar to Walter Smith's technological blackboard drawings, distance-delivery is just another way of educating the 'masses'.

Yes, yes.

Not sure.

It's becoming important. I'm not sure how valuable it is.

Yes.
Not qualified to comment much on this, sorry. I can’t say that there’s any special interest in this topic here in Arts in Ed prog.

14. What are the top 3-5 motivators that impact your decision to teach a distance education course?

Faculty responses:

I am motivated to understand how youth are learning, thinking, interacting & creating sense of self and community online. This makes distance learning an exciting possibility. I am interested in researching these areas & what comes out of that study would determine why and how I might be inspired or motivated to want to TEACH through distance education.

Need to service regions of the state not easily accessible.

Would never teach a distance education course.

Money. It would be extremely difficult to do something meaningful which is studio based, with distance technology.

Training, administrative support, and faculty teaching load credit, demonstrated effectiveness.

The top decisions to teach a distance education course would be the following; 1. The effectiveness of the course related to the needs of the constituents using the course. 2. The up-to-date technology available to deliver a quality distance course. 3. The infrastructure necessary to sustain the quality of the distance education course.

None.
I would do it in a heart beat if I had more time to develop it.

Flex-time. Off-site capacity

1. Recruitment of more students who are mature and motivated. 2. Content of course that lends itself to distance learning. 3. Faculty who can make the most of the technological advantages and demands of distance learning Training and education about what works and what does not. At least one course release for a new distance course before and during the terms of teaching. Extensive support with technology training. Equal weight distribution with other courses for tenure.

I'm not really interested in distance learning.

Learning how to do it Finding students to participate Converting classroom materials to user friendly computer use.

Need, quality of education, creativity involved

Reaching non traditional students or reaching students who are far away from my campus. Facilitating the professional development of teachers and others who want to invest this way

I already do, for the reasons mentioned above.

I do teach a distance education course, an introductory art course that is offered as a general education course. My main motivation is teaching a course on art to mostly older students who come from all over the country and the world (literally). I enjoy the diversity of the students I teach, and I like the idea of introducing them to art.

Schedule flexibility: teaching online theoretically allows me more time in the studio during the day while I can do the course work at night. I also enjoy the conversation with students online; it is different than in a day course. In some ways they run the discussion, while the teacher has more control in day classes.

I really would avoid a distance education course if I could. So far I haven't had to teach one. I like face to face. I like to see expressions, hear voice tones, and so on... I do like having Blackboard so we all can check on syllabus changes and good readings that may come up and so on....

Time to develop course, tech support, good course management system.

To reach people in disadvantaged or destitute areas
Serving more students. Serving students who can not physically come to campus. Teaching the non-major course (particularly the undergraduate research course for non-art majors).

To reach teachers who need to get a masters (in the state of NY, all teachers have to get their masters).

I don't want to teach a distance ed. course.

PREPARATION TIME. STUDENT POPULATION. PERSONAL INTEREST.

1. The constant demand for online courses at undergraduate level seems to me to be driven by the wrong reasons-- it brings in money, it can be done in bed! I think online classes should be offered under those circumstances in which physical distance from a classroom, providing learning opportunities to those who otherwise would be deprived.

Administrator responses:

1. I can write the curriculum, but getting someone to do the technological 'stuff' would definitely be a motivation. This does exist in our college and I know of faculty that have successfully done this. 2. Time to put this together. As a lecturer, I have no course releases. 3. Need. 4. Understanding of how this is best 'done'.

1. Need of students 2. Ability to broaden and include multiple voices and viewpoints. 3. Team teaching across universities 4. Bring together a broader student participation. 5. cost effective

Possibility of reaching people across the globe, non-traditional students, and to offer professional development to teacher.

Expanding student base; self-directed learning possibilities ability to work from anywhere with online connection.

We offer distance education options on art education survey courses

It would be extremely surprising to learn that the Arts in Ed program faculty were interested in teaching a distance-ed course.
15. Have you ever taught a distance education course?  If yes, what have you taught?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question about teaching distance education courses.]

**Faculty response:**

No

We incorporate online instruction into our course work, although all students do meet together on a regular basis as well.

No.

No

No

No, I prepared a distance course, but the lack of student enrollment caused the course to be cancelled.

No.

No, but I use blackboard with all my classes and have been a student in a good online course on learning theories

No

No

No

Yes, I’ve taught distance art history survey and assessment courses.
Yes, several online courses since 1998 for 3 different universities: Research Methods in Art Education, Explorations in Visual Culture, Arts & Visual Literacy Colloquium, Virtual Learning Communities in Art Education.

Not a distance ed, but I have created and used hybrid course that utilized a website I created for the course for retrieval of material and discussions. I'm in the process of developing a true distance ed course for a program as we speak.

Yes: Multicultural Art Education, Assessment, Art Criticism.

Yes--team taught history of art education course for U. of Arizona where I was the person at a distance, in Florida.

No

Yes. ART 001, Introduction to Art, offered through the World Campus at Penn State. I've been teaching this course for about 7 years. For the last 5 years, I have taught online sections of the course.

I am teaching my first two sections of Art Appreciation this semester.

See above

No

Yes, many times. Visual Literacy, Professional development courses in art education, folk art, seminar in art education, and I have taught combination courses in art ed methods.

No

Yes. I taught Art for Elementary Teachers via distance ed when I was in grad school.

No

No

NO

Not in the US.
Administrator responses:

No.

Yes, A Graduate Research Course

No.

I haven't taught an online course, but I have worked with students online and long distance.

No

No--nor have the few faculty in this program, to my knowledge.

16. What is the total number of distance education courses your department has offered? How many are currently offered?

Administrator responses:

I do not know how many are offered in our department: Theory and Practice in Teacher Education. We do not offer any in our area: art education.

We offer off campus courses and independent study courses that are 'distant.' But, if you are speaking of online courses and/or courses that are classified as specific distance ed courses......2/1

1 in graphic design

Not certain.

0 --but other faculty at HGSE no doubt are looking into this field, especially those in the Technology Innovation and Education program (TIE) that is run by Joe Blatt (blattjo@gse.harvard.edu). Joe has a number of our Arts in Ed students in his classes. You might want to speak with Nathan Finch in the WIDE web-based ed prog here at HGSE--at finchna@gse.harvard.edu
17. Have you ever taken a course via distance education? If yes, how would you rate your experience as a distance education student?

Faculty responses:

No. But my son did & found it highly Unsuccessful. Too many technical problems with incompatible software & platforms. Also, the course was run like a traditional course in terms of assignments. It was little more than a gimmick in this regard & was more frustrating than enlightening.

No

No

I tried but lost interest.

Yes, I took a grant-writing course. The experience was good.

No

Yes, excellent

No

No

No

Yes. Average. It did not leave an impact. I can’t actually remember the experience.

No.
Yes--participated in online conferences allows time to reflect, all included actively in learning, not passive like onsite conference lectures, enables resource development and sharing beyond the conference

No.

No.

No

No

No, I have never taken a distance education course.

No.

No

No

Yes, many in grad school. They were combination DE and F2F. I loved it.

No

No. But my students take the curriculum theory course in the college of education online. Some enjoy it and others do not.

No

NO

NO

No

Administrator responses:

No. But, thirty five years ago, I took a biology course that was the professor video-taped. We watched him on a giant screen and there were about 150 in the class. I failed the course, as did many others. But, I know from my colleagues that distance education have come a long way! You can interact with students and everything. I think it sounds great.

No
Only professional training courses

18. How many faculty members in your program teach distance education courses?

Administrator responses:
0 in art education. Many faculty do in our college
3
0
1
2-3 per semester
0

19. When did your program first offer distance education courses?

Administrator responses:
NA
Before I arrived
It has not. I have plans for summer 07
Just the last year or so
Not certain
Not applicable to AIE; maybe to TIE--see below
20. How many students are currently enrolled in distance education courses in your program?

Administrator responses:

NA

15

0

I have no idea.

Not certain.

None in specifically named 'distance ed' courses though some in courses that address issue--see next answer.

21. How did your experience compare to in-classroom courses you have taken?

Faculty responses:

See comments to #14. the only advantage was that my son did not have to drive to campus & could work from home. this was a disadvantage also, because when there were technical problems, he still had to drive to campus and find the professor to relate the problem and find tech support...etc, It was disastrous to his progress in learning & - ultimately - to his grade!.

n/a

n/a

Does not apply.

Negative

The number of in-classroom courses that I have taken versus distance education courses is very skewed, it would be unfair of me to judge the two experiences.

NA

Just as good just a more flexible format
Dna

Can't say

N/a

It did not stand out. I prefer in-classroom courses.

NA

Both sites of learning can be poor experiences and both sites of learning can be excellent--it depends on the pedagogical strategies.

n/a

There are similarities and differences... I believe online learning allows students the opportunity to 'speak' and converse in a much deeper, more meaningful way, as all students have the opportunity to participate. Students who may be shy or quiet in a classroom setting, often open up much more in an online environment. Also, there are more opportunities for diversity in an online situation as students literally come from all over the world with wonderful experiences to share.

n/a

Not a student, but I enjoy the conversation with students online; it is different than in a day course. In some ways they run the discussion, while the teacher has more control in day classes. The textbook we use has developed many tests and quizzes that I use as well as many areas for discussion. So the course is less about the chronological development of art (as I teach it in class) than about discussion of issues and artworks in particular.

N/A

N/A

Prefer to be in class with art educators. But loved being in a cohort group with professionals from all over the country, sharing expertise.

There is no comparison for contact learning

N/A

n/a
Administrator responses:

None of the administrators had taught a class online.

22. How would you describe your experience teaching a distance education course?

Faculty responses:

n/a
do not apply
N/A
See answer #13.
NA
Na
Dna
Can't say
N/a

Average. I felt isolated from about 1/3 of the class. It is easier to lose certain students. I'm used to reaching everyone.

NA

Rewarding. Many students report they have not had such a course that made them think so much, collaborate & share with others on a worldwide level, and engage in real-life issues.
In my hybrid course - LOTS of work for me!!!!!!!

Eye-opening. Meaningful. Multicultural. Adaptive to multiple learning styles,.. see article by Elizabeth Garber & M. A. Stankiewicz from ART EDUCATION several years ago.

My experiences have been mostly positive.

I enjoy the conversation with students online; it is different than in a day course. In some ways they run the discussion, while the teacher has more control in day classes. The textbook we use has developed many tests and quizzes that I use as well as many areas for discussion. So the course is less about the chronological development of art (as I teach it in class) than about discussion of issues and artworks in particular.

N/A

N/A

Loved it. I am comfortable with the technology, and know how to promote interaction at all sites if using simultaneous conferencing, or how to promote engaged student learning in asynchronous learning. But it is a different methodology that teachers need to be aware of.

n/a

I enjoyed it. I felt that I got to know some students more than others.

None.

N/A

NIL

I taught art to in-service untrained art teachers in Kenya, long before online courses existed.

Administrator responses:

None of the administrators had taught a class online.
23. How much preparation time did you spend compared to classroom-based courses you have taught?

Faculty responses:

n/a

n/a

N/A

I spent approximately 40% more time in the preparation of the course. I would estimate that 20% of that time was dedicated to the institutions online course protocol.

NA

na

dna

Can't say

N/a

About the same amount as in-classroom.

NA
I include Web-based pedagogies in classroom-based courses so the preparation is about the same.

Much more - triple the amount of time

Quite a bit, but less time maintaining the course than classroom courses.

Probably a full week preparing for the course.

About the same--3 hours for each hour of contact time.

Distance education courses require MUCH more time than resident courses. Other instructors have said the same thing. For that matter, so have the students who have discussed this: They say online courses are far more demanding, on average, than resident courses.

Luckily I use the textbook's quizzes and discussion questions, so I don't have to spend that time. In terms of checking the discussion board, posting announcements, organizing and correcting my own papers and exam essays, I spend at least as much on the online course. I don't have to choose and file slides and teach in the classroom, but the other discussion board tasks take at least as much time. But the good thing is that I can do that work when I choose: at midnight, or on the exercycle, or whenever.

N/A

N/A

Same - lots for the first time I taught the course, less each time it was taught.

n/a

About the same.

n/a

N/A

NO

Just the same, if not more. The circumstances and situations were entirely different so I can't really answer this question with any degree of accuracy.

Administrator responses:

None of the administrators had taught a class online.
24. Please describe the types of technology your department uses to deliver distance education courses.

Faculty responses:

Oncourse. Also television hook-ups

WebCT plus supporting tools to mount resources on WebCT from powerpoint presentations, Imovies, etc.

We don't have distance education courses in Art Education. We are developing such a program, but I am not involved in this.

None

The institution where I am currently employed does not have distant education courses, the topic has been discussed once.

NA

None yet

dna

Standard internet connections

Internet, e-mail and black board as far as I know...

We do not specialize. I've worked with other departments for the courses I've taught.

Not sure what kind of information you are looking for here. They use computers.

A university-wide course management system, Internet, video, podcasts, databases, animations, interactive programming, etc.

None right now

Online course management, the past two years it has been Carmen.

n/a

For both resident and online courses, most faculty use ANGEL.

We use Blackboard.
The usual..... computers, cameras etc....

N/A

Online, internet, chat, web-based, 2way AV and desktop videoconferencing

Hi speed internet  closed circuit tv

We do not currently offer distance education courses, but we do have the facility on campus to do so. We have a virtual classroom set up for that purpose. One faculty taught a grad student in the distance learning lab on campus

Earlier, #10???, I mentioned thesis work via the internet

NOTHING

Student software programs such as BLACKBOARD and video conferences, emails.

Administrator responses:

I know that we have an Instructional Services Center that works with faculty to do distance education. I know of quite a few faculty in other areas of education that do this.

Online, Blackboard. Most faculty have Blackboard sites for all their classes. I have also taught through the Distance Ed lab, iChat, AIM, Blogs, Vlog, Poscasting, and WWW sites.

Not sure.

Oncampus programs- don't know exactly

Not certain

n/a
25. What art education courses can be taught effectively via distance education?

Faculty responses:

I am developing a model for a course I think may be very effectively taught online - it is a studio course for non-art majors who have specialized interests they would like to explore within small groups of like-minded cohorts and the guidance of a more skilled 'peer.' It would take to long to describe here, but imagine of 'deviantartists' were collected in small groups with a more experienced 'deviantartist' as tutor?

I believe that all instruction requires some amount of face time. Distance education can be a part of any course.

None.

Not sure since most art education classes require oral class participation.

I think the following art courses could be taught effectively via distance education: learning theory courses art philosophy courses visual cultural

I don't think that art education courses could be taught effectively via distance education. It requires too much hands on education.

I think definitely theory based and history based courses. I think it is harder for studio type courses and student teaching and supervision have to be done in person.

Assessment curriculum aesthetics contemporary art

Exchange of ideas, discussion,
I am not sure. Maybe an intro course. I have trouble thinking about how to translate my pedagogy to an online format.

None that I teach. The all deal with clinicals and lots of 'hands on' interpersonal experiences.

As far as I know, all courses can be taught via distance education ~ at least that seems to be true in our Department

Potentially all art education courses. Online pedagogy can include f2f dialogues beyond limiting to members in the online class, and can include studio and community-based activities shared in the online learning environment.

All except studio

Most... Writing classes work really well.

None.

Courses that concern theory, knowledge, collaborative work, artmaking with new media, and discussion can all be effectively taught via ONLINE distance education. I'm not so sure about distance education conducted through surface mail, though.

I don't know about Art Ed courses per se. I think Art Appreciation and various other art history courses can be taught on line. Art Criticism might be very good online.

See my response in 11 above

Seminars if the technology is easy to use.

Methods in art education seminar in art education I broke it into modules, such as classroom management in the artroom, curriculum development, art and tech integration, motivating students, assessment in the arts, etc. even art making can be shared online, because we are not teaching a studio class, but developing teaching strategies, etc.

None

In our program, Child Art (theories of children's artistic and aesthetic development) could effectively be taught to elementary and early childhood majors. I would prefer to keep the Art Education majors in a real time setting.

art appreciation
I don't know.

THEORY

Since I haven't taught any course as yet, I do not feel competent to answer this question.

Administrator responses:

I think a good many can be taught via distance ed. A good deal of our graduate classes: History and Philosophy of AE, Contemporary Issues in AE, Advanced Curriculum, etc. could be adapted pretty effectively.

I think most courses can be taught IF they are approached appropriately. We can't just do the same thing we do in face to face teaching!

Assessment, classroom management, a seminar.

Perhaps curriculum development assessment strategies foundations in art education theory

Not certain

Art history, studio courses in drawing, exercises in creative writing, etc.

26. What art education courses cannot be taught effectively via distance education?

![Bar chart showing responses](chart.png)

Faculty responses:

Only those that would require 'Hand on' demonstration & instruction - like ceramics, for example.
I believe that all instruction requires some amount of face time. Distance education can be a part of any course.

All

Student teaching

I think the following courses would not be taught effectively via distance education: any methods/materials courses any assessment courses any instructional delivery type of course

All of them.

Supervision of student teachers

Student internship

Studio

Methods courses are really about nurturing a professional educator and I am not sure that can take place in a distance format??

See #19

Have no idea

Courses taught by people who are seeking efficiency, minimal effort, and standardization.

Studio

Multicultural classes are difficult since the conversation is so important... But it is possible to have it done well. Service-learning and community-based courses are very difficult.

All

Practicum courses such as early field experiences and student teaching.

I don't think studio courses can be taught well online. I think the instructor should be there to give advice, to brainstorm with the student over problems. I think critiques need to be on site. But perhaps I will be proven wrong.

See 11 above
Studio courses require interaction between student and instructor.

?

If possible education must be hands on.

I would prefer to teach courses with studio content in real time. I also (yes I know I am old fashioned) prefer to teach my graduate research methodology course in real time. I like the conversations and the collaborations that happen between and among my students in class. They mirror what happens in the real world of research.

Teaching methods classes

I don't know.

HANDS-ON FIELD EXPERIENCE  PRACTICUM  FOUNDATIONS

See #19

Administrator responses:

I think 'lower' level art ed classes need the interaction and availability of supplies, etc. Students would have supplies in distance ed, but many times, I'll put out something out on a table that they would never have thought of using. Or I will introduce something that they did not expect. Some of this might be difficult to do--the actual experience would be missing...the mediation between the student and tools. I think that physically my presence is important in intro classes--to act as a mediator.

Maybe practicum is tough---but if we used web cams, etc....then maybe!!!!! I'm open!

Anything that involves a practicum--field experiences, museum-based courses, etc.

Methods classes for future teachers in classrooms

Not certain
APPENDIX K

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR QUANTITATIVE DATA - GENDER
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compete within College</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compete with Other Colleges</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed Success</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Distance Ed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Stipend</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Teaching Load</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Financial Reward</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender *</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Student Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender *</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender *</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender *</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender *</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender *</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Heavy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Lack</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Lack</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Distance Ed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Copyright Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Adequate Student Support – Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.161(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.136</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*9 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .67.*

### Adequate Faculty Support – Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.013(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.940</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*9 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .64.*
### Recognition – Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Recognition</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Recognition</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Recognition</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Recognition</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.921(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>8.088</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** 8 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.

### Reduced Teaching Load – Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Reduced Teaching Load</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Reduced Teaching Load</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Reduced Teaching Load</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Reduced Teaching Load</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>11.768(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.828</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** 7 cells (87.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .81.
### Additional Time – Gender

**Crosstab**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.279(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.369</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

### Additional Stipend – Gender

**Crosstab**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Stipend</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Stipend</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Stipend</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.025(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.552</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.
### Heavy Teaching Load – Gender

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutr</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Male   | 100.0% | 50.0% | 42.9% | 14.3% | 100.0%
| Female | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 19 |
| Total  | 0.0% | 10.5% | 21.1% | 68.4% | 100.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% within Heavy Teaching Load</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Male | 3.8% | 7.7% | 11.5% | 3.8% | 26.9%
| Female | 0.0% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 50.0% | 73.1%
| Total | 0.0% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 50.0% | 73.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Heavy Teaching Load</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Male | 0.0% | 10.5% | 21.1% | 68.4% | 100.0%
| Female | 0.0% | 50.0% | 57.1% | 92.9% | 73.1%
| Total | 0.0% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 50.0% | 73.1%

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.484(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.979</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.*

### Lack of Financial Reward – Gender

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Financial Reward</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>% within Lack Financial Reward</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Male | 0 | 14.3% | 42.9% | 42.9% | 0.0% | 100.0%
| Female | 1 | 0.0% | 50.0% | 57.1% | 92.9% | 73.1%
| Total | 1 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 26 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% within Lack Financial Reward</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Male | 0.0% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 44.4% | 100.0%
| Female | 0.0% | 50.0% | 66.7% | 100.0% | 72.0%
| Total | 0.0% | 12.0% | 24.0% | 32.0% | 72.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th>% within Lack Financial Reward</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Male | 5.6% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 44.4% | 100.0%
| Female | 100.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 66.7% | 100.0%
| Total | 4.0% | 12.0% | 24.0% | 32.0% | 72.0%

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.639(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.873</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. 8 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.*
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### Lack Technical Knowledge – Gender

**Crosstab**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack Tech Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.836(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.31.

### Distance Education Effective – Gender

**Crosstab**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distance Ed Effective</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.738(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.870</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. 8 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.14.
### Copyright Law – Gender

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- % within Gender: 12.5% Male, 0.0% Female, 3.7% Total
- % within Copyright Law: 100.0% Male, 0.0% Female, 100.0% Total

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.705(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.847</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. 8 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.*
APPENDIX L

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR QUANTITATIVE DATA - AGE
## Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Stipend</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Teaching Load</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reward</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Adequate Student Support – Age

## Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Student Support</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.397(a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.524</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a. 20 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .07.*
### Adequate Faculty Support – Age

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Adequate Faculty Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Adequate Faculty Support</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.110(a)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.403</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 19 cells (95.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .07.
## Recognition – Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
<th>% within Recognition</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
<th>% within Recognition</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.732(a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.884</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 20 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.
## Reduced Teaching Load – Age

### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Reduced Teaching Load</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.847(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.319</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 15 cells (93.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .12.
# Additional Time – Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Additional Time</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.186(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.501</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 15 cells (93.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.
# Additional Stipend – Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
<th>% within Additional Stipend</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.706(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>14.323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 16 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.
## Heavy Teaching Load – Age

### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Heavy Teaching Load</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Heavy Teaching Load</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>12.008(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>15.124</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 15 cells (93.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.04.
### Lack of Financial Reward – Age

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
<th>% within Lack Financial Reward</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
<th>% within Lack Financial Reward</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>11.171(a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>11.148</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>11.148</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 20 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.
### Lack Technical Knowledge – Age

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Lack Tech Knowledge</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.510(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>5.751</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 14 cells (87.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.
### Adequate Student Support – Age

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Distance Ed Effective</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.604(a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.330</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 20 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.
### Copyright Law – Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>12.513(a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.346</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 27

a. 20 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.
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