OPEN PRAXIS

Investigation of Tendency among Instructors to Conduct a Massive Open Online Course: Case of Turkey

RESEARCH ARTICLE

MEVA BAYRAK KARSLI
SELCUK KARAMAN
*Author affiliations can be found in the back matter of this article

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR OPEN AND DISTANCE EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the faculty members' tendency to conduct a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) and the factors affecting these tendencies. In this study, the sectional survey model, a quantitative research method, was used. The study group is comprised of 122 faculty members working at a major state university in Turkey and selected by using a random stratified sampling method. During the research process, the faculty members were informed about the MOOCs, and data were collected through questionnaires. According to the results of the research, 34.4% of the faculty members were willing to conduct MOOC and the main aim of teaching MOOC was to share their knowledge and experience with the masses. According to the faculty members, it is seen that it is more appropriate to conduct MOOC with expert and experienced faculty members. Factors such as providing benefits to corporate development and promotion, supporting lifelong learning, and creating reliable sources of information on the Internet are considered positive elements for conducting MOOC, while it has been determined that concerns on issues such as adequate time, copyright, and instructional design experience adversely affect conducting MOOC. In addition, it was revealed that faculty members expected institutional incentives including technical infrastructure and information. In line with the results obtained from the study, suggestions were made for the institutions wishing to conduct MOOCs and for researchers wishing to conduct studies about MOOCs.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:
Meva Bayrak Karsli
Atatürk University, TR
mevabayrak@gmail.com

KEYWORDS:
MOOC; massive open online course; adoption of MOOCs; tendency to conduct MOOC; online course; distance education; faculty members

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:
Bayrak Karsli, M., & Karaman, S.(2022). Investigation of Tendency among Instructors to Conduct a Massive Open Online Course: Case of Turkey. *Open Praxis*, 14(3), pp. 214–229. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.14.3.476

INTRODUCTION

Today, developments in the field of technology have made internet access easier and cheaper, as well as the creation of a variety of internet-based computer platforms. This increase in computer platforms has brought new dimensions to education. After the Open Course Resources (OCR) initiative initiated by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) at the end of the 1990s, MOOC (Massive Open Online Course – MOOC) applications began. It is aimed that individuals will be able to follow the courses as they are in face-to-face lectures as well as sharing the resources of the course with the applications of "MOOC". Students participating in MOOC applications developed for this purpose can benefit from many rights such as accessing course resources, communicating with the lecturer and students, preparing homework and taking exams, as well as receiving a certificate for the relevant course depending on the success they have demonstrated at the end of their participation (Çağıltay, 2014; Demirci, 2014; Henderikx et al., 2019; Sullivan et al., 2019; Pappano, 2012; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022). On MOOC platforms, students gain skills on various topics (Goglio & Bertolini, 2021) as well as self-regulated learning (Onah et al., 2021) self-paced learning (Zhou et al., 2020), and information literacy skills (Dreisiebner et al., 2020).

Currently, applications of MOOC are mostly conducted by well-known universities in the United States. The courses opened in these universities, which are generally known for their good content and their success in attracting the attention of students from many parts of the world, are very popular (Kassabian, 2014; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022). In this direction, past studies pointed out that the development of MOOCs demands a high level of commitment and involvement from universities (Doo et al., 2020). There are basically two objectives for universities to conduct MOOC applications. The first is to introduce themselves. Universities that have the opportunity to introduce themselves worldwide through the applications of MOOCs, can therefore expand their training programs. The second aim of these universities, on the other hand, is to attract good students and increase their power even more through promotion. With MOOC applications, universities can demonstrate to many students without having to worry about where they live and thus have the opportunity to attract good students (Kassabian, 2014; Ma & Lee, 2019; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022).

The faculty members are a very important factor in the applications of MOOC. Because, faculty members play a key role in all processes of MOOC from beginning to end, such as creating a course syllabus, designing activities, and determining the types and tools of evaluation in the MOOC applications (Bali, 2013; Conole, 2013; Haavind & Sistek-Chandler, 2015; Read & Rodrigo, 2014). In addition, faculty members need to create a flexible learning environment suitable for students with different abilities in these courses that appeal to everyone (García-Peñalvo et al., 2018). Therefore, there are faculty members at the center of MOOC applications (Tseng et al., 2022). Although MOOC applications are generally conducted as institutional activities, the transition process and compliance of faculty members are very important for the success of these applications (Ahmad et al., 2020).

In the literature, it is seen that many elements affect faculty members positively or negatively in the process of conducting MOOC. In this context, some of the positive factors that affect conducting MOOC by faculty members are that they have the opportunity to share their knowledge and experiences in their fields with a large number of students (Bali, 2013; Gerber, 2014; Hew & Cheung, 2014; Teplechuk, 2013; Yuan & Powell, 2013), enabling them to develop pedagogically (Bali, 2013; Chengjie, 2015; Cormier & Siemens, 2010; Hew & Cheung, 2014), gaining online education experience (Jansen & Schuwer, 2015), and the opportunity to be recognized in their field, in the institution they work in and in the international area (Gerber, 2014; Hew & Cheung, 2014; Kolowich, 2013; Rai & Chunrao, 2016; Teplechuk, 2013) and having the opportunity to advertise the institution they work for (Teplechuk, 2013; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022). Similarly, some of the factors that negatively affect faculty members in the process of conducting MOOC are that faculty members cannot find time to conduct MOOC applications due to their excessive workload (Belanger & Thornton, 2013; García-Peñalvo et al., 2018; Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Kolowich, 2013; Teplechuk, 2013), difficulties in ensuring the quality of the content (Chengjie, 2015) and protecting copyrights (Chen, 2014), problems encountered in determining the individual learning characteristics of students and communicating with them due to the high number of students (Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Teplechuk, 2013), very few

of the students complete the courses (Chengjie, 2015; Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Hone & El Said, 2016; Sullivan et al., 2019; Kassabian, 2014; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022) and the difficulty of the evaluation process (Chengjie, 2015; Sánchez-Vera et al., 2014).

As with many new attempts in the field of education, MOOC applications are seen as a potential benefit for the education system. However, to see whether this initiative contributes to the education system, it is thought that worldwide MOOC applications should be widespread in Turkey. MOOC applications have just started to develop in Turkey and the first institutional application was undertaken by Atatürk University by launching the AtademiX application. According to Rogers's "Diffusion of Innovation Theory", for an innovation to be accepted and spread by society in any field, it must be adapted to that innovation (Rogers, 1995). In the adaptation process, it is necessary to carry out studies aimed at the target audience that will spread the innovation (Evans & Myrick, 2015). In this context, the current study can be considered from the point of view of the Diffusion of Innovation Theory. On the other hand, it is also possible to examine the transition process of faculty members to MOOCs, which is a new practice, through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). According to TAM, two main factors, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are effective in individuals' acceptance of technology. Perceived usefulness expresses the opinions and thoughts of individuals about the improvement of their performance in the work they have done through technology. Perceived ease of use refers to the ease of use of a particular technology and learning to use it in a short time without requiring much effort. Apart from these two perceptual factors, individuals' attitudes and intentions towards technology use can be affected by various external factors such as social, cultural, and political (Davis, 1989). It is thought that TAM will guide the determination and interpretation of the tendencies of the faculty members and the factors affecting these tendencies during the implementation of MOOCs, which can be seen as a new technology. In order to ensure the continuity of this new initiative in Turkey, it is very important to get the opinions of the faculty members who constitute the cornerstone of the application at the first stage. In this context, the main purpose of this study is to examine the faculty members' tendency to conduct a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) and the factors affecting these tendencies. In this context, positive and negative factors affecting the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC and their expectations for MOOC incentives were investigated. The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC?
   a. What is the willingness of faculty members to conduct MOOC?
   b. What are the aims of faculty members to conduct MOOC?
   c. What are the competence perceptions of faculty members for conducting MOOC?
2. What are the positive factors that affect the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC?
3. What are the negative factors that affect the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC?
4. What are the expectations of faculty members to encourage MOOC?

METHOD

RESEARCH DESIGN

In this research, survey research design, one of the quantitative research methods, was used. Survey research is carried out on large groups, based on the collection of data from that group in order to determine the specific characteristics of the group (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990; Karasar, 2005). Survey studies are classified in different ways. This study is based on the sectional survey study of the classification made by Fraenkel and Wallen (1990). The characteristics of the variables to be described in sectional survey studies are measured at once and are generally used when the sample has large and different characteristics. In sectional survey studies, descriptive statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage calculation are used more than correlational techniques (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008; Karasar, 2005). In this study, a questionnaire was developed to determine the positive and negative factors of conducting MOOC and what needs to be done to encourage faculty members. A sectional survey study was used as it was aimed to descriptively determine the

level of participation in these items by presenting ready-made items to the faculty members and to collect data from the study group at once.

STUDY GROUP

The population of the research consists of faculty members working at a major state university in Turkey. Accordingly, the sample of the study consists of 122 faculty members selected by random stratified sampling method among 1316 faculty members. Determining the number of samples is very important in terms of generalizing the research results to the population. For this reason, when determining the number of samples in descriptive studies, at least 10% of the population should be included in the sample (Özen & Gül, 2007). Similarly, the generalizability of the research results needs to include each unit in the population with the size of the sample in the sample selection (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008). Therefore, based on the number of faculty members working in 20 faculties, 10% of the faculty members in each faculty were randomly included in the sample selection. Thus, 135 faculty members in each unit of the population were selected by using a random stratified sampling method. However, due to the lack of access to 13 faculty members, the study group consisted of 122 faculty members. 45 of the faculty members in the study group were female and 77 were male. 23 of the faculty members were professors, 33 were associate professors and 66 were assistant professors.

DATA COLLECTION TOOL

In this study, it is aimed to examine the faculty members' tendency to conduct a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) and the factors affecting these tendencies. In this context, positive and negative factors affecting the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC and their expectations for MOOC incentives were investigated. In this study, a questionnaire was developed and used to obtain data for these purposes.

In the process of developing the data collection tool, firstly literature review was done. In particular, studies focusing on the positive and negative factors that might affect conducting MOOC processes of the faculty members (Gerber, 2014; Kassabian, 2014; Pappano, 2012; Teplechuk, 2013) were analyzed and an item pool was created. While creating the item pool, studies examining the tendencies of faculty members in similar areas such as sharing open course resources (Kurşun, 2011) and the opinions of subject area experts were used. The items formed in this direction were grouped with the experts in the field within the framework of the research questions of the study. As a result of the grouping, the questionnaire consisted of 4 main sections.

In the first part of the questionnaire, there are positive items that may affect conducting MOOC of faculty members (18 items), in the second part, negative items that may affect conducting MOOC of faculty members (14 items), in the third part, there are items to encourage the faculty members to conduct MOOC (10 items and 1 open-ended question). In the last part of the questionnaire, there are questions about the demographic information of the faculty members and their tendency to conduct MOOC.

The items in the first three sections of the questionnaire were arranged according to the participants' level of agreement with each item from 1 to 6 (1 = "I totally disagree", 2 = "I disagree", 3 = "I partially disagree", 4 = "I partially agree", 5 = "I agree", 6 = "I completely agree"). According to Krosnick and Fabrigar (1997), the use of midpoints in rating questions reduces the mental effort of the participants and in some cases gives them an easy answer without thinking. For this reason, a 6-point rating without a mid-point was used in the developed questionnaire.

After the questionnaire was developed, the items were checked with the subject area experts and necessary changes were made. As a result of the changes, 5 faculty members were selected from the list created for sample selection by the appropriate sampling method, and a pilot application was performed. In addition to observations during the pilot application process, faculty members were asked whether the items in the questionnaire were clear and understandable and whether the groupings were appropriate. Thus, the level of reflecting the desired thought of each item was controlled. The feedback obtained was evaluated and the items that were not understood or misunderstood were changed and the questionnaire was finalized.

DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

In the process of data collection; one-to-one interviews were conducted by the researchers with each faculty member in the study group and the questionnaire was administered. Interviews with faculty members were conducted in two stages. In the first stage of the interviews, the researcher informed the faculty members about MOOC applications using a presentation, and in the second stage, the faculty members were asked to fill in the questionnaire. Interviews lasted an average of 20–25 minutes, with the first 10 minutes providing information. An informative material was prepared in advance to inform the faculty members and this material was presented using a tablet during the interview. After the presentation, the questions of the faculty members were answered and they were asked to fill in the questionnaire.

INFORMATION MATERIAL

MOOC applications are a new field that has been developing since 2008. In Turkey, MOOC practices are a new field when we look at the world in general. Therefore, it was thought that the faculty members in the study group should be informed about MOOC applications in terms of the validity of the research results. During the data collection process, a presentation material was prepared to inform the faculty members about MOOC applications. At the stage of material development, firstly literature review was done and general data about MOOC applications were collected. A draft presentation was prepared after the data collection process. Based on this presentation, the material was finalized in consultation with the subject area experts. The material includes the general characteristics of MOOCs, their operation and materials used, MOOC conducting countries, universities and special platforms, and MOOC applications. In addition, the introduction of the AtademiX platform which is one of the first examples of a MOOC in Turkey (Aydemir et al., 2016) was demonstrated, and the operation of a sample course was demonstrated.

DATA ANALYSIS

In the study, data analysis was conducted considering the relationship between research questions and the data collection tool. In this respect, the quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive analysis methods. IBM SPSS 20 program was used for analysis. The average and standard deviation of the positive, negative, and incentive items that may affect conducting MOOC of the faculty members are calculated and presented in tables. The qualitative data obtained from the open-ended question in the questionnaire were analyzed using the content analysis method.

FINDINGS

THE TENDENCY OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO CONDUCT PUBLIC COURSES ON THE INTERNET

In order to determine the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC; the willingness of the faculty members to conduct MOOC, their aims, and their perceptions of competence for conducting MOOC were investigated. The data obtained for this purpose are presented within the framework of the research questions.

The willingness of faculty members to conduct MOOC

In order to determine the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC; their willingness to conduct MOOC was investigated. The data obtained for this purpose are presented in Table 1.

According to Table 1, 34.4% of 122 faculty members want to conduct MOOC, and 65.6% do not want to conduct MOOC.

WILLINGNESS TO CONDUCT MOOC	*F*	%
I want to conduct MOOC.	42	34.4
I don't want to conduct MOOC.	80	65.6
Total	**122**	**100.0**

Table 1 The willingness of the faculty members to conduct MOOC.

The aims of the faculty members to conduct MOOC

In order to determine the main aims of faculty members for conducting MOOC; 42 faculty members who would like to conduct MOOC were asked the question "What is your main aim to conduct MOOC?". 38 faculty members answered this question and 4 faculty members left it blank. The responses were analyzed by content analysis method and as a result of the analysis; categories of individual aims, course-based aims, and general aims emerged. Factors related to the main aims of the faculty members for conducting MOOC are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Main aims of the faculty members for conducting MOOC.

CATEGORY	FACTORS	*F*
Individual aims	Addressing large audiences	19
	Sharing knowledge and experiences	8
	Sharing course resources	4
	Self-development in the field	4
	Introducing oneself in the field	2
	Online training experience	2
	Save time and space	2
	Financial gain	1
Field related aims	Raising public awareness in the related field	8
	Contribute to the development of the related field	6
	Destruction of negative perceptions in the related field	6
Social aims	Creating equal opportunities in education	4
	Strengthening communication and information exchange	2
	Supporting MOOC applications	2

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the main aims of the faculty members to conduct MOOC are mostly in the individual direction. It has been seen that for the individual aims of the faculty members, the aims such as addressing large audiences and sharing their knowledge and experiences come to the forefront. It was seen that the least mentioned individual aim by faculty members was financial gain. It is seen that field-related aims of the faculty members for conducting MOOC are to raise awareness of the society in the relevant field, to contribute to the development of the relevant field, and to destroy the negative perceptions about the related field. It has been revealed, on the other hand, that the social aims of the faculty members for conducting MOOCs are mainly to provide equal opportunity in education.

Proficiency perceptions of faculty members for conducting MOOC

In order to determine the proficiency perceptions of the faculty members for conducting MOOC, the faculty members were asked the question "Who do you think should conduct MOOC?. While 100 of the faculty members answered this question, 22 left it blank. The answers received were analyzed by content analysis method and as a result of the analysis; professional competence, personal characteristics, and profession categories emerged. The qualifications required from faculty members conducting MOOC, according to the faculty members, are presented in Table 3.

When Table 3 is examined, according to the faculty members, it is seen that the qualifications required by the faculty members conducting MOOC are more towards professional competence. The faculty members mentioned the factors related to professional qualifications, being experts in their field, and having educational experience. According to the faculty members, the faculty members who conduct MOOC should have the characteristics such as volunteering to conduct MOOC, having sufficient time, and being good at communication, diction, and oratory. Among these factors, volunteering was the most prominent one. In addition, according to the faculty members, the field of expertise of the faculty members conducting MOOC should be more theoretical and the field of expertise should draw the interest of society.

CATEGORY	FACTORS	*F*
Professional competence	Being an expert in the field	36
	Having teaching experience	20
	Having technical skills	14
Personal characteristics	Volunteering	30
	Having sufficient time	9
	Being good at communication, diction, and oratory	8
	Being recognized in the field	6
	Being open and innovative for self-improvement	4
Profession	Having theoretical expertise in the field	14
	Drawing public interest in the field of expertise	10

Table 3 Required qualifications of faculty members conducting MOOC.

POSITIVE FACTORS AFFECTING THE TENDENCY OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO CONDUCT MOOC

In this part of the study, which examines the tendency of the faculty members to conduct MOOC and the effective factors; the positive factors that may affect the faculty members to conduct MOOC are examined. The data obtained are presented in Table 4.

ITEMS	$\bar{X}$	SD
I think that it will contribute to the promotion of our university both nationally and internationally.	5.20	.82
I think it will support lifelong learning.	5.05	.85
Since it is presented by universities, I think it will provide more reliable information on the internet.	4.91	1.10
I think it will contribute to the faculty and students who have a shortage of information resources.	4.85	.90
I think it will help faculty members to design their courses.	4.80	1.00
I think I will develop myself in the field of technology use.	4.70	1.10
I think it will enable faculty members to prepare their courses with care.	4.69	1.09
I think a lot of students should benefit from my knowledge.	4.59	1.13
I think it will help university students choose the courses they will take.	4.43	1.08
I think I will develop useful relationships with new students and faculty.	4.43	1.04
I think I will develop myself in a pedagogical sense.	4.39	1.15
I think it will contribute to research and development activities.	4.33	1.12
I think it will create a new field of work for academics.	4.32	1.21
I think it will raise the level of education in universities.	4.32	1.24
I think I will become a recognized faculty member in my field.	4.17	1.17
I think it will be a guide for the students to choose their departments.	4.06	1.24
I think I will become a recognized faculty member throughout the university.	4.00	1.24
I think it will strengthen my position at the university.	3.67	1.31

Table 4 Mean and standard deviation of positive factors for conducting MOOC.

When Table 4 is examined; The most powerful positive factor that encourages faculty members to conduct MOOC is thought to contribute to the promotion of the institution in the national and international environment ($\bar{X}$ = 5.20, SD = 0.82). Two other positive factors that encouraged faculty members to conduct MOOC were found to be supporting lifelong learning ($\bar{X}$ = 5.05, SD = 0.85) and ensuring reliable information on the Internet ($\bar{X}$ = 4.91, SD = 1.10), respectively. The weakest positive factor that encouraged faculty members to conduct MOOC was found to be strengthening the position of faculty members in the institution ($\bar{X}$ = 3.67 SD = 1.31).

NEGATIVE FACTORS AFFECTING INSTRUCTORS' TENDENCY TO CONDUCT MOOC

In this part of the study, which examines the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC and the effective factors, the negative factors that may affect the faculty members to conduct MOOC are examined. The data obtained are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Mean and standard deviation of negative factors related to conducting MOOC.

ITEMS	$\bar{X}$	SD
I don't have enough time.	4.02	1.29
If I share materials that do not belong to me in MOOCs, I think I will have problems with how to ensure copyright.	3.66	1.52
I think I need to be more proficient in instructional design to conduct a MOOC.	3.48	1.46
I think there will be no financial incentives.	3.27	1.40
I think that if I share my course resources in MOOCs, plagiarism will increase.	3.25	1.36
I think I need to be more competent in that area to conduct a MOOC.	3.12	1.49
I do not have the technical skills necessary to develop materials in a digital (computational) environment.	2.98	1.44
I do not have enough materials to use in a digital (computational) environment.	2.98	1.39
I don't think the university administration will have any support.	2.51	1.26
I don't think MOOCs will draw interest.	2.34	1.23
I do not have the necessary technical equipment (computer, scanner, etc.).	2.17	1.25
I don't think that there is enough technical infrastructure at my university.	2.07	1.08
I think it is a risk to share my experiences with everyone in a highly competitive environment.	2.03	1.10
I don't think MOOCs will be useful to anyone.	1.84	1.05

When Table 5 is examined; it is found that the most powerful factor that could negatively affect instructors to conduct MOOC is not havin ($\bar{X}$ = 4.02, SD = 1.29). It can also be seen that the other two main factors that could adversely affect the instructors to conduct MOOCs are, respectively, thinking that they would have copyright problems in sharing materials ($\bar{X}$ = 3.66, SD = 1.52) and that they should be more competent in instructional design ($\bar{X}$ = 3.48, SD = 1.46). The weakest negative factor that might affect instructors to conduct MOOCs is that MOOCs will not be beneficial to anyone ($\bar{X}$ = 1.84, SD = 1.05).

EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO BE ENCOURAGED TO CONDUCT MOOC

In this part of the study, which examines faculty members' tendencies to conduct MOOCs and influential factors, what needs to be done to encourage faculty members to conduct MOOCs is examined. The data obtained are presented in Table 6.

When Table 6 is examined; It can be seen that the most powerful factors that should be done to encourage instructors to conduct MOOC are conducting MOOCs through a platform provided by the institution (learning management system) ($\bar{X}$ = 5.15, SD = 0.80) and providing an easy to use platform (learning management system) ($\bar{X}$ = 5.15, SD = 0.86). The other two main factors that could be done to encourage instructors to conduct MOOC are seen to provide training on conducting MOOC ($\bar{X}$ = 5.03, SD = 0.93) and protecting shared course resources against plagiarism ($\bar{X}$ = 5.00, SD = 1.24). It can also be seen that the weakest factor that can be done to encourage instructors to conduct MOOC is to make it compulsory to conduct MOOCs ($\bar{X}$ = 2.02, SD = 1.05).

According to the faculty members, in order to determine what should be done to encourage them to use MOOC, an open-ended question "What do you think should be done to encourage faculty members to conduct MOOC?" was asked. 54 of 122 instructors answered this question and 58 of them were left blank. The obtained data were analyzed with the content analysis method, and as a result of the analysis, it was seen that 8 factors stood out for the faculty

ITEMS	$\bar{X}$	SS
My MOOC should be conducted through a platform (learning management system) created by my university.	5.15	.80
An easy-to-use platform (learning management system) must be provided to conduct MOOC.	5.15	.86
Instructors should be given training so that they can open a MOOC for their own courses.	5.03	.93
The resources I share in the MOOCs must be protected against plagiarism.	5.00	1.24
MOOC support centers should be established in universities affiliated with faculties or rectorates.	4.93	.93
Hardware support (computer, browser, etc.) should be provided to faculty members to open MOOCs related to their own courses.	4.88	.91
Rewards should be given to encourage to conduct MOOC.	4.77	1.19
Financial support should be provided for instructors to open MOOCs for their own courses.	4.74	.96
The efforts of instructors to conduct MOOCs for their own courses should be included in the academic promotion criteria.	3.99	1.59
Conducting MOOC must be mandatory.	2.02	1.05

Table 6 Average and standard deviation of MOOC encouragement expectations.

members to be encouraged to carry out MOOC. Each factor and its frequency are given in Table 7.

When Table 7. is examined, it is seen that the views of faculty members about what kind of incentives should be provided to conduct MOOCs are gathered on the factors of promoting the system (N = 25), providing financial support (N = 16), and providing technical support (N = 10). Some of the faculty members' views on what needs to be done to be encouraged to conduct MOOC are as follows

FACTORS	*F*
The system should be introduced.	25
Financial support should be provided.	16
Technical support should be provided.	10
Conducting MOOC should be included in the academic promotion criteria.	8
Rewarding should be done.	7
The views of the instructor should be taken into consideration in the course design.	6
Freedom of science, art, and thought should be protected.	1
Body language and stage performance training should be provided.	1

Table 7 Things to do to encourage faculty members to conduct MOOC.

> *"It is clear that there is a need to inform many instroductors about MOOC and to raise awareness on this issue. For this reason, especially in each faculty, separate information and seminars should be held." (Faculty member 25)*
>
> *"The faculty members who wish to open these courses should be supported especially in terms of technical infrastructure with financial support." (Faculty member 70)*
>
> *"The criteria for academic promotion should also include articles for conducting these courses. It should be ensured that the academic points of publications and courses made for these courses are increased for academicians." (Faculty member 74)*
>
> *"The success of the courses offered in these applications should be rewarded." (Faculty member 32)*

DISCUSSION

In this study, it is aimed to examine the faculty members' tendency to conduct a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) and the factors affecting these tendencies. In this context, positive and negative factors affecting the tendency of faculty members to conduct MOOC and their

expectations for MOOC incentives were investigated. In this section, the results obtained in accordance with the purposes of the research are interpreted in light of the literature and the results of similar studies are evaluated. When interpreting the findings of this study, the limitation should be taken into consideration that the majority of the faculty members in the study group had not previously conducted MOOC. However, it should not be ignored that this limitation can be considered an advantage in terms of identifying barriers to MOOC applications.

FACULTY MEMBERS' TRENDS IN CONDUCTING MOOC

As a result of the study, 34.4% of the faculty members who participated in the study wanted to conduct MOOC. The low rate of faculty members who want to conduct MOOCs may be related to the fact that MOOC applications have just started to be applied in Turkey, and therefore the faculty members do not have enough knowledge about MOOCs. However, faculty members have stated that providing adequate information for MOOC applications can be a strong incentive for conducting these courses.

It has been revealed that the main objectives of the faculty members for conducting MOOC are to raise the awareness of society and contribute to the development of the field by sharing the resources, knowledge, and experiences of the experts and improving themselves in the field of expertise. It can be thought that these goals of the faculty members are influenced by the fact that the MOOCs provide more students with the opportunity to share information and increase the recognition of the faculty members both in their own fields and in the institution they work in (Aydemir et al., 2018; Kolowich, 2013; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022). It has been found that among the aims of the faculty members conducting MOOC, there is also the opportunity to create equal opportunities in education in the social sense. The feature allowing everyone to take courses by participating in the courses regardless of their level of education (Peter & Deimann, 2013; Yousef et al., 2014b) supports lifelong learning by creating equal opportunities in education (Sharma et al., 2020). Therefore, it can be thought that faculty members can achieve these aims by conducting MOOC. In the studies examined, it was observed that the aims of faculty members to support lifelong learning by creating equal opportunities in education were associated with the feeling of "sacrifice" (Aydemir et al., 2018; Hew & Cheung, 2014; Kolowich, 2013).

According to the faculty members, the academicians who will conduct MOOC must have some basic professional qualifications, such as having expert, experienced and technical skills in the field. Kassabian (2014) stated that students who participate in MOOC applications tend to take courses from specialists and prominent faculty members in their field. Gerber (2014) and Teplechuk (2013) emphasized the importance of integrating technology into education for MOOC applications. Therefore, the fact that the faculty members who will conduct MOOC have these qualifications may increase the motivation of the faculty members by increasing student participation (Henderikx et al., 2021) and may also ensure the healthy progress of the courses.

According to the faculty members, MOOCs should be conducted by faculty members with adequate time, voluntary, and good communication skills. This result can be explained by the fact that MOOC applications require considerable time and effort (Evans & Myrick, 2015; Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Teplechuk, 2013). In MOOCs ongoing monitoring of online students necessitates more time and attention from faculty members (García-Peñalvo et al., 2018). Kumar and Al-Samarrie (2018) underlined the importance of faculty members' motivation and volunteering levels in developing and delivering MOOCs. Volunteering is a variable that is also considered within the framework of the TAM. In this direction, Anderson et al. (2006) stated that volunteering is the basis for the acceptance of technology in their study in higher education institutions. On the other hand, there are some observations that the communication skills of the faculty members who will conduct the MOOC should be good. Bali (2013) and Conole (2013) stated that conducting MOOC applications through distance education and addressing a large number of students in these courses should provide an effective communication process.

According to the faculty members, the fields of expertise of the faculty members who will conduct MOOC should be theoretical and attract the attention of society. Chengjie (2015), in his study, found that educators who are experts in fields that require applications such as face-to-face communication, group work, and laboratory work have difficulty in distance education applications. The opinions of faculty members about the fact that the subject area of the

MOOC should be theoretical can be related to these difficulties. On the other hand, the views of the faculty members about conducting MOOC applications on issues of public interest to society can be associated with participant demand. In the studies examined, it was stated that the number of students attending courses for faculty members is a strong motivation factor (Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Kassabian, 2014). Therefore, it may be thought that the demand for MOOC on subjects that are of interest to society will be high. Therefore, it can be thought that there will be a high demand for MOOC applications on subjects that are of interest to society.

POSITIVE FACTORS AFFECTING FACULTY MEMBERS' TENDENCY TO CONDUCT MOOC

In the study, it was found that many factors positively affect faculty members in conducting MOOC. The strongest positive factor that led faculty members to conduct MOOC was found to be institutional belonging. The faculty members believe that they can contribute to the promotion of the institution they work in the national and international area by conducting MOOC. Similarly, in the studies examined, it was found that MOOC applications contribute to the promotion of the institutions and thus they have the opportunity to improve their educational spectrum (Hollands & Tirthali, 2014). One of the strong positive factors for the faculty members to conduct MOOC was the idea of supporting lifelong learning. According to the studies examined, individuals' expectations of education are changing and demands for lifelong learning are increasing (Belanger & Thornton, 2013; Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Sullivan et al., 2019; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022). In MOOC applications, there is no prerequisite for the participants and thus life-long learning can be provided to individuals of all ages (García-Peñalvo et al., 2018; Peter & Deimann, 2013; Yousef et al., 2014b). Therefore, it can be considered that this aspect of MOOC is deemed appropriate by the faculty members to respond to the changing demand in education.

The faculty members think that the resources used in MOOCs will provide more reliable information on the internet and that these resources will be useful for everyone who needs it. MOOCs are generally conducted by successful faculty members from well-known universities (Kassabian, 2014; Voudoukis & Pagiatakis 2022). This may have created a perception among faculty members that the resources used in MOOCs will be reliable. Moreover, this perception in faculty members may be due to the idea that any error in resources can be detected more easily because the MOOC appeals to a wider audience (Chengjie, 2015) and therefore the resources can be prepared more carefully. In addition, it is mentioned in many studies that instructors pay attention to the preparation of course content by using reliable sources and design principles in MOOCs (Aleman de la Garza et al., 2015; Fischer, 2014; Yousef et al., 2014a). In the study by Du (2022), in which the factors related to student satisfaction in MOOCs were examined, it was emphasized that the course content and design greatly affected student satisfaction. In the study by Ma & Lee (2020), it was emphasized that the MOOC design is of great importance to increase the rate of adoption by students and reduce dropout. Similarly, in this study, it was revealed that faculty members could improve themselves in course design while conducting MOOCs. Because there is no dependency on the curriculum in MOOCs, many tasks; such as creating lesson syllabi, designing activities, and determining assessment types and tools are performed by instructors (Bali, 2013; Conole, 2013; Read & Rodrigo, 2014; Sánchez-Vera et al., 2014; Teplechuk, 2013). Undertaking all these tasks can also influence the belief of faculty members who will conduct MOOC, that they will be able to develop themselves in course design.

NEGATIVE FACTORS AFFECTING FACULTY MEMBERS' TENDENCY TO CONDUCT MOOC

As a result of the study, it was found that the most powerful factor that could negatively affect faculty members to conduct MOOC was the time problem. Due to the nature of MOOCs, faculty members spend a lot of time and effort preparing for MOOCs (Chengjie, 2015; García-Peñalvo et al., 2018; Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Kassabian, 2014). In addition to this situation, the course load of the faculty members in their institutions and the tasks that they have to perform in academic terms may cause them not to be able to devote time to conduct MOOC.

Another element that instructors considered as an obstacle to conducting MOOC was that the materials they shared in MOOCs might be subject to copyright problems and that the support to be provided at this point was seen as a strong incentive for conducting MOOC. In the study conducted by Kursun, Cagiltay, and Can (2014) on the sharing of open course resources, they found that faculty members may have problems with copyrights in sharing their own materials and others' materials. On the other hand, Chen (2014), found that there were problems with the copyright of the materials shared in the MOOCs among instructors, universities, and MOOC platforms.

It was found out that faculty members felt they needed to be more proficient in instructional design to conduct MOOC. This may be related to the faculty members' level of competence in instructional design, as well as the requirements of MOOCs for instructional design. In studies examined, since MOOCs are addressed to a large number of students it is necessary to design an instructional design that meets the needs of these students (Asiri, 2014; Evans & Myrick, 2015; Hollands & Tirthali, 2014; Hoy, 2014; Jansen & Schuwer, 2015) and therefore it was concluded that faculty members should be sufficiently knowledgeable about instructional design (Du, 2022; Haavind & Sistek-Chandler, 2015; Ma & Lee, 2020; Sánchez-Vera et al., 2014; Teplechuk, 2013).

It was also found that the lack of financial incentives for MOOCs was seen as a negative factor. MOOCs are generally conducted without financial gain. Teplechuk (2013), in his study, found that the lack of financial gain to conduct MOOCs and ensure sustainability is a compelling factor for both instructors and institutions. Kolowich (2013), on the other hand, stated in his study that the willingness to earn financial gain by instructors was underestimated under the name of negative elements related to conducting MOOC.

FACULTY MEMBERS' EXPECTATIONS TO BE ENCOURAGED TO CONDUCT MOOC

As a result of the study, it was found that faculty members perceive the institutional support given while conducting MOOCs as a strong encouraging factor. Ghazali and Nordin (2018) stated in their study that motivating activities to be provided by educational institutions are of vital importance. At this point, it is very important to determine the elements that can motivate faculty members correctly. In this direction, it was determined that faculty members want to conduct their MOOCs through an easy-to-use platform created by their own universities. This result may be related to the perception of institutional affinity of faculty members. The wishes of faculty members to provide an easy-to-use platform may be related to perceived ease of use according to TAM (Technology Acceptance Model) model (Davis, 1989). Moreover, in the studies where the adaptation process of the faculty members to the new technologies was examined, it was determined that the ease of using a new technology eliminates the prejudices about that technology and enables the individuals to trust their own competencies and thus reduces the barriers to the use of technology (Gibson, Harris & Colaric, 2008; Turan & Colakoglu, 2011).

It was revealed at the point of encouraging them to conduct MOOCs that faculty members need different support such as being informed about MOOC applications by the institution they work for, the establishment of centers that can provide the necessary support in terms of protecting copyright, and conducting MOOC applications. Expectations of incentives for information may be related to the fact that the faculty members do not have an idea about the benefits of these applications and how they are conducted because applications have just been conducted recently in Turkey. Also, it was seen that perceived usefulness, which is one of the components of TAM, is one of the factors affecting the use of technology by instructors (Halawi & McCarthy, 2007; Keengwe, Kidd & Kyei-Blankson, 2009; Ma & Lee, 2019). Informing faculty members about the impact and benefits of the technology on their performance may facilitate their adaptation to technology (Antonaci et al., 2019; Jansen et al., 2020).

It was found that faculty members felt that MOOC activities should be encouraged in different ways, such as financial support, rewarding, or inclusion in academic promotion scores. It can be thought that the expectation of the faculty members stems from the fact that MOOCs require a lot of time and effort. Similarly, Surry and Land (2000), in their study to determine the strategies for encouraging higher education institutions to use technology, found that instructors were expecting awards in their activities related to the use of technology in their courses. The results of the studies on MOOCs also showed the importance of rewarding (Chengjie, 2015; Hollands &

Tirthali, 2014; Kassabian, 2014). On the other hand, Goel et al. (2022) emphasized that financial support is not seen as a primary motivation factor by educators in their study to determine the motivational elements related to MOOCs, but it is placed in fourth place. Faculty members believe that making MOOCs mandatory is not an appropriate incentive. In line with this idea, faculty members emphasized that the people who will conduct MOOCs should be completely voluntary. Similarly, Teplechuk (2013), in his study, found that faculty members conducting MOOCs take part in these practices based on volunteering. On the other hand, in the studies conducted on the acceptance of technology by instructors, it has been found that individuals who are open and willing to innovate in technology use are easier to adapt to technology (Evans & Myrick, 2015; Hall & Elliott, 2003; Lewis, Agarwal & Sambamurthy, 2003; Turan & Colakoglu, 2011).

As a result, it has been determined that various positive and negative factors may affect faculty members during MOOC conducting process and that faculty members have different expectations to encourage them to conduct MOOC. In line with the results obtained from the study, suggestions were made for the institutions wishing to conduct MOOCs and for researchers wishing to conduct studies about MOOCs.

Recommendations for institutions wishing to conduct MOOC:

- Faculty members should be informed about what MOOCs are and how they are conducted.
- Faculty members should be provided with information and support on materials development and sharing in MOOCs.
- Faculty members should be informed about instructional design and integration of instructional technologies in education.
- Faculty members should be provided with an easy-to-use platform that they can easily use while conducting MOOCs.
- Incentives such as financial support, rewards, or academic points should be provided to faculty members who conduct MOOC.

Recommendations for researchers wishing to conduct studies about MOOCs:

- The relationship between faculty members' tendency to conduct MOOC and different variables (subject area, expertise, computer skills, workload, etc.).
- In order to reveal the nature of aiming to conduct MOOC, the primary aims of the faculty members and how these aims change according to different variables such as belief in resource sharing and interest in their own fields can be investigated in depth.
- The reason for their negative attitudes towards conducting MOOC can be investigated in depth by conducting interviews with faculty members who are in the research group but do not want to conduct MOOC.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research paper was produced from the master thesis of the first author.

This research paper was examined by Atatürk University/Educational Sciences Institute Directorate/Educational Sciences Unit Ethics Committee and approved for ethical compliance. Reference number: E-56785782-050.02.04-2200006212.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

Meva Bayrak Karsli orcid.org/0000-0002-9062-6482
Atatürk University, TR

Selcuk Karaman orcid.org/0000-0002-0493-3444
Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, TR

REFERENCES

Ahmad, M. A., Hussin, A. R. C., Dahlan, H. M., & **Mahmood, J.** (2020). Motivations of teaching in massive open online course: review of literature. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1500*(1), 1087–1097. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1500/1/012096

Aleman de la Garza, L., Sancho Vinuesa, T., & **Gomez Zermeño, M. G.** (2015). Indicators of pedagogical quality for the design of a Massive Open Online Course for teacher training. *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal, 12*(1), 104–118. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v12i1.2260

Anderson, J. E., Schwager, P. H., & **Kerns, R. L.** (2006). The drivers for acceptance of tablet PCs by faculty in a college of business. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *17*(4), 429–440.

Antonaci, A., Klemke, R., Dirkx, K., & **Specht, M.** (2019). May the plan be with you! A usability study of the stimulated planning game element embedded in a MOOC platform. *International Journal of Serious Games*, *6*(1), 49–70. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17083/ijsg.v6i1.239

Asiri, O. I. (2014). *A Comparison Between International and US Graduate Students' Attitudes and Experiences Using Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)*. Published doctoral thesis. B. Thomas Golisano College of Computing and Information Sciences, Rochester, New York.

Aydemir, M., Çelik, E., Bingol, I., Çakmak-Karapınar, D., Kursun, E., & **Karaman, S.** (2016). İnternet üzerinden herkese açık kurs (İHAK) sağlama deneyimi: AtademiX. *Açıköğretim Uygulamaları ve Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(3), 52–74.

Aydemir, M., Çelik, E., Kurşun, E., & **Karaman, S.** (2018). Katilimcilar kitlesel açik çevrimiçi derslere neden katiliyorlar? Atademix örneği. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *18*(4), 1921–1937. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2018.18.41844-413255

Bali, M. (2013). 5 reasons teachers should dip into MOOCs for professional development. *MOOC News & Reviews*, *5*.

Belanger, Y., & **Thornton, J.** (2013). Bioelectricity: A Quantitative Approach Duke University's First MOOC.

Büyüköztürk, S., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, S., & **Demirel, F.** (2008). *Bilimsel Arastirma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Çağıltay, K. (2014). Gökyüzünde öğrenme? Sanal dünyada öğrenme? Kitlesel Açık Çevrimiçi Dersler (KAÇD) MOOC–Massive Open Online Courses. *ODTÜLÜ Dergisi, 54*, 44–45.

Chen, Y. (2014). Investigating MOOCs through blog mining. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 15*(2), 85–106. DOI: https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i2.1695

Chengjie, Y. (2015). Challenges and changes of MOOC to traditional classroom teaching mode. *Canadian Social Science, 11*(1), 135–139. DOI: http://doi.org/10.3968/%25x

Conole, G. (2013). MOOCs as disruptive technologies: strategies for enhancing the learner experience and quality of MOOCs. *Revista de Educación a Distancia, 39*, 1–17.

Cormier, D., & **Siemens, G.** (2010). The open course: Through the open door-open courses as research, learning, and engagement. *Educause Review, 45*(4), 30.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS quarterly, 13*(3), 318–340. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Demirci, N. (2014). What is Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and What is promising us for learning?: A Review-evaluative Article about MOOCs. *Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science & Mathematics Education, 8*(1), 231–256. DOI: https://doi.org/10.12973/nefmed.2014.8.1.a10

Doo, M. Y., Tang, Y., Bonk, C. J., & **Zhu, M.** (2020). MOOC instructor motivation and career development. *Distance Education*, *41*(1), 26–47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1724770

Dreisiebner, S., Polzer, A. K., Robinson, L., Libbrecht, P., Boté-Vericad, J. J., Urbano, C., ... & **Stričević, I.** (2020). Facilitation of information literacy through a multilingual MOOC considering cultural aspects. *Journal of Documentation*, *77*(3), 777–797. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-06-2020-0099

Du, B. (2022). Research on the factors influencing the learner satisfaction of MOOCs. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1–21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11269-0

Evans, S., & **Myrick, J. G.** (2015). How MOOC instructors view the pedagogy and purposes of massive open online courses. *Distance Education*, *36*(3), 295–311. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2015.1081736

Fischer, G. (2014). Beyond hype and underestimation: identifying research challenges for the future of MOOCs. *Distance Education, 35*(2), 149–158. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2014.920752

Fraenkel, J. R., & **Wallen, N. E.** (1990). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

García-Peñalvo, F. J., Fidalgo-Blanco, Á., & **Sein-Echaluce, M. L.** (2018). An adaptive hybrid MOOC model: Disrupting the MOOC concept in higher education. *Telematics and Informatics*, *35*(4), 1018–1030. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.09.012

Gerber, J. (2014). *MOOCs: Innovation, Disruption and Instructional Leadership in Higher Education.* Published doctoral thesis. Los Angeles, USA: University of California.

Ghazali, N. B., & **Nordin, M. S.** (2018). The perception of university lecturers of teaching and learning in massive open online courses (MOOCs). *Journal of Personalized Learning*, *2*(1), 52–57.

Gibson, S. G., Harris, M. L., & **Colaric, S. M.** (2008). Technology acceptance in an academic context: Faculty acceptance of online education. *Journal of Education for Business, 83*(6), 355–359. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.83.6.355-359

Goel, P., Raj, S., Garg, A., Singh, S., & **Gupta, S.** (2022). Peeping in the minds of MOOCs instructors: using fuzzy approach to understand the motivational factors. *Online Information Review*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-04-2021-0205

Goglio, V., & **Bertolini, S.** (2021). The contribution of MOOCs to upskilling the labor force. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 3*(7), 561–574. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-10-2020-0159

Haavind, S., & **Sistek-Chandler, C.** (2015). The emergent role of the MOOC instructor: A qualitative study of trends toward improving future practice. *International Journal on E-learning*, *14*(3), 331–350.

Halawi, L., & **McCarthy, R.** (2007). Measuring faculty perceptions of blackboard using the technology acceptance model. *Issues in Information Systems, 8*(2), 160–165.

Hall, M., & **Elliott, K. M.** (2003). Diffusion of technology into the teaching process: Strategies to encourage faculty members to embrace the laptop environment. *Journal of Education for Business, 78*(6), 301–307. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320309598617

Henderikx, M., Kreijns, K., Castaño Muñoz, J., & **Kalz, M.** (2019). Factors influencing the pursuit of personal learning goals in MOOCs. *Distance Education*, *40*(2), 187–204. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2019.1600364

Henderikx, M., Kreijns, K., Xu, K. M., & **Kalz, M.** (2021). Making barriers to learning in MOOCs visible. A factor analytical approach. *Open Praxis*, *13*(2), 143–159. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.13.2.124

Hew, K. F., & **Cheung, W. S.** (2014). Students' and instructors' use of massive open online courses (MOOCs): Motivations and challenges. *Educational Research Review, 12*(0), 45–58. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.05.001

Hollands, F. M., & **Tirthali, D.** (2014). *MOOCs: Expectations and reality*. New York, NY: Center for Benefit-Cost Studies of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Hone, K. S., & **El Said, G. R.** (2016). Exploring the factors affecting MOOC retention: A survey study. *Computers & Education*, *98*, 157–168. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.03.016

Hoy, M. B. (2014). MOOCs 101: An Introduction to Massive Open Online Courses. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly, 33*(1), 85–91. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/02763869.2014.866490

Jansen, D., & **Schuwer, R.** (2015). *Institutional MOOC strategies in Europe*. EADTU.

Jansen, R. S., van Leeuwen, A., Janssen, J., Conijn, R., & **Kester, L.** (2020). Supporting learners' self-regulated learning in Massive Open Online Courses. *Computers & Education*, *146*, 103771. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103771

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. (14. Baskı)*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kassabian, D. (2014). *Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) at elite, early-adopter universities: Goals, progress, and value proposition*. Published doctoral thesis. Pennsylvania, USA: University of Pennsylvania.

Keengwe, J., Kidd, T., & **Kyei-Blankson, L.** (2009). Faculty and technology: Implications for faculty training and technology leadership. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 18*(1), 23–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-008-9126-2

Kolowich, S. (2013). The professors who make the MOOCs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 18*, 1–12.

Krosnick, J. A., & **Fabrigar, L. R.** (1997). Designing rating scales for effective measurement in surveys. *Survey measurement and process quality*, 141–164. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118490013.ch6

Kumar, J. A., & **Al-Samarraie, H.** (2018). MOOCs in the Malaysian higher education institutions: The instructors' perspectives. *The Reference Librarian*, *59*(3), 163–177. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2018.1458688

Kurşun, E. (2011). *An investigation of incentives, barriers and values about the OER movement in Turkish universities: Implications for policy framework*. Published doctoral thesis. Ankara, Turkey: Middle East Technical University.

Kursun, E., Cagiltay, K., & **Can, G.** (2014). An investigation of faculty perspectives on barriers, incentives, and benefits of the OER movement in Turkey. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *15*(6), 14–32. DOI: https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i6.1914

Lewis, W., Agarwal, R., & **Sambamurthy, V.** (2003). Sources of influence on beliefs about information technology use: an empirical study of knowledge workers. *MIS quarterly*, 657–678. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/30036552

Ma, L., & **Lee, C. S.** (2019). Investigating the adoption of MOOC s: A technology–user–environment perspective. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *35*(1), 89–98. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12314

Ma, L., & **Lee, C. S.** (2020). Drivers and barriers to MOOC adoption: Perspectives from adopters and non-adopters. *Online Information Review*, *44*(3), 671–684. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-06-2019-0203

Onah, D. F., Pang, E. L., Sinclair, J. E., & **Uhomoibhi, J.** (2021). An innovative MOOC platform: the implications of self-directed learning abilities to improve motivation in learning and to support self-regulation. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, *38*(3), 283–298. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-03-2020-0040

Özen, Y., & **Gül, A.** (2007). Sosyal ve eğitim bilimleri araştırmalarında evren-örneklem sorunu. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *15*, 394–422.

Pappano, L. (2012). The Year of the MOOC. *The New York Times, 2*(12), 1–7.

Peter, S., & **Deimann, M.** (2013). On the role of openness in education: A historical reconstruction. *Open Praxis, 5*(1), 7–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.5.1.23

Rai, L., & **Chunrao, D.** (2016). Influencing factors of success and failure in MOOC and general analysis of learner behavior. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 6*(4), 262–268. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7763/IJIET.2016.V6.697

Read, T., & **Rodrigo, C.** (2014). Toward a quality model for UNED MOOCs. *eLearning Papers, 37, 1–8*. http://www.researchgate.net/publication/265293654

Rogers, E. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations* (4th Ed.). New York: Free Press.

Sánchez-Vera, M. d. M., León-Urrutia, M., & **Davis, H. C.** (2014). Challenges in the creation, development and implementation of MOOCs: Web Science course at the University of Southampton. *Comunicar, 22*(44), 37–43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3916/C44-2015-04

Sharma, B., Nand, R., Naseem, M., & **Reddy, E. V.** (2020). Effectiveness of online presence in a blended higher learning environment in the Pacific. *Studies in Higher Education*, *45*(8), 1547–1565. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1602756

Sullivan, R., Fulcher-Rood, K., Kruger, J., Sipley, G., & **van Putten, C.** (2019). Emerging technologies for lifelong learning and success: A MOOC for everyone. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *47*(3), 318–336. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239518821065

Surry, D. W., & **Land, S. M.** (2000). Strategies for motivating higher education faculty to use technology. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *37*(2), 145–153. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13558000050034501

Teplechuk, E. (2013). *Emergent models of Massive Open Online Courses: an exploration of sustainable practices for MOOC institutions in the context of the launch of MOOCs at the University of Edinburgh.* Published doctoral thesis. Edinburgh, Scotland: The University of Edinburgh.

Tseng, T. H., Lin, S., Wang, Y. S., & **Liu, H. X.** (2022). Investigating teachers' adoption of MOOCs: the perspective of UTAUT2. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *30*(4), 635–650. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1674888

Turan, A. H., & **Çolakoğlu, B. E.** (2011). Yüksek öğrenimde öğretim elemanlarının teknoloji kabulü ve kullanımı: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesinde ampirik bir değerlendirme. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi, 9*(1), 106–121. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31671/dogus.2019.226

Voudoukis, N., & **Pagiatakis, G.** (2022). Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs): Practices, Trends, and Challenges for the Higher Education. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, *3*(3), 288–295. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2022.3.3.365

Yousef, A. M. F., Chatti, M. A., Schroeder, U., & **Wosnitza, M.** (2014a). What drives a successful MOOC? An empirical examination of criteria to assure design quality of MOOCs. *Paper presented at the 14th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT) – Advanced Technologies for Supporting Open Access to Formal and Informal Learning*, Athens, GREECE. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1109/ICALT.2014.23

Yousef, A. M. F., Chatti, M. A., Schroeder, U., Wosnitza, M., & **Jakobs, H.** (2014b). MOOCs-A Review of the State-of-the-Art. In *Proc. CSEDU 2014 conference, 3*, 9–20.

Yuan, L., & **Powell, S.** (2013). MOOCs and Open Education: Implications for Higher Education – A white paper. JISC CETIS (Centre for Educational Technology & Interoperability Standards). http://publications.cetis.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/MOOCs-and-Open-Education.pdf

Zhou, T., Huang, S., Cheng, J., & **Xiao, Y.** (2020). The distance teaching practice of combined mode of massive open online course micro-video for interns in emergency department during the COVID-19 epidemic period. *Telemedicine and e-Health*, *26*(5), 584–588. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2020.0079

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:
Bayrak Karsli, M., & Karaman, S.(2022). Investigation of Tendency among Instructors to Conduct a Massive Open Online Course: Case of Turkey. *Open Praxis*, *14*(3), pp. 214–229. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.14.3.476

Submitted: 16 January 2022
Accepted: 05 September 2022
Published: 03February 2023