

Motivational Factors Affecting the Integration of a Learning Management System by Faculty

Cynthia Gautreau, California State University Fullerton.

Abstract

Online courses taught using a learning management system are common in higher education. Teaching online requires a new set of skills, knowledge, and professional growth. Faculty development programs often overlook factors that promote or inhibit the use of technologies among professors. This study identified the motivation factors that faculty consider relevant to their personal decision to adopt a learning management system. A needs assessment evaluation methodology was applied to investigate two research questions. The first question analyzed the demographics of the participants in this study including gender, age, tenure status, department, and years of experience using a technology and using an LMS. The second research question investigated the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that motivate faculty to adopt a learning management system in their instruction. Participants ($N = 42$) were tenured and tenure track faculty instructing at a four-year public university in California.

Introduction

Online instruction using a learning management system (LMS) is a growing practice at institutions of higher education. Faculty who transition from face-to-face courses to online instruction need support from their universities. Research shows that understanding and identifying the motivation factors that influence faculty is relevant to effective faculty development, support structures, and the use of an LMS (Betts, 1998). An LMS is a self-contained webpage with embedded instructional tools that permit faculty to organize academic content and engage students in their learning (Laster, 2005). Research shows that infusing education technology resources, such as an LMS, may assist faculty with managing courses and organizing content to engage students and decrease planning time, thus supporting the instructional process (Ayers & Doherty, 2003; Jafari, McGee, & Carmean, 2006; Oliva & Pawlas, 2005). Despite the benefits of incorporating an LMS, many faculty do not adopt technology as a teaching tool.

Background

Online course offerings continue to increase. Teaching, designing and developing online courses requires extensive faculty development. Many faculty members are not motivated to teach using an LMS for a variety of reasons. The reasons will vary depending on demographics and the motivation factors that are important to faculty. Research in instructional technology and motivation demonstrates a relationship between motivators and teaching practices. Among the most prevalent motivation factors identified are achievement, compensation, personal growth, administrative support, and personal fulfillment (Betts, 1998; Lawler & King, 2003; Rogers, 1995). The presence of these factors is a key component in the adoption and use of technology, specifically an LMS, by faculty.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the motivation factors and analyze demographics among faculty at the same college to understand what motivates faculty to adopt an LMS as part of face-to-face teaching, and when deciding to teach online courses. Based on previous studies

(Betts, 1998; Hood, 2002; Lawler & King, 2003, Schifter, 2000; Smylie, 1988), motivation factors that influence faculty will fluctuate depending on the demographics of the participants.

Literature Review

Technology has infused all aspects of society. One of the most prominent changes has occurred in the education field. The manner in which universities conduct administration, educators teach, and students learn are affected by technology advancements.

Instructional technology in education is defined as the combined approach of instructional design and instructional development (Saettler, 1968). According to the Commission on Instructional Technology (1970), "...it encompasses the systemic and systematic application of strategies and techniques derived from behavioral, cognitive, and constructivist theories to the solution of instructional challenges..." (p. 59). Instructional technologies as described by Engler (as cited by Anglin, 1995) are to support the process of teaching by faculty, support the process of learning by students, and apply research methods to implement instructional techniques using available resources.

Researchers (Chickering & Ehrmann, 1996; Edelstein & Edwards, 2002; Frazee, 2003; Wang, 2001) address numerous benefits of technology integration. For example, Frazee's (2003) position is that because face-to-face class time is limited and online discussion provides a non-threatening environment, students feel confident about participating and asking questions. Furthermore, Edelstein and Edwards (2002) noted that online courses are successful when the students are involved and active participants. Online instruction contains advantages that support student learning, however, faculty development training is necessary to understand the effective techniques. Faculty development and research clearly emphasizes needs based training.

Instructional Technology Research

Wang (2001) states that, "...the World-Wide Web provides unprecedented opportunities for instructors to create engaging and authentic learning contexts and activities for learners..." (p. 3). This principle describes opportunities that may be cultivated so that instructors apply

resources, create new learning opportunities using an LMS and use research based teaching methods. With the intention of reaching a level of proficiency, adequate training needs to be provided for educators (Covington, Petherbridge, & Warrant, 2005). An array of innovations exist that may support instruction; however, determining the appropriate technology is the responsibility of each educator. Chickering and Ehrmann (1996) state that "...any given instructional strategy can be supported by a number of contrasting technologies, and just as any given technology might support different instructional strategies. But for any given instructional strategy, some technologies are better than others..." (p. 3). Recent additions to instructional technologies are learning management systems.

Learning Management Systems

The integration of formal electronic learning management systems is a relatively new instrument in teaching (e.g. the Blackboard Learning Management System® was first introduced in 1995). An LMS is a web based software consisting of courses that contain electronic tools including a discussion board, files, grade book, electronic mail, announcements, assessments, and multimedia elements. An LMS provides access to student-centered teaching approaches, increased accessibility, assessment and evaluation features, and improved management of course content and administrative tasks (Laster, 2005; Mullinix & McCurry, 2003; Simpson & Payne, 1999).

Benefits of LMS Use

As institutions increase the number of online course offerings, more faculty will need to learn to teach using an LMS. Therefore, understanding the potential benefits of adopting an LMS is relevant to instruction. A perceived benefit of using an LMS is the ability to instruct online using a variety of modalities to meet learners' diverse needs (Mullinix & McCurry, 2003). A challenge for instructors is providing differentiated instruction. An LMS permits faculty to incorporate multimedia elements including audio recordings, music, video, text, interactivity, and sequencing (Klemm, 1998; Smith, 1996). Furthermore, as outlined by Mullinix and McCurry, the potential uses of an LMS to improve the teaching and learning process include increased access to course content and improved communication among professors and students. As noted by O'Quinn and

Corry (2002) who support Mullinix and McCurry's findings, a web-based course expands the learning time because content is readily accessible.

Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment and evaluation techniques are another significant benefit of online learning (Laster, 2005; Smith, 1996). Online assessments incorporate a variety of metacognitive strategies including self-monitoring, personal management, focus, and planning objectives. Smith notes that LMS resources permit tutorials, simulated and real world models, problem solving and role-playing activities. The social and affective strategies incorporated through an LMS are the collaboration and cooperation that occurs in discussion boards, group pages, and chat sessions.

Organization of Content

The electronic tools that are available in an LMS provide faculty with a comprehensive approach to organizing course content and completing administrative procedures (Travis, 1997, Wang, 2001). Distribution of reading materials and handouts are completed through electronic documents and files, thereby eliminating additional clerical tasks (Pittinsky, 2004). The advantages of integrating and incorporating an LMS are apparent to faculty who are avid users (Patterson, 2004). Based on the benefits outlined in research, it is advantageous for faculty to adopt an LMS to support their instruction. However, as demonstrated through this research, many other factors influence their decisions.

Theoretical Framework

Theories related to motivation, education and technology are pertinent to this research and identify similar factors. Three theories that have been applied to the area of motivation, technology use, and changes in higher education are (a) the motivation hygiene theory (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959), (b) the diffusion of innovations theory (Rogers, 1995), and (c) the change theory as it relates to technology integration (Fullan, 2001). An analysis of each theory revealed that one factor, administrative support and practices, is present in each theory and it is consistent with the findings of this study.

Motivation Hygiene Theory

Herzberg et al. (1959) examined motivation and job satisfaction within an organization; findings were not specific to education, however, the results have been generalized to various career fields including education (Betts, 1998; Chyung, 2005; Lee 2001). Herzberg et al. emphasized that motivation was not limited by individual views and opinions, but the administrative support and practices of the organization influenced a person's motivation to work. As noted by Herzberg based on the findings of the study, "The results indicated that motivators were the primary cause of satisfaction and hygiene factors the primary cause of unhappiness on the job" (Herzberg, 1968, p. 57). The study outlined two sets of factors defined as the motivators and hygiene factors.

Motivator factors included both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Outlined in the motivation hygiene theory are seven motivator factors; "the factors are achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, growth or advancement (Herzberg, p. 58, 1968). The factors are based on a person's ability to achieve and maintain a positive attitude towards their specific organization and career.

The second set of factors were labeled hygiene factors. Hygiene factors may influence an individual's satisfaction level in their current careers but do not affect their motivation to work. The hygiene factors that most affect an individual's career satisfaction are "company policy and administrative practices, supervision, interpersonal relationships, and working conditions, salary, status and security" (Herzberg, p.58, 1968) . Another theory that is pertinent to this research is the diffusion of innovation theory (Rogers, 1995).

Diffusion of Innovation Theory

The diffusion of innovation theory relates to the adoption of new technologies into the teaching and learning process. As described by Rogers (1995), there are five adopter categories including innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. The categories are based on the rate of adoption of an innovation and reflect the rates that faculty adopt technological innovations. Diffusion is influenced by four major factors including the innovation itself, innovation information distribution, time, and the social system adopting the innovation (Rogers

& Scott, 1997). Given the recent availability of an LMS, the diffusion theory is relevant in that faculty who are innovators or early adopters of technologies may be among those who are likely to use an LMS. The social system identified in this study includes university administration. Another theory that relates to this research is the change theory (Fullan, 2001).

Change Theory

The change theory by Fullan (2001) is associated with technology integration. Implementation strategies affecting the rate of change indicate that, "...there is some evidence that projects with greater definition and more specific implementation support strategies do better at impacting student achievement..." (Fullan, 2001, p. 55). Fullan identified seven factors that influence the adoption of changes. Those factors include the (a) access to innovation, (b) orientation to a new policy, (c) community support or pressure or apathy for the change to take place, (d) administrative support, (e) existence and quality of instruction and innovation that change will bring, (f) external change agent that supports and initiates the changes; and (g) professor advocacy. Fullan asserts that there are three stages consistent in the change theory. Stage 1 is the initiation of the prospective change; this stage includes an introduction to the new policy or technology. Stage 2 is characterized by the implementation of changes that may include technologically enhanced software or hardware. Finally, Stage 3 is the institutionalization of the innovation that fosters the change. For example, the system wide availability of an LMS would serve as an institutionally available factor that would influence change. The change theory emphasizes is that once the stages are present, change will transpire.

Consistent factors present in the motivation hygiene theory, the diffusion of innovations theory and the change theory are *administrative policy and practices*. Another prominent factor that appears in two theories is the *innovation itself*. These factors support the motivation factors identified by participants in this research. Namely, the innovation is a contributing factor that determines if faculty members will adopt it into their teaching practices. In addition to the identified theories, several research studies support similar findings.

Identified Motivation Factors

Numerous studies have focused on identifying motivation attributes among instructors, the findings differ depending on the population assessed (Betts, 1998; Frayer, 1999; Hood, 2002; Johnson, 2000; MacDonald, Yanchar, & Osguthorpe, 2005; Quick & Davies, 1999; Schifter, 2000; Smylie, 1988; Wang, 2001). Schifter (2000) notes that motivators include personal motivation, previous technology training, scholarly pursuit, and reduced teaching loads. In contrast, factors that inhibit faculty are workload concerns, negative comments made by colleagues, training, lack of support, minimal release time provided by their department. Research by Smylie (1988) in faculty motivation identifies availability of resources, a system of rewards and incentives, and administrative training and support as key factors in technology use. Based on findings by Quick and Davies (1999), influential factors include release time, availability of innovative software programs, technical support, and professional development support. MacDonald et al. (2005) states that motivating factors include adequate faculty development and support from administrators, reflective practice time, and access to technology. Wang (2001) identified another set of factors that influence motivation and noted that motivation factors should not be generalize and are specific to individual needs; therefore, a needs assessment survey is recommended. After motivation factors are identified, the next step is to incorporate those factors into designing an effective faculty development program that supports faculty needs.

Faculty Development

Faculty development should focus on meeting the needs of professors. A needs assessment survey, followed by an analysis of the survey results is an effective way to begin building a program that addresses faculty needs (Mullinix & McCurry, 2003; Smylie, 1988). The analysis may be used to determine the appropriate training that will meet the priorities of faculty. Teaching online using an LMS requires training that focuses on instructional design (Tam, 2000), effective online instructional strategies (Pankowski, 2004), and assessment options (Spicer & DeBlois, 2004).

Designing instruction that is relevant to online learning requires that faculty understand the LMS capabilities. Improved instructional organization by professors is one benefit of LMS use.

However, the design process differs from a traditional learning environment (Mullinix & McCurry, 2003; Tam, 2000); therefore, effective faculty development is warranted. Active learning strategies that are effective online are similar to those that are used in a traditional classroom; however, the mode of delivery requires that faculty understand the LMS tools that facilitate communication, group format structures, and collaboration (Ayers & Doherty, 2003). Other LMS features, that are relevant to online instruction, are assessment options. Through effective faculty development that is designed based on the needs of faculty (Lawler & King, 2003), professors will acquire skills to assess student learning. Through frequent use of technology, educators will discover alternative means of assessing students in addition to using the grading tool, quiz and test functions, and rubrics provided during their professional development training.

Methodology

Research Questions

Two research questions guided this study. The first question was designed to evaluate the demographic characteristics of the faculty who participated in the study. As revealed in the literature review, depending on the specific population, the motivation factors expressed will differ (Betts, 1998; Hood, 2002; Lawyer & King, 2003, Schifter, 2000; Smylie, 1988). The second research question sought to identify the motivation factors that may influence a faculty member's decision to adopt an LMS in their instruction. The motivation hygiene theory (Herzberg et al., 1966) was used as a foundation for identifying motivation factors that were surveyed in this study. The research questions were:

1. To what extent are demographics related to motivation factors that influence the adoption of a learning management system by faculty?
2. What is the ranked order of motivation factors related to the adoption of a learning management system by faculty?

Instrument

A needs assessment evaluation methodology was applied in this study. The needs assessment was used to identify specific factors that motivate faculty to adopt an LMS as part of their teaching strategies. A survey instrument based on Betts research (1998) was used to complete

this study (see Appendix A for survey). The self-administered, group administration, written format was used to increase the rate of survey return. A chi-square test of independence was used to assess demographic characteristics. The demographics analyzed were (a) department, (b) age, (c) status, (d) gender, and (e) teaching experience using technologies in teaching. A five-point Likert scale response format was used with the following response categories: 5 = *Strongly Agree*; 4 = *Agree*; 3 = *Uncertain*; 2 = *Disagree*; and 1 = *Strongly Disagree*.

Population

The target population for this study was restricted to full-time tenure and tenure track faculty (N=42) who taught in the College of Communications. The number of faculty who participated in this study represented 87% of the total faculty who taught in the College of Communications during spring semester 2008. The study took place at a public four-year university in southern California.

Data Analysis and Findings

Level of Significance

The level of significance that was used for this study was set at an alpha level of 0.05 ($\alpha = 0.05$). McMillan and Schumacher (2001) state that "...when the researcher predetermines the alpha level, then the researcher rejects the null hypothesis at the same level $\alpha = 0.05$..." (p. 366).

Findings

A review of the empirical research related to motivation factors and LMS use revealed that faculty motivation was pertinent to LMS integration. The factors identified in the literature review were inconsistent and varied depending on demographics, survey instruments applied, and research strategies used. The common motivation factors that appeared in several studies were: the availability of resources, adequate training support, a system of rewards and incentives, needs based training programs, personal motivation to attend training, a variety of opportunities and strong support systems. Due in part to the lack of uniformity, the researcher sought to investigate the motivation factors that directly influenced the faculty who participated in this study.

Research Question 1 Findings

The conclusions drawn based on research question one, “To what extent are demographic characteristics related to motivation factors that influence the adoption of a learning management system by faculty?” showed variations existed among the response frequencies based on demographic factors.

TABLE 1: Sample demographics

Gender	Status	Experience with LMS		Experience with Computers	
			%		%
Male = 28	Tenured = 51%	<2 years	12	<2 years	18
Female= 13	Untenured = 49%	2 to 5 years	31	2 to 5 years	49
		>5 years	57	>5 years	33

A faculty member’s decision to adopt an LMS was not influenced by the factors of age and gender. However, the variables of (a) tenure status, (b) level of experience with an LMS, (c) level of experience with computers were significant ($p < 0.05$). These findings are consistent with other research findings (Baldwin, 1998; Betts, 1998; Lam, 2004) in that the tenure status is a determining factor in whether or not individuals will utilize technology resources. Untenured faculty apply available resources to enhance their instruction and meet the needs of students. Furthermore, the level of technology experience influences a faculty member’s decision to adopt an LMS in their instructional practices. Faculty who had experience and were proficient with technology in general, were likely to use technology in instruction. The level of technology proficiency coincides with a faculty members use of technology in their personal life. If an instructor is adept at using technology as part of their daily life, then those skills transfer to their teaching and technology use is common practice. This finding is consistent with faculty development research (Bates, 2000; Surry & Land, 2000; Roblyer, 2005) and constant with the factors identified in the change theory (Fullan, 2001) and the adoption of innovation theory (Rogers, 1995).

Research Question 2 Findings

The second research question focused on factors that motivate faculty to adopt an LMS to support instruction in a face-to-face course or to deliver content to students enrolled in online courses. Question 2 was “What is the ranked order of motivation factors related to the adoption of a learning management system by faculty? The factors analyzed in this study were the motivation factors detailed by faculty members who participated in this study. Of the seven motivation factors explored in this study the ranked order was (a) salary, (b) responsibility, (c) achievement, (d) advancement, (e) company policy and administration, (f) the work itself, and (g) recognition. Table 2 displays the ranked order of motivation factors and the mean responses with standard deviations.

TABLE 2: Motivation Factors, Mean Responses, and Standard Deviation

Ranked Order of Motivation Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Salary	3.83	1.05	42
Responsibility	3.56	1.25	42
Achievement	3.44	1.05	42
Advancement	3.37	0.87	42
Company Policy/Administration	3.30	0.96	42
Work Itself	3.10	1.02	42
Recognition	3.07	1.07	42

Administrators should consider motivation factors that are relevant to faculty when creating a faculty development program that supports faculty needs. As noted in the findings of this study, salary, responsibility and achievement are the prominent factors that faculty consider important when considering the motivation factors that influence their decision to adopt a learning management system into their instructional practices. A faculty development program should provide faculty with a monetary stipend, reinforce a faculty members responsibility to teach, and help faculty achieve their goals and advance their knowledge of teaching using an LMS.

Another important area that motivated faculty was the influence of company policy and administration. Specifically, participants were asked if “requirements by departments, expectation by the university that faculty use an LMS, and mandates from university administrators” motivated their decision to adopt an LMS. As noted in the findings, company policy and administration was considered a motivator by faculty, but ranked lower than salary, responsibility, achievement and advancement.

Discussion and Conclusions

The integration of a learning management system into teaching practices is increasing in higher education. Allen and Seaman (2009) note that “Over 4.6 million students were taking at least one online course during the fall 2008 term; a 17 percent increase over the number reported the previous year” (p.3). As online course offerings continue to grow and expand, more faculty members will be needed to teach courses using an LMS.

Research in the area of instructional technology integration and motivation factors demonstrates a link between motivators and current instructional practices. Researchers (Bates, 2000; Betts, 1998; Wilson, 2003) concur that motivation is the key to a faculty member’s decision to learn and implement technology into their teaching. The findings of this study supported prior research and showed that a relationship exists between motivating factors identified by faculty and the adoption of a learning management system. The prominent factors that motivate the faculty who participated in this study were salary, responsibility, achievement, advancement, company policy, the work itself, and recognition. The factors are identified as important to faculty, this information may be applied to design a faculty development program that addresses the specific needs of faculty at the college. For example, the most significant factors identified in this study were salary, responsibility and achievement. A faculty development program should be designed and structured to meet the motivational attributes identified that promote responsibility, recognize the achievements of those who participate, and award a salary stipend for individual efforts.

This study was limited to a relatively small number of participants who taught for the same college at the same university. Future studies based on the needs, motivation factors of faculty are warranted to promote the effective use and adoption of an LMS by faculty. Emphasis should be placed on indentifying the needs of faculty because of the trend towards distance education courses that are offered through an LMS in higher education.

Recommendations

Research related to current practices in technology integration in higher education shows that available resources, such as an LMS, are not fully applied (Allen & Seaman, 2010; Morgan & Hill, 2005). The literature review revealed that conducting a needs assessment is essential. The information attained through a needs assessment may inform and aid in developing a well-structured and balanced faculty development program that addresses the needs of faculty.

Recommendations based on the findings of this study are divided into four categories. The categories include (a) increasing the awareness of faculty motivation factors among constituencies, (b) expanding the knowledge of professors inhibiting factors among constituencies, (c) promoting faculty development programs to address faculty needs; and (d) improving technology proficiency and knowledge among faculty to improve their ability to use an LMS.

Increasing Awareness of Motivation Factors

Motivation factors of faculty are personal and vary reflecting the needs of the particular population assessed (Betts, 1998; Hood, 2002; Lawyer & King, 2003, Schifter, 2000; Smylie, 1988). The first suggestion based on this research is to identify the needs of faculty and conduct a formal needs assessment. The information collected may reveal the factors that are pertinent to faculty and identify their needs. The data may be collected at the end of each semester or academic year using a web based survey application. The population surveyed should include faculty from each of the colleges on the campus. The specific needs of faculty may fluctuate depending on the college and department. The integration of survey software to collect the information will aid in the accuracy and efficiency of data collection and assist in readily

permitting the researcher to analyze the findings. As indicated by this research, demographic characteristics contribute to the findings of the needs assessment; therefore, it is vital to assess individuals. The priorities expressed will fluctuate depending on several variables including tenure status of the professors, teaching experiences, technology proficiencies, specific educational and research needs, departments, and the access to resources.

Understanding Inhibiting Factors

The literature review revealed that understanding and identifying the inhibiting factors among technology integration should be a priority (Bates, 2000). The deterring attributes may serve as guidelines for the development of training, online teaching, instructional programs, grant opportunities, and addressing individual needs among faculty. In order to determine the factors that limit LMS adoption, it is necessary to conduct a needs assessment. Specifically, questions inquiring about the factors that suppress the use of technology among faculty should be included in the survey. Suggestions for identifying inhibiting factors include a web based anonymous survey, structured focus groups, and individual interviews conducted with faculty members. The factors that delay the use of technology among faculty should be identified and addressed to secure the facilitation of technology among faculty. Numerous researchers including Ayers and Doherty (2003); Jafari et al. (2006); Oakley (2004), and Oliva and Pawlas (2005) show that technology aids in education, and it should be used. Inhibiting factors are relevant and should be identified and addressed to meet faculty needs.

Promoting Faculty Development Programs

Faculty development programs offered by campus training centers should be based on the changing needs of faculty (Laurillard, 1993; Wallin, 2003). As revealed through this research and supported in the findings of the literature review, administrative support is critical. Effective models of faculty development stress three relevant components. First, the training should engage faculty through active learning techniques. Second, the sessions should be collaborative in nature and permit faculty input. Faculty should decide on the training content, dates offered, duration of sessions, and the level of instruction. Finally, after the initial training sessions, supplemental training should be available. Faculty should have the opportunity to receive advanced training or individual consultations with trainers.

Improving Technology Proficiencies among Faculty

Studies identify that technology based resources, including an LMS, are beneficial and support the teaching and learning process (Diamond, 2002; Mullinix & McCurry, 2003; Richlin, 2006; Surry & Land, 2000; Wilson, 2003). Faculty need to understand technology advantages and strategies that will aid in meeting learner's needs. Therefore, it is recommended that to increase faculty technology proficiencies, measures need to be taken to improve the skills of faculty. Initial LMS training should be offered regularly by the university to ensure that faculty members understand the basic functions and the benefits of adopting an LMS. Offering training that demonstrates the prospective use and rewards of technology use is recommended. Faculty need access to technology training and resources. The resources needed are (a) access to support materials, (b) individual and group consultations, (c) a support system that includes professionals well versed in technology integration, (d) administrators who encourage faculty to explore technologically based resources; and (e) collaborative opportunities for faculty to work with colleagues to increase technology proficiencies.

References

- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2010). Learning on demand: Online education in the United States 2009. Retrieved June 1, 2010 from, <http://www.sloan-c.org/publications/survey/pdf/learningondemand.pdf>
- Anglin, G. J. (1995). *Instructional technology: Past, present, and future* (2nd ed.). London: Libraries Unlimited.
- Ayers, C., & Doherty, B. (2003). Integrating instructional technology across the campus. *Leadership Abstracts*, 16(1), 2-7.
- Baldwin, R. G. (1998). Technology's impact on faculty life and work. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 76, 7-21.
- Bates, A. W. (2000). Teaching, learning and the impact of multimedia technologies. *Educause Review*, 35(5), 38-44.
- Betts, K. S. (1998). *Factors influencing faculty participation in distance education in postsecondary education in the United States: An institutional study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, DC.
- Chickering, A., & Ehrmann, S. C. (1996, October). Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin*, 3-6.
- Chyung, S. (2005). Analyze motivation-hygiene factors to improve satisfaction levels of your online training program. Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching and Learning. Retrieved July 7, 2006, from <http://ipt.Boisestate.edu/faculty/YChyung.htm>
- Commission on Instructional Technology. (1970). *To improve learning. A report to the President and the Congress of the United States*. Washington, DC: Commission on Instructional Technology.
- Covington, D., Petherbridge, D., & Warren, S. E. (2005). Best practices: A triangulated support approach in transitioning faculty to online teaching. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(1), 3-14.
- Diamond, R. M. (2002). Faculty, instructional and organizational development: Options and choices. In K. Gillespie, *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources* (pp. 2-9). Boston: Anker.

- Edelstein, S., & Edwards, J. (2002). If you build it, they will come: Building learning communities through threaded discussions. Retrieved April 4, 2006, from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring51.html>
- Frayser, D. A. (1999). Creating a campus culture to support a teaching and learning revolution. *Cause/Effect Journal*, 22(2), 6-19.
- Frazee, R. V. (2003). Using relevance to facilitate online participation in a hybrid course. *Educause Quarterly*, 4, 67-69.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*. Toronto, ON: Irwin.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 53-62.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hood, P. (2002). Perspectives on knowledge utilization in education. Retrieved June 12, 2006, from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/perspectives.pdf
- Jafari, A., McGee, P., & Carmean, C. (2006). Managing courses defining learning: What faculty, students, and administrators want. *Educause Review*, 50-70.
- Johnson, J. D. (2000). Levels of success in implementing information technologies. *Innovative Higher Education*, 25(1), 59-76.
- Klemm, W. R. (1998). Eight ways to get students more engaged in online conferences. Retrieved June 1, 2006, from <http://www.thejournal.com/magazine/vault/A1997.cfm>
- Lam, W. (2004). Encouraging online participation. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 15(4), 345-348.
- Laster, S. (2005). Model-driven design: Systematically building integrated blended learning experiences. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 8(5), 23-40.
- Laurillard, D. (1993). *Rethinking university teaching: A framework for the effective use of educational technology*. New York: Routledge.
- Lawler, P. A., & King, K. P. (2003). *New perspectives on designing and implementing professional development of teachers of adults*. Chester, PA: Widener University.
- Lee, J. (2001). Instructional support for distance education and faculty motivation, commitment, satisfaction. *British Journal of Education Technology*, 32(2), 153-160.

- MacDonald, J. K., Yanchar, S.C., & Osguthrope, R. T. (2005). Addressing faculty concerns about distance learning. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(4), 1-12.
- McMillan, M., & Schumacher, R. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman
- Mendenhall, W., Beaver, R., & Beaver, B. (1994). *Introduction to probability and statistics* (9th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.
- Morgan, G., & Hill, P. (2005). CSU academic technology research bulletin #4: A summary of the learning management systems summits conducted October 2005. Retrieved August 13, 2006, from <http://iacc.calpoly.edu/Document/2005-06/CSU-AT-Research-Bulletin-2.pdf>
- Mullinix, B. B., & McCurry, D. (2003). Balancing the learning equation: Exploring effective mixtures of technology, teaching, and learning. Retrieved November 1, 2005, from http://technologysource.org/article/balancing_the_learning_equation/
- Oakley, B. (2004). The value of online learning: Perspectives from the University of Illinois at Springfield. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 8(3), 22-32.
- Oliva, P. F., & Pawlas, G. E. (2005). *Supervision for today's schools*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- O'Quinn, L., & Corry, M. (2002). Factors that deter faculty from participating in distance education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 5(4).
- Pankowski, P. (2004). Faculty training for online teaching. *Technology in Higher Education Journal Online*, 3-10.
- Patterson, D. (2004). Encouraging and assisting faculty incorporation of innovative classroom technologies. *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM SIGUCCS Conference on User Services 2004, Baltimore, MD, USA*, October 10-13, 2004. Retrieved June 10, 2006, from <http://www.informatik.uni-trier.de/~ley/db/conf/siguccs/siguccs2004.html>
- Pittinsky, M. (2004). The networked learning environment. Retrieved September 10, 2006, from http://library.blackboard.com/docs/AS/Bb_Whitepaper_NLE.pdf
- Quick, D., & Davies, T. G. (1999). Community college faculty development: Bringing technology into instruction. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23, 641-653.

- Richlin, L. (2006). *Blueprint for learning: Constructing college courses to facilitate, assess and document learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Roblyer, M. D. (2005). *Integrating educational technology into teaching* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
- Rogers, E. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Rogers, E., & Scott, K. L. (1997). The diffusion of innovations model and outreach from the national network of libraries of medicine to Native American Communities. Retrieved November 21, 2005, from <http://nml.gov/pnr/eval/rogers.html>
- Saettler, P. (1968). *A history of instructional technology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schifter, C. C. (2000). Faculty participation in asynchronous learning networks: A case study of motivating and inhibiting factors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 4(1), 15-22.
- Simpson, M., & Payne, F. (1999). Using information and communications technology as a pedagogical tool: Who educates the educators? *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 25(3), 248-262.
- Smith, K. L. (1996). *Preparing faculty for instructional technology: From education to development to creative independence*. Paper presented at 1996 CAUSE Annual Conference. Retrieved June 11, 2006, from <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/CNC9659.pdf>
- Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 1-30.
- Spicer, D. Z., & DeBlois, P. B. (2004). Current IT issues 2004. *Educause Review*, 13-26.
- 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.
- Tam, M. (2000). Constructivism, instructional design and technology: Implications for transforming distance learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 3(2), 50-60.
- Travis, J. E. (1997). *Models for improving college teaching: A faculty resource*. ASHE ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

- Wallin, D. L. (2003). Motivation and faculty development: A three-state study of presidential perceptions of faculty professional development needs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 317-335.
- Wang, C. Y. (2001). Walk a mile in students' shoes: An approach to faculty development on integrating web-based collaborative learning into instruction. Retrieved May 31, 2005, from <http://newmedia.colorado.edu/cscl/155.html>
- Wilson, W. (2003). Faculty perceptions and uses of instructional technology: A study at one university system revealed the current state of technology and some steps that could improve it. *Educause Quarterly*, 2, 60-62.

Appendix A

Faculty Self Evaluation Survey

SECTION ONE: DEMOGRAPHICS

Directions: Please answer the following questions based on your current status.

1. In which department are you teaching?

- Communications Department
- Radio, Television and Film Department
- Human Communication Studies

2. What is your age range?

- Under 30 years old
- 31-45 years old
- 45+ years old

3. What is your status?

- Tenured
- Non-tenured
- Full time lecturer
- Lecturer

4. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

5. How many years have you been teaching at this university? _____

6. How many years have you been teaching in postsecondary education? _____

7. Have you taught any courses using an LMS? Yes No

8. Have you taken any courses where the instructor used an LMS? Yes No

9. Have you received any of your degrees via distance education? Yes No
10. Have you received any formal LMS training? Yes No

SECTION TWO: TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND

Please complete this section if you are currently using or have previously used a learning management system to augment teaching and learning.

1. How many years have you been using an LMS?
- | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Started this semester | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 - 4 years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Less than 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 - 5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1 - 3 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 + years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
2. What has your involvement in using an LMS included? Check all that apply.
- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Teaching courses | <input type="checkbox"/> | Co-teaching courses | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Designing courses | <input type="checkbox"/> | Providing consultation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
3. If you have taught, co-taught, or designed an LMS supported course in the past and are no longer doing so, please specify why you are no longer using this method of instruction.
-

4. Have you received any formal training for instruction using an LMS?
 Yes No
 If yes, (a) when did you receive the training?
-

(b) where did you receive the training?

5. Would you be interested in participating in faculty development programs that focus on using an LMS to support teaching and learning? Yes No

Please complete this section if you are have never used a learning management system to augment teaching and learning.

6. Have you ever been asked to:

- a. teach a course using an LMS? Yes No
- b. co-teach a course using an LMS? Yes No
- c. design a course using an LMS? Yes No

If you answered yes to any of the above, please specify why you did not get involved.

7. Have you ever contemplated teaching, co-teaching, or designing a course using an LMS?

Yes No

If yes, specific why you did not pursue this method of instruction.

8. Would you be interested in teaching or co-teaching a course using an LMS in the future?

Yes No

If no, please specify reasons.

9. Would you be interested in designing a course using an LMS in the future?

Yes No

If no, please specify reasons.

10. Would you be interested in participating in faculty development programs that focus on LMS instruction? Yes No

11. Please specify what the university could do to encourage you to participate in LMS use and training in the future?

SECTION THREE: FACULTY ASSESSMENT

Please rate 1-5 the extent to which you agree the factors listed below would motivate you to adopt a learning management system (1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree).

Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Personal motivation to use technology	1	2	3	4	5
2. Graduate training received	1	2	3	4	5
3. Opportunity for scholarly pursuit	1	2	3	4	5
4. Reduced teaching load	1	2	3	4	5
5. Opportunity to use personal research as a teaching tool	1	2	3	4	5
6. Requirement by department	1	2	3	4	5
7. Support and encouragement from dean or chair	1	2	3	4	5
8. Working conditions (hours, location)	1	2	3	4	5
9. Increase in salary	1	2	3	4	5
10. Opportunity to influence social change	1	2	3	4	5
11. Job security	1	2	3	4	5
12. Monetary support for participation (stipend, overload)	1	2	3	4	5
13. Expectation by university that faculty participate	1	2	3	4	5
14. Opportunity to develop new ideas	1	2	3	4	5
15. Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations	1	2	3	4	5
16. Professional prestige and status	1	2	3	4	5
17. Grants for materials/expenses	1	2	3	4	5
18. Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
19. Intellectual challenge	1	2	3	4	5
20. Overall job satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5
21. Course assignments	1	2	3	4	5
22. Technical support provided by the university	1	2	3	4	5
23. Career exploration	1	2	3	4	5
24. Credit toward promotion and tenure	1	2	3	4	5
25. Release time	1	2	3	4	5
26. Blackboard training provided by the university	1	2	3	4	5
27. Merit pay	1	2	3	4	5
28. Royalties on copyrighted materials	1	2	3	4	5
29. Greater course flexibility for students	1	2	3	4	5
30. Recognition and awards	1	2	3	4	5
31. Opportunity to diversify program offerings	1	2	3	4	5
32. Ability to reach new audiences that cannot attend classes on campus	1	2	3	4	5
33. Opportunity to improve my teaching	1	2	3	4	5
34. Support and encouragement from university administrators	1	2	3	4	5

Please list any additional factors that would motivate you to use the Blackboard learning management system.
