

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

Sam & Irene Black School of Business

A LITTLE KNOWLEDGE GOES A LONG WAY:
STUDENT EXPECTATION AND SATISFACTION WITH HYBRID LEARNING

KASSANDRA BARRETT
Spring 2012

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in Marketing
with honors in Marketing

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Dr. Mary Beth Pinto
Professor of Marketing
Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Michael Brown
Associate Professor of Management
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

Providing hybrid courses is becoming an increasingly popular trend in higher education today. In 2002, Dr. Graham Spainer contended that “hybrid instruction is the single greatest unrecognized trend in higher education today.” (El Mansour and Mupinga) The research in this study answers the following questions: (1) What were students’ preconceived and informed expectations regarding hybrid learning? (2) How satisfied were students with the hybrid course? (3) What factors were related to satisfaction with this hybrid course? Secondary research was conducted and primary data was collected in the form of survey responses from 44 students that were enrolled in an upper level marketing course that was modified and transitioned into a hybrid learning format. Students were given three surveys; the first was a pre-course survey that focused on “preconceived expectations” and was given before the students were made aware of the hybrid delivery format, the second focused on “informed expectations” and was given after students were told they were going to be taking a hybrid course had reviewed the syllabus, the third survey given at the end of the course measured perceived performance. Independent samples t-tests were run to test for significant differences between preconceived and informed expectations, the results of which showed significant difference for 11 expectation items ($p \leq .05$). Student satisfaction with the hybrid course was neutral with a mean of 2.98 on a 5 point Likert scale and a standard deviation of .862. A Pearson Correlation was run on the perceived performance survey responses to measure the degree of association between all survey items and satisfaction, 21 of the 41 expectation items were found to have significant correlation with satisfaction.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Background	1
Definitions	1
Literature Review	3
Purpose of Research	5
Methodology	5
Sample	6
Results	7
Limitations and Future Research	10
Table 1	11
Survey 1 Descriptive Statistics	11
Table 2	12
Survey 2 Descriptive Statistics	12
Table 3	13
Preconceived and Informed Independent Samples T-Test.....	13
Table 4	14
Correlations	14
Appendix A.....	15
Appendix B.....	17
Appendix C.....	19
References	21

Introduction and Background

Since the 1990's, a number of colleges and universities have modified traditional face-to-face classroom instruction to include more of an online format. Data suggests that there has been a steady rise in the number of students enrolling in online courses- over 5.6 million students during the fall term of 2009 (Allen and Seaman 2010). Online course delivery covers a range of options from web-facilitated courses to blended/hybrid courses to fully online courses. The primary difference between these options is the percent of course content that is delivered online (Allen and Seaman 2010).

Specifically in the area of blended learning, the movement is to “perfecting the blend” and enhancing delivery methods for this innovative technique. One heavily researched area is student satisfaction. Among the determinants of student satisfaction, creating a match between actual and expected learning experiences is shown to directly impact student satisfaction. Indicative of this stream of research is the recent work of Sinclaire (2011) and Jackson, Jones and Rodriguez (2010), both of which examined student satisfaction with online learning. With the notable exception of O’Leary and Quinlan (2007), most of the work investigating the phenomenon of expectations includes single-item measures of expectations (i.e., “Expectations were clearly stated either verbally or in the syllabus”) and/or single point in time measurement of expectations at the beginning of the semester. A richer understanding of the construct, expectations, is missing.

Definitions

Students bring “preconceived expectations” into the learning environment, defined as “forming an opinion of idea before possessing full or adequate knowledge or experience”

(American Heritage Dictionary 2000). These expectations often change through receiving new information or updated experiences, becoming “informed expectations.” For example, once a student has received a course syllabus, explored the course website, and become familiar with the nature of the assignments, their expectations may change concurrently.

The issues of preconceived expectations are further complicated by the fact that some students have had experiences with online learning while other students have not. Many students enter college having experienced blended learning in elementary, through high school. In addition, students are influenced by the experiences of others (family and friends) who have taken online courses (either hybrid or fully online). Therefore, students enter a class with preconceived notions; however, the level of sophistication in their preconceived notions varies dramatically depending on factors such as: rumors, personal experiences, peer experiences, reputation of instructor, and lack of standardization across online courses. They may have negative perceptions also due to their time management skills, comfort with technology and discipline (Napier, Dekhane and Smith 2011).

Literature Review

In the reading of student satisfaction literature, it became clear that research in the area of hybrid (also referred to as “blended” and/or “e-learning”) has been growing in popularity, while still leaving much to be explored. A hybrid course is defined in the literature as a combination of face-to-face classroom interaction with an online component. Many articles looked at student satisfaction with strictly online learning, creating room for future studies, including this one, to delve more into the hybrid space. What was not present in the literature was studies that looked at students’ expectations, both preconceived and informed, of hybrid courses.

Jollean K. Sinclair wrote an article for the *Research in Higher Education Journal* in June 2011 titled “Student satisfaction with online learning: Lessons from organizational behavior.” In his research he was able to identify determinants of student satisfaction with online learning that fell into five categories: (1) Satisfaction with interaction with peers and instructors, (2) A match between actual and expected learning experiences, (3) Satisfaction with advising, registration, and access to materials that is as good as that found on the traditional campus, (4) Satisfactory orientation for how to learn online, (5) Outcomes of online learning that are useful for career and professional development as well as academic development. He summarized his research finding by stating, “student satisfaction with online learning is linked to interaction and communication, course design, the learning environment, and individual student factors of computer self-efficacy and the ability to control individual learning pace.” (5)

In the 2009 article, “A study of student satisfaction in a blended e-learning system environment” by Jen-Her Wu, Robert Tennyson, and Tzyh-Lih Hsia a study was conducted to examine determinants of student learning satisfaction in a blended e-learning environment (BELS), based on social cognitive theory. BELS was defined as an “instructional system that

combines multiple learning delivery methods, including most often face-to-face classroom with asynchronous and/or synchronous online learning.” (155) Results of the study found performance expectations and learning climate to be two strong determinants and computer self-efficacy, system functionality, content feature, and interaction to be indirect contributions to learning satisfaction with BELS. The four contributions and implications of the study included the following: (1) A BELS environment should enhance students’ performance expectations and foster positive learning climate, (2) Education institutions should provide incentives and supports to enhance students’ computer self-efficacy, (3) BELS should offer appropriate system functionality and content features with multimedia presentation and flexibility, (4) BELS should provide effective interaction tools and instructors should motivate interaction publicly.

The 2007 article, “Students’ positive and negative experiences in hybrid and online classes” by Bassou El Mansour and Davison Mupunga described the characteristics of a hybrid course and presented students’ positive and negative experiences in a hybrid course. A hybrid course was defined as a course that combines elements of face-to-face instruction with elements of distance learning. Hybrid was also referred to as “web-enhanced/assisted, or blended.” Results of the study containing responses from 41 undergraduate students at a four-year mid-western US college found that students felt the option of scheduling the class face-to-face and online, as well as instructor availability in the hybrid course as positive. Rigid schedules for the face-to-face sessions and technical problems with computers and internet service were cited as negatives for the hybrid course format. The Mansour and Mupunga study was particularly helpful in creating items for the hybrid survey questionnaire used in this study.

Purpose of Research

This study aimed to address the follow research questions, looking at one specific retail marketing course converted to a hybrid format for fall 2011:

1. What were students' preconceived and informed expectations regarding hybrid learning?
2. How satisfied were students with the hybrid course?
3. What factors were related to satisfaction with this hybrid course?

Methodology

Data for this study was collected during the 2011 fall term from one section of an upper level retail marketing class at Penn State Erie, The Behrend College. Prior to the fall semester, this course was taught exclusively in a traditional, face-to-face setting. The instructor (Dr. Mary Beth Pinto) received approval to modify the course and transition from the traditional format to a hybrid learning format. Students having already enrolled in the course were unaware of the change in delivery format when they arrived to class on the first day. A series of three surveys utilizing a 5 point Likert scale where a 1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree were collected by students enrolled in the course to determine their expectations and satisfaction.

Using a similar method employed by O'Leary and Quinlan (2004), student satisfaction with the hybrid course delivery format was assessed following the expectancy confirmation/disconfirmation paradigm originated by Oliver (1980). A two-phased approach was utilized in this study. First, students were given two pre-course questionnaires consisting of 41 expectation items covering six factors (technology, time management, content, student attitudes, communication, and course community) and demographic questions. The first pre-

course survey on “preconceived expectations” occurred on the first day of class before students received any information about the hybrid delivery format. Also included in the first survey were questions regarding interest in taking a hybrid course, and online experience. A copy of the first survey is found in Appendix A. The second pre-course survey on “informed expectations” occurred on day two after the following events: 1) The students were informed of the hybrid course format; 2) The instructor reviewed the hybrid course syllabus; and 3) The students were assigned homework to thoroughly review the hybrid course materials on the university’s class management system. A copy of the second survey is found in Appendix B. The final survey was given at the end of the semester during the last week of classes, converting the expectation questions used in the first two surveys into perceived performance statements. A copy of survey three is found in Appendix C.

Sample

The sample for this research came entirely from one upper level retail marketing course offered at Penn State Erie, The Behrend College during the fall 2011 semester. A total of 44 students participated in this study, including 20 men and 24 women. Fifty-two percent were seniors and forty-eight percent were juniors. Fifty-two percent (23 participants) indicated that they had previously taken an online course.

Results

In order to answer the first research question regarding students' expectations of hybrid learning, a series of descriptive statistics including mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation were run for each of the 41 expectation items for survey one and two. The results from the first two surveys are shown in Tables 1 and 2 respectively. For both preconceived and informed expectations the means for an overwhelming majority of the items were neutral, hovering along the mid-point on the 5 point Likert scale with standard deviations for almost all items being less than 1.

To test for significant difference between perceived and informed expectations, independent samples t-tests were run (see Table 3). Results of the t-tests showed a statistical significant difference for 11 expectation items ($p \leq .05$). After being informed about the hybrid course format, reviewing the syllabus and looking over course materials, students felt more strongly that: (1) Hybrid course projects and assignment would help build and understanding of course-related concepts and principles. (2) The hybrid course would be a good learning experience. (3) Novelty of the hybrid course format would inspire a greater interest in learning course material than a traditional course. (4) Students would communicate more with each other in the hybrid course. (5) Online discussions and debates would allow more time to reflect and prepare well thought out responses. (6) The hybrid course would allow for differing viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed. (7) The hybrid course would be more "boring" than a traditional course. (8) Students would be less willing to "speak their mind" in the hybrid course format. (9) Instructor feedback would be slower in comparison to traditional courses. (10) The hybrid course would have less camaraderie among students. (11) The hybrid course would

provide less opportunity for each student to contribute to class learning. The differences found in the t-tests are expectation items that relate to the student attitudes and communication factors.

In answering research question number two on student satisfaction with this hybrid course, it was found that student satisfaction had a mean of 2.98 on a 5 point scale with a standard deviation of .862.

To determine what factors were related to satisfaction, a Pearson Correlation was run on the survey three responses to measure the degree of association between all 41 survey items and satisfaction. The significant correlations can be found in Table 4. The correlation results suggest:

- The more that students felt “a part of the class” in the hybrid course format, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt that group work was fun in the hybrid course, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the hybrid course improved dialogue with the instructor, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the hybrid course provided a better opportunity to learn from other students, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the hybrid course allowed differing viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the online components of the hybrid course enhanced their interactions with other students during the face-to-face class time, the more satisfied they were.

- The more students felt the hybrid course improved dialogue between fellow students, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt hybrid course projects and assignments helped them build an understanding of course-related concepts and principles, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the hybrid course was a good learning experience, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the novelty of the hybrid course format inspired a greater interest in learning course material, the more satisfied they were.
- The more flexibility students had with their personal schedule in the hybrid course, the more satisfied they are.
- The more students felt online discussions and debates allowed them more time to reflect and prepare well thought out responses, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students were comfortable with using technology in the hybrid course, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt utilizing technology in the hybrid course enhanced the learning of course material, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the hybrid format encouraged students to discuss course content with others, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt the hybrid course had activities consistent with the course objectives, the more satisfied they were.
- The more students felt others would withdraw (drop) the course, the less satisfied they were.
- The more students thought the hybrid course was “boring”, the less satisfied they were.

- The more students felt the technology requirement in the hybrid course was a barrier to successfully learning the material, the less satisfied they were.
- The more students felt that the hybrid course would not be taken by those prone to procrastination, the less satisfied they were.
- The less students felt they would learn in the hybrid course, the less satisfied they were.

Limitations and Future Research

As with any research conducted, limitations were present and have been identified in an effort prepare for the possibility of future research opportunities looking at student perceptions and satisfaction with hybrid learning. The limitations unique to this study include a small data sample of 44 students enrolled in one upper lever (junior/senior) retail marketing course taught by one professor. This was also the first time that the retail marketing course was offered in the hybrid format and students were not aware of the format change until after they were enrolled and received the syllabus on the first day of class. Student course evaluations revealed that some students may have felt “tricked” into a course delivery that they may not have signed up for had they known in advance. In addition, the first time a course is offered in a hybrid format problems normally arise as they often do with any new course offering.

Future expansion on this research could include increasing the sample size and including other hybrid delivery formats offered for different majors and different undergraduate levels. A more accurate representation of the student population would be achieved by this increase in sample size and diversification of hybrid courses for which students would be assessing in their survey responses. Future research could include assessing student versus instructor expectations and how those differences could be better managed.

Table 1

Survey 1 Descriptive Statistics

	Technical Problems	More Time	Tech Requirement Barrier	Procrastination	Tech Comfort	Tech Enhance Learning	Self-learning	Easier "A"	format not appropriate	Learn Less	Easier Grading	Encourage discussion	Activities Consistent with Course	Project/Assignments build learning	Withdraw
N	44	44	44	44	43	44	44	44	44	43	44	44	44	44	44
Missing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.18	3.09	2.93	3.25	3.37	3.36	3.68	2.89	3.66	2.81	3.09	3.16	3.41	3.34	3.00
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	3	3	3*	4	4	4	3	5	2	3	3*	3	4	3
Std. Deviation	.815	.936	.925	1.102	1.001	.750	1.177	.813	1.293	.982	.866	.888	.787	.680	.856
Range	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	4

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest values shown

	Satisfaction	Good Learning Experience	"Boring"	Greater Interest	More flexibility	Not "speak" mind	More student communication	Slow instructor Feedback	More time to think out responses	Instructor less accessible	Traditionalis more interactive	interactions more effective in traditional	lose the "personal" teacher-student relationship
N	42	43	42	42	43	43	42	43	43	43	43	43	43
Missing	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mean	3.14	3.37	2.90	2.93	3.51	2.88	3.07	3.19	3.28	3.09	3.16	2.88	3.19
Median	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation	.716	.900	1.008	.712	1.298	1.086	.897	1.006	.959	1.042	.949	.988	1.029
Range	3	3	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

	Students feel more "a part of the class"	less camaraderie	more opportunities to get to know students for instructor	ease some group problems	Group work more fun	confortible participating in face-to-face interactions	improve the dialogue with the instructor.	better opportunity to learn from other students.	less opportunity for each student to contribute to class learning.	different viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed.	online components will enhance interactions during the face-to-face class time.	uncomfortable participating in online interactions	improve the dialogue between students.
N	43	42	43	43	42	43	43	42	43	43	42	43	43
Missing	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
Mean	2.98	3.12	2.79	3.33	3.07	3.07	3.12	3.19	3.09	3.19	3.21	2.88	3.09
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation	.740	.633	.833	.885	.808	.866	.697	.833	.811	.852	.813	.731	.840
Range	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	3	2	3	3	3	3

Table 2

Survey 2 Descriptive Statistics

Statistics

	Technical Problems	More Time	Tech Requirement Barrier	Procrastination	Tech Comfort	Tech Enhance Learning	Self-learning	Easier "A"	format not appropriate	Learn Less	Easier Grading	Encourage discussion	Activities Consistent with Course	Project/Assignments build learning	Withdraw
N	42	42	42	42	42	41	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.31	3.24	2.71	2.95	3.55	3.51	3.62	2.71	3.71	2.45	2.90	3.52	3.69	3.67	2.69
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00
Mode	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	3
Std. Deviation	.841	.790	.805	1.103	.739	.870	.731	.864	1.132	.889	.932	.890	.860	.764	.841
Range	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Statistics

	Satisfaction	Good Learning Experience	"Boing"	Greater Interest	More flexibility	Not "speak" mind	More student communication	Slow Instructor Feedback	More time to think out responses	Instructor less accessible	Traditionalists more interactive	interactions more effective in traditional	lose the "personal" teacher-student relationship
N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	41
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mean	3.21	3.98	2.38	3.36	3.71	2.40	3.50	2.69	3.79	2.81	2.98	2.95	2.78
Median	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	3	3
Std. Deviation	.606	.869	1.058	.656	.995	.912	.890	.811	.935	.890	.924	.909	.988
Range	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4

Statistics

	Students feel more "a part of the class"	less camaraderie	more opportunities to get to know students for instructor	ease some group problems	Group work more fun	comfortable participating in face-to-face interactions	opportunities for dialogue with the instructor	better opportunity to learn from other students	less opportunity for each student to contribute to class learning	difficulting viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed	grouping components will enhance interactions during the face-to-face class time	uncomfortable participating in online interactions	opportunities for dialogue between students
N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.14	2.76	2.76	3.45	3.40	3.24	3.33	3.38	2.69	3.57	3.29	2.74	3.36
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	2	4	3	2	3
Std. Deviation	.843	.790	.692	.832	.989	.484	.687	.962	1.024	.941	.696	1.014	.850
Range	3	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	2	4	4

Table 3

Preconceived and Informed Independent Samples T-Test

	"Preconceived" Expectations n=44	"Informed" Expectations n=42	t-value	P*
Projects/Assignments would help build an understanding of course related concepts and principles	3.34	3.67	-2.105	0.038
The hybrid course would be a good learning experience	3.37	3.98	-3.146	0.002
Hybrid course would be more "boring" than traditional course	2.90	2.38	2.323	0.023
Novelty of the hybrid course format would inspire a greater interest in learning course material than a traditional course	2.93	3.36	-2.869	0.005
Students would be less willing to "speak their mind" in the hybrid course format	2.88	2.40	2.188	0.032
Students would communicate more with each other in hybrid course	3.07	3.50	-2.077	0.041
Instructor feedback would be slower in comparison to traditional courses	3.19	2.69	2.497	0.015
Online discussions and debates would allow more time to reflect and prepare well thought out responses	3.28	3.79	-2.478	0.015
The hybrid course would have less camaraderie among students	3.12	2.76	2.286	0.025
Less opportunity for each student to contribute to class learning.	3.09	2.69	2.012	0.047
Differing viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed.	3.19	3.57	-1.980	0.050

*note all significances less than $p \leq .05$

Table 4
Correlations

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Pearson Correlation
Students feel more "a part of the class"	2.8	0.939	0.202*
Group work more fun	3.13	1.289	0.376**
Improve the dialogue with the instructor	2.93	0.944	0.256**
Better opportunity to learn from other students	3.1	1.057	.360**
Differing viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed	3.45	0.846	.267**
Online components will enhance interactions during the face-to-face class time	2.78	1.074	.302**
Improve the dialogue between students	2.93	0.944	.300**
Project/assignments build learning	3.4	0.928	.353**
Withdraw	2.7	0.992	-0.236**
Good learning experience	3.33	1.185	.496**
"Boring"	2.44	1.021	-0.372**
Greater interest	2.73	0.816	.320**
More flexibility	3.55	1.26	.350**
More time to think out responses	3.25	1.149	.308**
Tech requirement barrier	2.63	1.102	-0.378**
Procrastination	2.93	0.944	-0.214*
Tech comfort	3.3	1.043	.382**
Tech enhance learning	3.4	1.057	.382**
Learn less	2.8	1.265	-0.325**
Encourage discussion	3	1.038	.272**
Activities consistent with course	3.53	0.877	.328**
*-Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)			
**- Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)			

Appendix A

Survey #1

	No	Yes	If yes, specify
Have you ever taken a course online (over the internet)?			
Have you ever taken a traditional course where components of it (assignments, readings, debates, etc.) are online?			
Have you ever taken a traditional course with an online simulation?			

Have you ever heard of **“hybrid” or “blended” courses**? Hybrid (or Blended) course delivery is an increasingly popular trend in higher education today. A hybrid course is a blend of the traditional classroom setting (face-to-face instruction) with computer-based learning. In a hybrid course, a significant part of the course learning may be online; and as a result, the amount of classroom seat-time is reduced. Online learning activities vary course to course but may include: written papers, posted comments or essays to online discussion forums, online debates, web-based simulations, video demonstrations, PowerPoint presentations, completion of individual or group projects online, and online quizzes.

How interested would you be in taking a hybrid course?

Very
Interested

Not at all
Interested

1 2 3 4 5

Next, please tell us your **general expectations** regarding hybrid or blended courses. Use the following rating scale to assess your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements comparing **hybrid courses with traditional, face-to-face courses**.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

I expect...	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
There are more technical problems with computers in a hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses would require more time for students to complete successfully than traditional courses.	1	2	3	4	5
The technology requirement in a hybrid course would be a barrier to successfully learning the material.	1	2	3	4	5
Students would not want to take a hybrid course if they are prone to procrastination.	1	2	3	4	5
Students would be comfortable using technology in a hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Utilizing technology in a hybrid course will enhance learning of course material.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses would require more self-learning than traditional courses.	1	2	3	4	5
It is easier to get an “A” in a hybrid course than it is in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
The hybrid course format is not appropriate for all types of courses.	1	2	3	4	5
Students learn less in a hybrid course compared to a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Grading would be easier in a hybrid course than it is in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
The hybrid course format will encourage students to discuss course content with others.	1	2	3	4	5
A hybrid course would have course activities consistent with the course objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid course projects and assignments will help build an understanding of course-related concepts and principles.	1	2	3	4	5
More students withdraw (drop) from hybrid courses than they do from traditional courses.	1	2	3	4	5

I expect...

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Strongly Agree</i>
Students will be more satisfied with hybrid courses than with traditional courses.	1	2	3	4	5
A hybrid course would be a good learning experience.	1	2	3	4	5
A hybrid course would be more “boring” than a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
The novelty of a hybrid course format will inspire a greater interest in learning course material than a traditional face-to-face format.	1	2	3	4	5
More flexibility with students’ schedules during a hybrid course than in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will be less willing to “speak” their mind in a hybrid course than in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will communicate more with each other in a hybrid course than they do in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor feedback to be slower in hybrid courses than traditional courses.	1	2	3	4	5
Online discussions and debates during a hybrid course allow more time to reflect and prepare well thought out responses than during a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor will be less accessible to students in a hybrid course compared to a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Traditional courses provide better opportunities for students to interact than typically found in hybrid courses.	1	2	3	4	5
Student and faculty interactions will be more effective in traditional courses than hybrid courses.	1	2	3	4	5
Students lose the “personal” teacher-student relationship in a hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Students feel more “a part of the class” in a hybrid course format compared to traditional face-to-face formats.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses will have less camaraderie among students than in a hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Instructors in a hybrid course have more opportunities to get to know their students when compared to opportunities in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Working electronically in groups during a hybrid course will help ease some group problems found in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Group work in a hybrid course would be more fun than in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
To be comfortable participating in the face-to-face interactions during the regular class sessions of a hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses will improve the dialogue with the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses will provide a better opportunity to learn from other students.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses would provide less opportunity for each student to contribute to class learning.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses would allow for differing viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed.	1	2	3	4	5
The online components of a hybrid course format will enhance my interactions during the face-to-face class time.	1	2	3	4	5
To be uncomfortable participating in the online interactions of a hybrid course format.	1	2	3	4	5
Hybrid courses will improve the dialogue between students.	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer a few questions about yourself.

Have you ever taken a course before from Dr. Pinto? Yes No (specify)

Major: _____ (specify)

Year: Junior Senior (specify)

GPA: _____ (specify)

Appendix B

Survey #2

You have now had a chance to review the marketing course syllabus for Marketing 327 and become familiar with the various hybrid components of this course. We would like you to share your **expectations** regarding hybrid learning format being utilized in this course. Use the following rating scale to assess your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

I expect....

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Strongly Agree</i>
There will be more technical problems with computers in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses will require more time for students to complete successfully than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The technology requirement in this hybrid course will be a barrier to successfully learn the material.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will not want to take this hybrid course if they are prone to procrastination.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will be comfortable using technology in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Utilizing technology in this hybrid course will enhance learning of course material.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses will require more self-learning than traditional courses.	1	2	3	4	5
It will be easier to get an “A” in this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
This hybrid course format is not appropriate for all types of courses.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will learn less in this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The grading will be easier in this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The hybrid format of this course will encourage students to discuss course content with others.	1	2	3	4	5
The hybrid format of this course has course activities consistent with the course objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
The Hybrid course projects and assignments to help me build an understanding of course-related concepts and principles.	1	2	3	4	5
More students will withdraw (drop) from this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will be more satisfied with this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
This hybrid course will be a good learning experience.	1	2	3	4	5
This hybrid course will be more “boring” than the non-hybrid course equivalent..	1	2	3	4	5
The novelty of this hybrid course format will inspire a greater interest in learning course material than the non-hybrid course equivalent..	1	2	3	4	5
More flexibility with my personal schedule during this hybrid course than in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will be less willing to “speak” their mind in this hybrid course than in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will communicate more with each other in this hybrid course than they would do in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor feedback will be slower in this hybrid courses than non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Online discussions and debates during this hybrid course will allow me more time to reflect and prepare well thought out responses.	1	2	3	4	5

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Strongly Agree</i>
The instructor will be less accessible to students in this hybrid course compared to a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
The non-hybrid course equivalent provides better opportunities for students to interact than typically will be found in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Student and faculty interactions will be more effective in traditional courses than this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will lose the "personal" teacher-student relationship in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will feel more "a part of the class" in this hybrid course format compared to the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses will have less camaraderie among students than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The Instructor in this hybrid course have more opportunities to get to know the students compared to the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Working electronically in groups during this hybrid course will help ease some group problems found in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Group work in this hybrid course will be more fun than in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
To be comfortable participating in the face-to-face interactions during the regular class sessions of this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course will improve the dialogue with the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course will provide a better opportunity to learn from other students.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course will provide less opportunity for each student to contribute to class learning.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses will allow for differing viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed.	1	2	3	4	5
The online components of this hybrid course format will enhance my interactions during face-to-face class time.	1	2	3	4	5
To be uncomfortable participating in the online interactions of this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course will improve the dialogue between students.	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer a few questions about yourself.

Have you ever taken a course before from Dr. Pinto? Yes No (specify)

Major: _____ (specify)

Year: Junior Senior (specify)

GPA: _____ (specify)

Appendix C

Survey #3

You are now completing the Fall 2011 semester of Retailing (Marketing 327). We would like your opinions regarding how the semester has gone for you. Please share your **opinions** regarding the hybrid learning format that was utilized in this course. Use the following rating scale to assess your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Strongly Agree</i>
There were <i>more</i> technical problems with computers in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses required more time for students to complete successfully than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The technology requirement in this hybrid course was a barrier to successfully learn the material.	1	2	3	4	5
Students did not take this hybrid course if they were prone to procrastination.	1	2	3	4	5
Students were comfortable using technology in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Utilizing technology in this hybrid course enhanced the learning of course material.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses required <i>more</i> self-learning than traditional courses.	1	2	3	4	5
It is easier to get an “A” in this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
This hybrid course format is not appropriate for all types of courses.	1	2	3	4	5
Students will learn less in this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The grading was easier in this hybrid course than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The hybrid format of this course encouraged students to discuss course content with others.	1	2	3	4	5
The hybrid format of this course had course activities consistent with the course objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
The Hybrid course projects and assignments helped me build an understanding of course-related concepts and principles.	1	2	3	4	5
More students withdrew (dropped) from this hybrid course than they would have in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Students were more satisfied with this hybrid course than they would have been in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
This hybrid course was a good learning experience.	1	2	3	4	5
This hybrid course was more “boring” than the non-hybrid course equivalent..	1	2	3	4	5
The novelty of this hybrid course format inspired a greater interest in learning course material than the non-hybrid course equivalent would have.	1	2	3	4	5
There was more flexibility with my personal schedule during this hybrid course than in there would have been in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Students were less willing to “speak” their mind in this hybrid course than in they would have been in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Students communicated more with each other in this hybrid course than they would have in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor feedback was slower in this hybrid courses than it would have been in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Online discussions and debates during this hybrid course allowed me more time to reflect and prepare well thought out responses.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor was less accessible to students in this hybrid course compared to a traditional	1	2	3	4	5

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Strongly Agree</i>
courses.					
The non-hybrid course equivalent of this course would have provided better opportunities for students to interact than found in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Student and faculty interactions are more effective in traditional courses than what I found in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Students lost the benefits of a “personal” teacher-student relationship in this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
Students felt more “a part of the class” in this hybrid course format than they would have in the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses had less camaraderie among students than the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
The Instructor in this hybrid course had more opportunities to get to know the students compared to the non-hybrid course equivalent.	1	2	3	4	5
Working electronically in groups during this hybrid course helped ease some group problems found in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
Group work in this hybrid course was more fun than in a traditional course.	1	2	3	4	5
I was comfortable participating in the face-to-face interactions during the regular class sessions of this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course improved the dialogue with the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course provided a better opportunity to learn from other students.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course provided less opportunity for each student to contribute to class learning.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid courses allowed for differing viewpoints to be encouraged and discussed.	1	2	3	4	5
The online components of this hybrid course format enhanced my interactions with other students during face-to-face class time.	1	2	3	4	5
I was uncomfortable participating in the online interactions of this hybrid course.	1	2	3	4	5
This Hybrid course improved the dialogue between students.	1	2	3	4	5
I would be very likely to recommend this hybrid course to my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I learned a lot because of the hybrid course format used in Marketing 327.	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer a few questions about yourself.

Have you ever taken a course before from Dr. Pinto? Yes No (specify)

Major: _____ (specify)

Year: Junior Senior (specify)

GPA: _____ (specify)

References

- Alavi, Maryam (1994), "Computer-Mediated Collaborative Learning: An Empirical Evaluation," *MIS Quarterly*, 159-74.
- Arbaugh, J.B (2001), "How Instructor Immediacy Behaviors Affect Student Satisfaction and Learning in Web-Based Courses," *Business Communication Quarterly*, 64 (4), 42-54.
- Atack, Lynda, and James Rankin (2002), "A descriptive study of registered nurses' experiences with web-based learning," *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 40 (4), 457-65. Banerjee, Gouri, "Blended Environments: Learning Effectiveness and Student Satisfaction at a Small College in Transition," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 15 (1), 8-19.
- Beard, Lawrence A., and Cynthia Harper (2002), "Student Perceptions of Online Versus On Campus Instruction," *Education*, 122 (4), 658-63.
- Beqiri, Mirjeta S., Nancy M. Chase, and Atena Bishka (2010), "Online Course Delivery: An Empirical Investigation of Factors Affecting Student Satisfaction," *Journal of Education for Business*, 85, 95-100.
- Castle, Sidney R., and Chad J. McGuire (2010), "An Analysis of Student Self-Assessment of Online, Blended, and Face-to-Face Learning Environments: Implications for Sustainable Education Delivery," *International Education Studies*, 3 (3), 36-40.
- Cobb, Susan C, "Social Presence, Satisfaction, and Perceived Learning of RN-to-BSN Students in Web-Based Nursing Courses," *Teaching With Technology/RN-BSN Online Learning*, 32 (2), 115-19.
- Dennen, Vanessa P., A. Aubteen Darabi, and Linda J. Smith (2007), "Instructor-Learner Interaction in Online Courses: The relative perceived importance of a particular instructor actions on performance and satisfaction," *Distance Education*, 28 (1), 65-79.
- Dray, Barbara J., Patrick R. Lowenthal, Melissa J. Miskiewicz, Maria Araceli Ruiz-Primo, and Kelly Marczyński (2011), "Developing an Instrument to Assess Student Readiness for Online Learning: A Validation Study," *Distance Education*, 32 (1), 29-47.
- El Mansour, Bassaou and Davison M. Mupinga (2007), "Students' Positive and Negative Experiences in Hybrid and Online Classes," *College Student Journal*, 41 (1), 242-248.
- Ernst, Jeremy V (Spring 2008), "A Comparison of Traditional and Hybrid Online Instructional Presentation in Communication Technology," *Journal of Technology Education*, 19 (2), 40-49.
- Feldman, Kenneth A. (1976), "Grades and College Students' Evaluations of their Courses and Teachers," *Research In Higher Education*, 4, 69-111.
- Fetters, Michael L., and Tova Garcia Duby, "Faculty Development: A Stage Model Matched to Blended Learning Maturation," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 15 (1), 77-86.

Jackson, Lana C., Stephanie J. Jones, and Roy C. Rodriguez, "Faculty Actions That Result in Student Satisfaction in Online Courses," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 14 (4), 78-96.

Jackson, Mary Jo, and Marilyn M. Helms (2008), "Student Perceptions of Hybrid Courses: Measuring and Interpreting Quality," *Journal of Education for Business*, 7-12.

Keengwe, Jared, and Terry T. Kidd (2010), "Towards Best Practices in Online Learning and Teaching in Higher Education," *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6 (2), 533-41.

Kenney, Jane, and Ellen Newcombe, "Adopting a Blended Learning Approach: Challenges Encountered and Lessons Learned in an Action Research Study," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 15 (1), 45-57.

Kim, Kyong-Jee, and Curtis J. Bonk (2006), "The Future of Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: The Survey Says," *Educase Quarterly*, 22-30.

Kupczynski, Lori, Marie-Anne Mundy, and Don J. Jones, "A Study of Factors Affecting Online Student Success at the Graduate Level," *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 1-10.

Lim, Jon, May Kim, Steve S. Chen, and Cynthia E. Ryder (2008), "An Empirical Investigation of Student Achievement and Satisfaction in Different Learning Environments," *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35 (2), 113-19.

Lin, Qiuyun (Winter 2008-2009), "Student Views of Hybrid Learning: A One-Year Exploratory Study," *Journal of Computing in Teaching Education*, 25(2), 57-66.

Liu, Ying-Hsiu, and Mark Tourtellott, "Blending at Small Colleges: Challenges and Solutions," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 15 (1), 58-67.

Napier, Nannette P., Sonal Dekhane, and Stella Smith, "Transitioning to Blended Learning: Understanding Student and Faculty Perceptions," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 15 (1), 20-32.

Niemiec, Mary, and Geroge Otte (2009), "An Administrator's Guide to the Whys and Hows of Blended Learning," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 13 (1), 19-30.

O'Leary, Patrick F., and Thomas J. Quinlan Jr (2007), "Learner-Instructor Telephone Interaction: Effects on Satisfaction and Achievement of Online Students," *American Journal of Distance Education*, 21 (3), 133-43.

Osborne, Randall E., Paul Kriese, Heather Tobey, and Emily Johnson (2009), "And Never the Two Shall Meet?: Student vs. Faculty Perceptions of Online Courses," *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 40 (2), 171-82.

Picciano, Anthony G, "Introduction to the Special Issue on Transitioning to Blended Learning," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 15 (1), 3-7.

Picciano, Anthony G., Jeff Seaman, and I. Elaine Allen, "Educational Transformation Through Online Learning: To Be Or Not To Be," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 14 (4), 17-35.

Puzziferro, Maria (2008), "Online Technologies Self-Efficacy and Self-Regulated Learning as Predictors of Final Grade and Satisfaction in College-Level Online Courses," *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 22, 72-89.

Seok, Soonhwa, Boaventura DaCpsta, Carolyn Kinsell, and Chan K. Tung (2010), "Comparison of Instructors' and Students' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Online Courses," *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 11 (1), 25-36.

Sinclair, Jollean K (2011), "Student Satisfaction with Online Learning: Lessons from Organizational Behavior," *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 1-19.

Stein, David S., Constance E. Wanstreet, Jennifer Calvin, Christine Overtoom, and Joe E. Wheaton (2005), "Bridging the Transactional Distance Gap in Online Learning Environments," *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 19 (2), 105-18.

Stewart, Cynthia, Christine Bachman, and Ruth Johnson (2010), "Students' Characteristics and Motivation Orientations for Online and Traditional Degree Programs," *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6 (2), 367-79.

Thurmond, Veronica A., Karen Wambach, Helen R. Connors, and Bruce B. Frey (2002), "Evaluation of Student Satisfaction: Determining the Impact of a Web-Based Environment by Controlling for Student Characteristics," *American Journal of Distance Education*, 16 (3), 169-90.

Vamosi, Alexander R., Barbara G. Pierce, and Michael H. Slotkin, "Distance Learning in an Accounting Principles Course-Student Satisfaction and Perceptions of Efficacy," *Journal of Education for Business*, 360-66.

Walker, C. Eugene, and Erika Kelly (2007), "Online Instruction Student Satisfaction, Kudos, and Pet Peeves," *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8 (4), 309-19.

Winke, Paula, and Senta Goertler (2008), "Did We Forget Someone? Students' Computer Access and Literacy for CALL," *CALICO Journal*, 25 (3), 482-509.

Wu, Jen-Her, Robert D. Tennyson, and Tzyh-Lih Hsia (2010), "A Study of Student Satisfaction in a Blended e-Learning System Environment." *Computers & Education*, 55, 155-64.

Yudko, Errol, Randy Hirokawa, and Robert Chi (2008), "Attitudes, beliefs, and attendance in a hybrid course." *Computers & Education*, 50, 1217-27.

ACADEMIC VITA

Kassandra E. Barrett

905 East Grandview Blvd Apt 203 • Erie, PA 16504 • (814) 779-9256
keb5240@psu.edu

EDUCATION:

The Pennsylvania State University, Erie, PA Graduation: May 2012
• Bachelor of Science in Marketing with and Economics Minor
• Schreyer Honors College/Behrend Honors Program

WORK EXPERIENCE:

Penn State Behrend Chancellor's Office- Erie, PA *(July 2011-present)*
Project Management Intern

The Center for eBusiness and Advanced IT- Erie, PA *(January 2011-present)*
IT KickStart Program Assistant

The Center for eBusiness and Advanced IT- Erie, PA *(December 2009-December 2010)*
Marketing Assistant

Behrend Honors and Schreyer's Scholars Program- Erie, PA *(September 2009-May 2011)*
Honors Program Assistant

Blair Corporation – Warren, PA *(June 2009-August 2009)*
Telephone Order Representative

Radio Partners, LLC - Warren, PA *(March 2007-August 2008)*
Board Operator

Ellwood National Crankshaft – Irvine, PA *(June 2008-August 2008)*
Summer Production Control Specialist

STUDENT ACTIVITIES:

Apartment Advisory Board (2009)
Penn State Behrend Marketing Club (2009)
Created e-commerce website for Quiltessentials-www.quiltessentialsonline.com (2010)
Band/Orchestra principal flute player (2000-present)
Warren County Humane Society-Kennel Cleaner (2006-2007)

HONORS:

Undergraduate Student Research Grant recipient (Spring 2012)
Beta Gamma Sigma International Honor Society (2011-present)
Dean's List- Fall 2008, Spring 2009, Fall 2009, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011
Jacob Levinson Foundation Scholarship (2008-2009)
DeFrees Family Foundation Scholarship for Schreyer Scholars & Honors Students (2009)
Lambda Sigma Sophomore Honor Society (2008-2009)