



World Journal on Educational Technology



Vol 2, issue 3 (2010) 196-210

www.world-education-center.org/index.php/wjet

Blend or not to blend: a study investigating faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching

Mehmet Akif Ocak^{a *}

^a Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology, Faculty of Education, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

Received May 12, 2010; revised August 14, 2010; accepted October 22, 2010

Abstract

This study examined faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching from several perspectives. A total of 73 faculty members in Turkish Higher Education context participated in the study by completing an online survey that combined quantitative and qualitative approaches. Based on a data analysis, the faculty members' perceptions were sorted into six categories: (a) satisfaction with blended teaching, (b) perceived impact on the role of the faculty, (c) perceived impact on student learning, (d) perceived impact on student motivation, (e) advantages of blended teaching, and (f) disadvantages of blended teaching. Findings indicated that faculty members were likely to agree that blended teaching provides a high degree of satisfaction and that it requires more time and commitment from the faculty. The faculty members perceived that blended teaching improves student learning and, to some extent, improves motivation. The faculty members also emphasized the importance of institutional support and the use of technology to mitigate student problems. This study presents these faculty members' perceptions, which are helpful for those planning to implement a blended teaching approach, and makes suggestions for trouble-shooting and taking advantage of the opportunities in a blended environment successfully.

Keywords: Blended teaching; faculty teaching; faculty perception; satisfaction; blended college course

©2010 Academic World Education & Research Center. All rights reserved.

* Mehmet Akif Ocak. Tel.: +90 (312) 202 8319; fax: +90 (312) 222 8483
E-mail address: maocak@gazi.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

Blended teaching is becoming increasingly common, but research has shown that it demands time and effort from educators. Garrison and Kanuka (2004) indicated that blended teaching requires careful scheduling to balance face-to-face and online components of the classes. In addition, the quality of blended teaching varies according to the teachers' abilities to design and deliver the courses (Rovai & Jordan, 2004). Cavalli, Gnudi, Iovino, Lorenzi and Malvisi (2007) interviewed 32 faculty members and found that quality was always the most important issue in blended teaching. They showed that administrators must assess the faculty members' experience in order to establish their particular needs in terms of quality control and resources. Ginns and Ellis (2007) studied the quality of blended teaching using a sample of 127 students of Veterinary Science and investigated how faculty used the online components of blended courses to complement the face-to-face components. Their results suggested that the difficulty of implementing online coursework constitutes an obstacle for researchers to understand how students learn through technology-based activities.

Based on literature review, the research on blended teaching seemed to be divided in three categories: factors for students, educators and institutions. Boitshwarelo (2009) evaluated professional development for science teachers in a blended learning environment and found that change is needed in the culture of blended teaching so that collaboration between institutions and teachers might be established. Additionally, Davis and Fill (2007) emphasized the difficulty of blended teaching for faculty members, who found it difficult to adapt to new technologies because of inadequate institutional support.

1.1. Faculty concerns

Research has clearly supported the implementation of blended teaching in college courses. However, researchers have neglected faculty members' perceptions, challenges and concerns regarding blended teaching and their perceptions of student learning and motivation (Ocak, 2011). In particular, educators have struggled to adapt to their new roles because they face the challenge of integrating technology into their teaching. For instance, Humbert (2007) showed that faculty are under pressure to deal with online interactions and technical issues in blended teaching. The use of technology in blended teaching raises the concern that faculty members might spend more time learning new technologies than on promoting student learning and motivation (Klein, Spector, Grabowski & Teja, 2004). There is a growing concern that there is not enough time for faculty members to keep up with latest technology, which continues to evolve, and that this constraint might dissuade faculty members from teaching blended courses (Ocak, 2011). Kim, Bonk and Teng (2009) conducted a study with 674 training and human resource development professionals from five different countries and showed that the participants' lack of technological knowledge and skills was one of the most noticeable barriers to successful blended teaching.

1.1.1. *Administrative issues*

Administrative issues also play a crucial role in blended teaching. Faculty members who lack institutional support struggle with the technical details of blended courses (Gerbic et. al, 2009). Dziuban, Moskal and Hartman (2004), in a study of faculty members, concluded that blended learning is an evolving phenomenon that includes different challenges: "our experience is that blended learning is a transformational force, even at the outer edges of its influence. In a real sense, "we have only just begun"" (p.11). Because of the increasing emphasis on the impact of blended teaching in higher institutions, faculty members must have access to technical and pedagogical support that can motivate them to implement new classroom technologies. Faculty members play a vital role in laying the primary foundations for student motivation and learning and the use of technology in classrooms. Research clearly shows that institutional support must include both technical support and professional development.

1.1.2. *Changing Roles*

The new teaching dynamics in blended teaching have begun to change the role of educators. With the growth of accessibility to the Internet and its use, faculty members have struggled to balance their different roles. In addition to their teacher-centered courses, educators have begun to teach students how to use new technologies. However, researchers have not yet documented faculty members' perceptions of how their different roles affect student learning (Stacey & Gerbic, 2008). The use of different mediums in blended teaching has forced faculty members to handle communication problems and technical issues. The roles of educators in blended teaching remain unclear and, therefore, it is necessary to investigate educators' perceptions of teaching blended college courses. As Stacey and Gerbic (2008) have shown, high faculty satisfaction is an important factor that may promote the success of blended teaching.

Other studies on blended teaching have emphasized the properties of different constructivist learning environments. For example, Derntl and Motschnig-Pitrik (2005) found that a blended project-based learning environment increased students' motivation to participate in the course when provided with the help of an experienced teacher. Similarly, Donnelly (2010) studied a blended problem-based learning module and concluded that the combination of blended and problem-based learning is complex because the teachers and students must possess different teaching and learning skills for each component. McKenzie, Pelliccione and Parker (2008) found that peer reviews in blended learning environments are more complex than peer observations of face-to-face classes. Moreover, Donnelly (2009) found that it is important for faculty members to seek best practices for how to combine instructional strategies in technology-based classes. What is notable in studies investigating blended teaching is that teachers' roles and attitudes remain a strong predictor of the implementation of technology-enhanced learning processes and environments.

1.2. Purpose of the study

Research has clearly shown that the integration of technology into blended teaching requires educators to have some technological expertise (Donnelly, 2009; Davis and Fill, 2007; Cavalli, Gnudi, lovino, Lorenzi and Malvisi, 2007; Gerbic et. al, 2009). Furthermore, students' increasing interest in technology requires faculty members to have the appropriate training for technology-based courses (Ocak, 2011). Oh and Park (2009) showed that lack of faculty motivation to integrate technology into their courses is the biggest challenge to the implementation of blended teaching. As Klein, Spector, Grabowski and Teja (2004) have indicated, low satisfaction with technological tools affects faculty members' blended teaching. Research has also indicated that faculty satisfaction is the primary determinant of online teaching (Tallent-Runnels et. al, 2006). The impact of blended courses on faculty requires further investigation, and this study thus studied faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching. This study focused on the following research questions. What are faculty members' perceptions regarding:

1. their level of satisfaction with technological tools in blended teaching?
2. the impact of blended courses on educators' roles?
3. the impact of blended courses on students' learning?
4. the impact of blended courses on students' motivation?
5. the advantages of blended teaching?
6. the disadvantages of blended teaching?

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants

The snowball sampling technique was used to identify faculty members' who had taught or were currently teaching a blended course was used. In the initial phase 23 faculty members who had previously taught blended courses were contacted and asked to refer to other faculty members, who had also taught blended courses. 41 referred faculty's contact information (including telephone numbers and email addresses) were gathered and asked if they would participate in a study on faculty members' perceptions regarding blended teaching in college courses. It was explained that their participation would take approximately 25-30 minutes. In the second phase, 41 faculty members were asked if they knew anyone teaching blended college courses. Contact information of the 63 potential participants were collected and asked them to participate in the study. Of the 127 faculty members whom were contacted, 73 agreed to participate in the study. This sample consisted of 28 females and 45 males. In the sample, there were 5 professors, 12 associate professors, 23 assistant professors and 33 adjuncts and instructors at 11 different universities and colleges in Turkey.

2.2. Instrument

A survey was administered on the impact of blended teaching to faculty members to measure their perceptions regarding their satisfaction levels, faculty roles, student learning and student motivation. Impact questions were based on Rochowicz (1996), who used a Computing Technology Utilization/Impact Questionnaire to study the use of computers and calculators in college courses. Satisfaction questions were based on Shea, Pickett and Li (2005), who used a Satisfaction Survey to assess faculty members' levels of satisfaction with online teaching. These previous studies established the content validity of the surveys. Furthermore, the adapted surveys were pilot tested and administered to 54 faculty members before the study began. Table 1 presents the Cronbach's alpha values and Cronbach's alpha reliability test results for the original survey. The survey total consisted of 21 questions (17 Likert-type and 4 yes/no questions). Accordingly, the survey included four questions on the role of the faculty (e.g., blended teaching requires managing different roles), six on student learning (e.g., technology integration enhances the learning), four on student motivation (e.g., blended course becomes more relevant to student) and seven on satisfaction with blended teaching (e.g., Overall I was very satisfied with teaching this blended course). The responses for each item ranged from one to five (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4= agree, 5=strongly agree).

Table 1. Cronbach's alpha values for the original studies and this study

	Original study	Research conducted
	Rochowicz (1996)	
The role of the faculty	.95	.79
Student learning	.90	.91
Student motivation	.92	.82
	Shea, Pickett & Li (2005)	
Satisfaction	-	.84

2.3. Data collection

An online survey system to collect data was chosen for two reasons. First, it allowed for fast and reliable data collection in a short period of time. Second, online survey system enabled to ask two open-ended questions about faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching: (1) *what are the advantages of teaching blended college courses?*, (2) *what are the disadvantages of teaching blended college courses?* Every faculty member was expected to have different approaches and experiences, and it was thus crucial to ask these two open-ended questions to get detailed

information on their perceptions. After getting the participants' permission for the study, the data-collection process lasted for three weeks.

2.4. Data analysis

Data analysis aimed to identify patterns in the faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching; thus, quantitative and qualitative analyses were combined. The collected surveys were examined for missing data (item responses) but no error was found. A descriptive analysis and correlational analysis for the quantitative data was conducted, and also a qualitative approach to get the most appropriate data from the faculty members' answers was employed. The qualitative analysis was begun by developing coding categories based on the faculty members' answers to two open-ended questions. Coding categories by looking for patterns in the faculty members' answers were created.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive analysis

The faculty's background information included gender, age, rank, experience with Internet technology and content area. 28 of the faculty members who responded to the survey were female (38%), and 62% of the participants were male. The age range included faculty under 25 (2%) and over 55 (3%). The largest age group was 26-45 (63%), followed by 46-55 (32%). The faculty members' experience with the technology necessary for blended teaching varied. As Table 2 shows, 23% of the faculty indicated that they had experience with learning management systems like Blackboard and Module, and 45% of the faculty indicated that they had experience with self-paced learning tools. Furthermore, 32% indicated that they had experience with collaboration tools (e.g., forums, listservs, etc.).

Table 2. Background information of faculty members

Measure	Number (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	45	61.64
Female	28	38.35
Age		
Under 25	5	6.84
26-45	46	63.01
46-55	19	26.02
Over 55	3	4.10
Rank		
Professor	5	6.84
Associate professor	12	16.43
Assistant professor	23	31.50
Other (Instructor, lecturer, etc.)	33	45.20
Experience with Internet technology		
Learning Management System (LMS)	17	23.28

Self-paced tools	32	43.83
Collaboration tools	24	32.87
Content area		
Art and Science	11	15.06
Education	34	46.57
Engineering	10	13.69
Business	8	10.95

The survey results revealed that 88.6% of the faculty members were generally satisfied with teaching blended classes. Additionally, 87% of the faculty members indicated that they were satisfied with the course that they had just completed or were continuing to teach. As Table 3 shows, approximately 92.1% of the sample reported that their students learned a lot in blended courses, but 3.2% of the participants disagreed with this opinion.

Table 3. Faculty members' satisfaction with blended teaching

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Satisfied with the course currently taught	1.2%	3.2%	8.6%	46.3%	40.7%
Overall satisfied with blended teaching	1.5%	2.6%	7.3%	51.4%	37.2%
Students learned a great deal in blended teaching	1.8%	1.4%	4.7%	39.6%	52.5%

Table 4 shows that 96.2% of the faculty members indicated that blended teaching is an appropriate learning environment for college courses. Furthermore, 69.6% of the respondents reported that they were eager to teach another blended course, and 25.6% seemed undecided. The majority of the faculty members (82.3%) indicated that they would recommend teaching blended courses to other faculty members, and 13.8% of the faculty indicated that they were not sure if they would. Regarding technology competence for blended teaching, 90.7% of the faculty thought that they had adequate skills to design and deliver blended courses.

Table 4. Faculty members' additional perceptions of blended teaching

	Yes	Undecided	No
Is the blended approach an appropriate environment for teaching?	96.2%	3.5%	0.3%
Are you willing to teach another blended course?	69.6%	25.6%	4.8%
Do you recommend teaching blended courses to other faculty members?	82.3%	13.8%	3.9%
Do you think your technology level is sufficient for blended teaching?	90.7%	6.5%	2.8%

The majority of the faculty members (98.7%) agreed that blended teaching requires faculty members to manage different roles. Additionally, the majority agreed that blended teaching requires more time and effort than classroom-based and online teaching (95%). Furthermore, many participants indicated that blended teaching requires more creative teaching methods (69.8%), and 13.5% were undecided about this question. As Table 5 indicates, 87.9% of the participants agreed that blended teaching requires educators to reflect on meaningful ways of teaching.

Table 5. Faculty members' perceptions regarding the role of faculty in blended teaching

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Blended teaching requires:					
managing different roles	0%	1.3%	0%	16.3%	82.4%
significantly more time from the faculty	0%	3%	2%	18.4%	76.6%
more creative teaching on the part of the faculty	5.2%	11.5%	13.5%	38%	31.8%
more reflection on the ways in which a course can be taught.	4.2%	6.7%	1.2%	45.4%	42.5%

Table 6 reveals contradictory results about faculty members' perceptions regarding blended teaching's impact on student learning. For example, 37.1% of the participants agreed that blended teaching improves student learning, but 42.3% of the participants disagreed with this opinion. Approximately, half of the participants agreed that students' flexible thinking (58.7%), reasoning (51.8%) and interpretative skills (62.1%) increased and that more active learning in a blended teaching environment took place (69.4%). However, many faculty members expressed uncertainty about improvements in students' reasoning (34.6%), flexible thinking (32.1%) and interpretative skills (26.6%). When combining the "undecided" responses with the "disagree" responses, there was a consensus that the impact of blended teaching on students' learning remained steady.

Table 6. Faculty members' perceptions of student learning in blended teaching

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Learning improves	10.3%	32%	20.6%	32.4%	4.7%
Flexibility in thinking increases	3.8%	5.4%	32.1%	27.6%	31.1%
More active learning takes place	4.5%	6.7%	18.9%	20.5%	49.4%
Technology integration enhances the learning	0%	1.4%	5%	30.7%	62.9%
Students' reasoning improves	4.7%	8.9%	34.6%	46.3%	5.5%
Interpretation skills improve	6.7%	4.6%	26.6%	34.6%	27.5%

The results clearly show that most faculty members remain unsure of blended teaching's impact on certain aspects of student motivation (Table 7). The participants expressed uncertainty as to whether student motivation (43.6%), self-confidence (46.7%) and attitudes to learning (39.5%) improved. Furthermore, 34.9% disagreed that blended teaching develops better attitudes to learning. On the other hand, 62.4% of the faculty members indicated that blended teaching is more relevant to college students than classroom-based teaching.

Table 7. Faculty members' perceptions of student motivation in blended teaching

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
Student motivation improves	9.8%	8.7%	43.6%	26.7%	11.2%
Students' self-confidence increases	7.7%	10.2%	46.7%	18.9%	16.5%
Course becomes more relevant to students	5.6%	3.4%	28.6%	35.7%	26.7%
Better attitudes toward learning develop	13.5%	21.4%	39.5%	9.4%	16.2%

A possible explanation for the conflicting results of students' learning skills and motivation in this study might involve the students' insufficient involvement in the blended courses through technology integration. In other words, although results in Table 3, 4 and 5 showed that faculty satisfied and appreciated the blended courses, Table 6 and 7 showed that faculty perceived that students learning skills such as reasoning, thinking and also student motivation were not improved. This points out the need for faculty members to provide good opportunities for all students to engage in blended college courses. The findings suggest that faculty members make sure to integrate different cognitive and affective teaching methods into blended teaching and to provide student-centered techniques to maintain social interaction and cognitive presence. Faculty need to focus on balanced utilization of the face-to-face and online components of the blended courses to improve students' reasoning skills and motivation. As suggested by Derntl and Motschnig-Pitrik (2005), "neither learning platforms nor learning theories in isolation can provide the support required to realize effective blended learning scenarios" (p.113).

Table 8 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationships between faculty members' satisfaction and their perceptions regarding faculty roles and student learning and motivation in blended teaching. Table 8 depicts the strong relationship between faculty satisfaction and their roles on blended teaching and between student learning and faculty roles. The relationships between satisfaction and student learning, faculty roles and student motivation, student motivation and student learning and satisfaction and student motivation were moderate and positive. The correlation coefficients, which ranged from +.63 to +.88, show that between 39% and 77% of the variation in satisfaction, faculty role, student learning and student motivation can be explained by a positive relationship with the measures that were obtained at the time of teaching blended courses.

Table 8. Relationship between faculty satisfaction, faculty role, student learning and student motivation, as perceived by the faculty members

	Satisfaction	The role of the faculty	Student learning	Student motivation
Satisfaction	1	.88**	.69*	.63
The role of the faculty	.88	1	.71	.66*
Student learning	.69*	.71**	1	.68
Student motivation	.63*	.66	.68*	1

*p<0.05

3.2. Qualitative analysis

The qualitative results on faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching were divided into two categories: the advantages of blended teaching and its disadvantages. A coding scheme by examining the faculty members' answers to the two open-ended questions was developed. Similar answers under the same category were grouped and the number and percentage of the codings for each category was calculated. Table 9 summarizes the categories that were derived from the faculty members' answers. The faculty's perceptions regarding the advantages of blended teaching were grouped into four categories: flexibility of time and location, continuous feedback, more student interaction and more self-paced learning. Four themes emerged for the disadvantages of blended teaching: student problems with using technology, lack of institutional support, increased demands on time and faculty incompetence with technology.

Table 9. Advantages and disadvantage of blended teaching in college courses

		Number of the codings	Percentage of the codings
Advantages	Flexibility for time and location	67	39.9
	Continuing feedback	45	26.8
	More student interaction	34	20.2
	More self-paced learning	22	13.0
	Total	168	100
Disadvantages	Problems with students' use of technology	58	38.4
	Lack of institutional support	50	33.1
	Spending more time	31	20.5
	Faculty's prior experience with technology	12	7.9
	Total	151	100

A total of 39.9% of the codings indicated that blended teaching gives more flexibility to both faculty and students in terms of time and location. Furthermore, 26.8% indicated that blended

teaching provides clear and prompt feedback on questions, assignments, and grades. The participants clearly indicated that the continuous feedback in blended teaching helps students to improve their performance and deal with their concerns. Another 20.2% of the codings expressed faculty members' perceptions that blended teaching promotes student interaction through various technological tools such as email, forums, and discussion forms. As one faculty member indicated, *"blended courses increase the interactions between students and the instructor. That is a good advantage in web-assisted courses."* Faculty members also indicated that blended teaching provides opportunities for independent study. For example, 13% of the codings indicated that online resources, weekly assignments and different assessment techniques foster students' engagement and should be emphasized. One of the responses about self-paced learning expressed, *"Independent study in blended teaching helps students to develop critical thinking and time management skills."* Another participant said, *"Self-study in blended courses enables faculty to arrange the course according to the students' different learning styles."*

Regarding the disadvantages of blended teaching, 38.4% of the codings related to faculty members' concerns about students' inability to use the technology for blended courses. Thus, faculty members most frequently cited their students' unsatisfactory use of technology in blended courses. One participant reported, *"Many students do not know how to log onto the system, and it creates problems for both instructor and other students"*; another said, *"I think many students need guidance for the online component of a blended course because they struggle with technological tools such as chatting, forums, etc."* These responses imply that students must be given clear guidelines, especially for the online components of blended courses. Approximately 33.1% of the codings indicated faculty concerns about the lack of institutional support for blended teaching. In this regard, faculty members cited the need for technical and pedagogical support from their institutions. As one of the participants pointed out, educators need *"some kind of help desk is important so that they can get over anxieties quickly and manage to learn the necessary skills for blended teaching."* Third, 20.5% of the codings indicated that teaching blended courses requires more time and commitment than either face-to-face or fully online courses. The participants' answers also indicated that they needed more time to design and deliver blended courses. Inadequate faculty knowledge of the technology for blended teaching was ranked fourth at 7.9%.

4. DISCUSSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching from several perspectives. The factors that reflected faculty members' satisfaction included their willingness to teach other blended courses, their technology level, their eagerness to recommend blended teaching to other faculty and their perceptions of blended teaching as an appropriate college learning environment. Some of the variables reported here are discussed below.

4.1. Changing roles of faculty

Although the faculty members seemed motivated and satisfied with blended teaching, this form of teaching seemed to shift their roles. According to results, faculty members had to manage these different roles in blended college courses. Faculty members expended more time, effort and, most importantly, commitment in blended courses. Unlike a traditional classroom setting with a single teacher, blended teaching requires different teaching methods with the support of technology and more reflection on students' work. Results revealed that most faculty members believe that blended teaching requires more responsibilities and that, in most cases, the faculty members must manage multiple roles.

4.2. Students' access to technology

Concerning the perceived impact of blended teaching on student learning, most faculty members agreed that the integration of technology into blended teaching improves students' learning. Although results revealed evidence that faculty see an increase in students' reasoning skills and interpretation skills, there was also disagreement among faculty members' responses about student learning in blended courses. Accordingly, the qualitative analysis revealed that faculty members were unhappy about the technological barriers students faced in blended teaching because of their limited access to technological tools.

4.3. Motivation

Results found a degree of uncertainty about the impact of blended teaching on students' motivation in the faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching. Contrary to previous research, which found that blended teaching increased students' motivation to participate in courses, compared to non-blended teaching (Derntl & Motschnig-Pitrik, 2005), this study indicated that faculty members tend to perceive a lack of student motivation in blended courses. Survey results showed that faculty members perceived a discontinuation in student motivation as an important outcome of blended teaching. Examples of perceived motivation factors included decreased student self-confidence, negative attitudes to learning and the relevance of the blended course for the students. Findings revealed that most faculty members agreed that improving students' interaction and communication with their instructors and peers helps to build motivation. The participants' satisfaction with blended courses was also related to their perceptions of student motivation because it motivated them to provide a rich and informative learning experience. The faculty who were highly satisfied with teaching blended courses was also more eager to establish effective communication in their courses.

5. CONCLUSION

This study's quantitative and qualitative approach allowed for a more detailed analysis of faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching in college courses. Consistent with previous findings (Graham, 2006; Davis & Fill, 2007), the present study found that faculty members were enthusiastic about the opportunity to provide timely feedback and excited by the flexibility offered by blended teaching. The participants also emphasized the lack of institutional support for technical and pedagogical hurdles and the need to spend more time in designing and delivering blended courses. Previous research has supported the view that a lack of institutional support directly affects faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching (Stacey & Gerbic, 2008; Bersin & Associates, 2003).

This study focused on faculty members' perceptions of the impact of blended teaching in college courses. Most of the participants indicated that, although the integration of technology into classrooms has improved student learning and motivation, the successful implementation of blended teaching requires taking into account students' access to technology and faculty competence with technology. As Oh and Park (2009) indicated, institutional support plays a crucial role in shaping faculty members' willingness to design and teach blended courses.

Previous studies have focused on changing faculty members' behavior by familiarizing them with new technology and instructional methods (Donnelly, 2010; Tallent-Runnels et. al, 2006). For example, process-planning models and online, collaborative approaches have gained attention as effective teaching methods in blended pedagogy (Nel & Wilkinson, 2006). Garrison and Kanuka (2004) indicated that the successful implementation of blended teaching in higher institutions will largely depend on faculty members' commitment to the effectiveness of teaching with technology. Encouraging faculty members to share their perceptions, experiences and insights might help them to manage the opportunities and limitations of blended teaching. Faculty members constitute the primary resource for knowledge, education and support for students in technology-based courses (Brahler, Peterson & Johnson, 1999; Rovai & Jordan, 2004; Jusoff & Khodabandelou, 2004; Ginns & Ellis, 2007). Therefore, research must concentrate on faculty members at all stages in the planning, organization and delivery of blended courses to foster the successful implementation of blended teaching in college courses. The present study's results provide new insights into faculty members' perceptions of blended teaching and suggest ways to encourage faculty members to adopt the blended approach to teaching.

REFERENCES

- Bersin & Associates (2003). *Blended Learning: What Works. An Introductory study of the strategy, implementation of blended learning*, Retrieved May 10, 2010, from http://www.e-learningguru.com/wpapers/blended_bersin.doc.
- Boitshwarelo, B. (2009). Exploring Blended Learning for Science Teacher Professional Development in an African Context. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 10(4), 1-19.
- Brahler, C. J., Peterson, N. S., & Johnson, E.C. (1999). Developing on-line learning materials for higher education: An overview of current issues. *Educational Technology & Society*, 2(2), Retrieved May 10, 2010, from http://www.ifets.info/journals/2_2/jayne_brahler.html
- Cavalli E., Gnudi A., Iovino D., Lorenzi A., & Malvisi L. (2007). Lecturer perception of the effectiveness of blended learning and institutional support mechanisms. *Proceedings of EDEN 2007 Annual Conference*, 13-16 June, 2007, Naples, Italy.
- Davis H., & Fill K. (2007). Embedding blended learning in a university's teaching culture: Experiences and reflections. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(5), 817- 828.
- Derntl, M., & Motschnig-Pitrik R. (2005). The role of structure, patterns, and people in blended learning. *Internet and Higher Education*, 8, 111–130.
- Dziuban, C., Moskal, P., & Hartman, J. (2004). Blended learning. *EDUCAUSE Center for applied research Research Bulletin*, 7, 1-12.
- Dziuban, C., Moskal, P., & Hartman, J. (2005). Higher education, blended learning and the generations: Knowledge is power—no more. In J. Bourne & J. C. Moore (Eds.), *Elements of quality online education: Engaging communities*. Needham, MA: Sloan Center for Online Education.
- Donnelly, R. (2009). Embedding interaction within a blend of learner centric pedagogy and technology. *World Journal on Educational Technology*, 1, 6-29.
- Donnelly, R. (2010). Harmonizing technology with interaction in blended problem-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 54, 350–359.
- Graham, R. G. (2006). Definition, current trends and future directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. Graham (Eds.), *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs* (pp. 3-21). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer Publications.
- Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95-105.
- Gerbic, P., Stacey, E., Anderson, B., Simpson, M., Mackey, J., Gunn, C., & Samarawickrema G. (2009). Blended learning: Is there evidence for its effectiveness? In Same places, different spaces. *Proceedings ascilite Auckland 2009*. Retrieved May 2, 2010, from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/gerbic-symposium.pdf>
- Ginns, P., & Ellis, R. (2007). Quality in blended learning: Exploring the relationships between on-line and face-to-face teaching and learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10(1), 53-64.
- Heinze, A., & Procter, C. (2004). Reflections on the Use of Blended Learning. *Education in a Changing Environment Conference Proceedings*, University of Salford, EDU.

- Humbert, M. (2007). Adoption of blended learning by faculty: An Exploratory Analysis. In M.K. McCuddy et al. (eds.), *The Challenges of Educating People to Lead in a Challenging World* (pp. 423–436), Springer.
- Jusoff, K., & Khodabandelou, R. (2004). Preliminary Study on the Role of Social Presence in Blended Learning Environment in Higher Education. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 79-83.
- Klein, J. D., Spector, J. M., Grabowski, B., & Teja N. (2004). *Instructor competencies: Standards for face-to-face, online and blended settings*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Kim, K., Bonk, C. J., & Teng, Y. (2009). The present state and future trends of blended learning in workplace learning settings across five countries. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10, 299–308
- McKenzie, J., Pelliccione, L., & Parker, N. (2008). Developing peer review of teaching in blended learning environments: Frameworks and challenges. In *Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology? Proceedings ascilite Melbourne 2008*. Retrieved May 2, 2010 from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/mckenzie-j.pdf>
- Nel, L., & Wilkinson, A. (2006). Enhancing Collaborative Learning in a Blended Learning Environment: Applying a Process Planning Model. *Systematic Practice and Action Research*, 19, 553–576.
- Ocak, M.A. (2011). Why are faculty members not teaching blended courses? Insights from faculty members. *Computers & Education*, 56(3), 689-699.
- Oh, E., & Park, S. (2009). How are universities involved in blended instruction? *Educational Technology & Society*, 12 (3), 327–342.
- Rochowicz, J.A. (1996). The impact of using computers and calculators on calculus instruction. *The Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*, 15(4), 423-435.
- Rovai, A. P., & Jordan, H. M. (2004). Blended Learning and Sense of Community: A comparative analysis with traditional and fully online graduate courses. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 5(2), 1-13.
- Shea, P., Pickett, A., & Li, C.S. (2005). Increasing access to Higher Education: A study of the diffusion of online teaching among 913 college faculty. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 6(2), 1-27.
- Stacey, E., & Gerbic, P. (2008). Success factors for blended learning. In *Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology? Proceedings ascilite Melbourne 2008*. Retrieved May 2, 2010 from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/stacey.pdf>
- Tallent-Runnels, M. K., Thomas, J. A., Lan, W. Y., Cooper, S., Ahern, T.C., Shaw, S.M., & Liu, X. (2006). Teaching Courses Online: A Review of the Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(1), 93–135.