AN EXAMINATION OF THE ONLINE VERSUS F2F ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF NON-TRADITIONAL UNDERGRADUATE BUSINESS SCHOOL STUDENTS

Dr. Rochelle Parks-Yancy
Associate Professor of Management, Jesse H. Jones School of Business
Texas Southern University
parksre@tsu.edu

Dr. Delonia Cooley
Associate Professor of Marketing, Jesse H. Jones School of Business
Texas Southern University
cooleydo@tsu.edu

Abstract: Online collegiate education offers students access to higher education, irrespective of their proximity to the university. Non-traditional student populations benefit from online education because they often work full time and are parents of young children. They can still earn a degree, despite their work and familial obligations. However, the results are mixed regarding the academic performance of students in online courses, relative to courses that are taught face to face (F2F). These students are generally not online education-savvy. They require extensive orientation to online learning norms and processes, and need large quantities of professor-student online interactions. Failure of university administrators and professors to recognize their needs and/or to institutionalize the responses to their needs can negatively affect students' academic performance in online courses, relative to F2F courses. This study compares the academic performance of non-traditional undergraduate business majors in online and F2F courses. The authors also discuss students' knowledge of online learning norms and the course platform prior to enrolling in online courses and how this can impact their course performance.

Keywords: online education; academic performance; face-to-face education; education; delivery method

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ONLINE VERSUS F2F ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF NON-TRADITIONAL UNDERGRADUATE BUSINESS SCHOOL STUDENTS

As the numbers of online educational institutions has increased, students are flocking to these programs. Traditional universities are adapting to this growing phenomena by offering their own fully online degree programs and/or increasing their numbers of online class offerings. Studies have found that online collegiate education offers many benefits for students (Cater, Michel, & Varela, 2012). Students have access to higher education that they may, otherwise, not have because they are not physically close to the university (Bressler, Bressler, & Bressler, 2010; Humphrey & Harbin, 2010). This is particularly beneficial to non-traditional student populations who, by definition, are often returning to school after having been away many years, they work full time and many have school-aged children. Online education enables them to earn a degree, in spite of their work and familial obligations (Brown & Park, 2015).

Also, online education offers significant benefits to universities, whether they are 100% online institutions or traditional institutions. Web-based course instruction provides institutions of higher education with new markets. That is, universities can increase their enrollment without having to increase or, otherwise, physically alter their classroom space. Given that many universities suffered financial challenges associated with the recession in the late 2000's (Brown & Hoxby, 2014), opportunities to increase their enrollment can be quite beneficial. Online education increases the global knowledge of and exposure to the institutions' course offerings, professors, and other attributes (Carthan, 2007) and is a potential way for universities to grow.

However, students may not gain all of online education's benefits nor do students necessarily perform better in online courses than in face to face (F2F) course settings. Some institutions offer online course orientations to students so that they can become familiar with the course platform and web-based instruction norms. However, many colleges and universities do not mandate completion of an online orientation prior to students' enrolling in online courses. Thus, students often enroll in web-based courses without having any idea

of how to navigate the course and, more generally, how to learn effectively online. This can negatively affect their course performance.

Also, faculty may not be well-versed in effective online teaching (Omar, Kalulu, Alijani, 2011). Some universities offer formalized online course instruction to faculty, but it is often not a requirement to teach online. Professors' variation in technological knowledge limits the extent to which faculty utilize the features of a course platform, though such features can enhance students' learning (Smith, 2005). Some online classes primarily consist of professors requiring students to post typed assignments and respond to discussion board posts. In other courses, professors utilize the web to teach in real-time, they record lectures for students to see and hear, they host online chat forums, etc. Thus, students may not gain as much knowledge from an online course, relative to F2F courses, because the faculty member is not knowledgeable of how to teach effectively online.

Finally, online instruction involves large quantities of professor-student interactions. Students may not be accustomed to having to wait for a response from the professor to questions or comments that they have about the course. Faculty often complain that though online teaching does not necessitate physically being in a specific place, it is more time-consuming than F2F instruction because students contact faculty any time and expect relatively fast responses from their professors. Also, faculty must spend more time explaining assignment expectations and giving feedback than in F2F settings (Omar, Kalulu, Alijani, 2011), namely because the online environment lends itself to greater confusion and misunderstandings than the F2F setting.

These issues can affect online course performance and, thus, retention of non-traditional college students. Working full time and their familial obligations can already affect their focus on academics. Then, there is the added burden of them often being less familiar with online educational norms relative to their more traditional collegiate peers (Wilkes et al., 2006). Students' limited knowledge of web-based instruction norms and processes and/or their need for active faculty-student interactions and consistent course performance feedback can contribute to students not performing as well in online courses compared to F2F courses (Omar, Kalulu, Alijani, 2011). This can lead to students' dropping courses and, eventually, dropping out of school, particularly if many of their required courses are online. This negatively affects the students' career prospects, their perspective of the institution that they dropped out of and, ultimately, universities' retention rates.

This study analyzes non-traditional students' online versus F2F academic performance to determine how they perform in both course settings. Second, the authors discuss the potential impact of students' prior online course knowledge on their course performance. The study concludes by proposing teaching and institutional enhancements to the online learning environment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Online education is growing in popularity due to the simplicity it creates in the complex setting of education. Allen and Seaman (2011) reported that over six million students enrolled in at least one online course during the Fall 2010 academic session, and by 2011, almost 31 percent of all college students were taking some kind of online course. Technological applications associated with online education provide the environment that cultivates all of the academic activities for a course, as well as the setting to develop networks between the students in the course. Students can share and participate in the creation of knowledge together. Many people turn to online education because it is a very effective way to fit education into the busy lives of working people who do not have the time to sit in a traditional classroom.

Online education also provides an educational avenue for people who have the time to attend school, but don't have the physical university in close proximity for them to attend. DiRienzo and Lilly (2014) argue that the increase in the number of online programs is due to students' demanding more ways to access higher education and online education is a cost-effective way for institutions increase their enrollment. The main benefits of online education for students include: the material can be delivered to anyone, anywhere with internet access; the opportunity for real-time interactions among students and professors via the internet; the opportunity for students to control the pace for their learning experience and some employers reimburse employees for returning to school, which incents them to increase their education and also increases work productivity (Evans & Hasse, 2001). More generally, the growth of online education increases the education and skill-set of society, as a whole.

The non-traditional undergraduate student in U.S. is normally over 25 years of age (Casselman, 2013). They work full-time and have families. Most didn't go straight to college after high school or they started and could not finish at the time, but returned to complete their education. Though this is not exclusive to every non-traditional student, they tend to fall in this arena. Thus, there is obviously a market for online education, in terms of adults seeking a college education that also fits within their working lives. As students become more

dependent on technology for day-to-day activities, the push for using technology for the delivery of that education is increasing. But these factors do not necessarily mean that online education is the most effective form of education for non-traditional students.

Students in online classes have a more limited capacity to interact with their instructor and their peers, whereas students in F2F classes solicit help from each other and the instructor more often than in online courses, given their physical proximity during class and between classes, too (Bejerano, 2008). Therefore, F2F students tend to have a closer relationship with their professors than students in online classes. Also, online students have to be more efficient with their time and be self-disciplined, due to the independent learning nature of the course. The lack of these traits can cause students to drop out because they become frustrated with the course format and, then, discouraged due to their often-poor performance in the online class. This is especially true for first-time college students and those who returned to school after years of absence. They miss out on the class time resources and nearness to peers and professors that students have in the F2F classroom setting. When F2F students are performing badly in a course, they are more likely to solicit help from their peers and their professor than will online students.

Therefore, faculty interaction is imperative to the success of students in online learning. Students need feedback on their work that is detailed and timely. When faculty are very interactive online, it increases students' engagement in the course and positively affects their course performance. Conversely, when faculty are not very engaged, online students tend not to perform as well as their F2F counterparts (Sull, 2013).

Finally, online education necessitates that students learn how to use a possibly new software (the course platform), oftentimes while they are enrolled in the course. This is because many institutions do not mandate that students (nor faculty) complete an online orientation to the course platform prior to enrolling in an online course. Thus, students experience the learning curve of trying to understand the course platform, while simultaneously having to use the software in order to complete their course. This can obviously negatively affect their course performance.

These differences between the two types of learning environments affect students' learning. Students in online courses have a lower performance rate compared to F2F courses because they do not have the student and faculty interaction resources that they get in F2F courses (Brown & Liedholm, 2002; Coates et al., 2004) nor have mastered the time management and self-discipline skills needed for online course success. However, other research suggests that it does not matter the delivery of the material, but rather it is the student population itself that makes a difference in the performance in online versus F2F settings (DiRienzo & Lilly, 2014). That is, students who are more technologically-savvy, organized and individually motivated to perform well are likely to succeed in online courses. Still, Cyrs (1997) argued that it is the correct matching-up of the course material and the correct use of media (the delivery method) that determines students' course performance. Without a correct match between the material and delivery, the student won't be perform well, whether the course is online or F2F.

Online education can also be challenging to the faculty. There are no limitations on the contact hours or the time that students need to pose questions about assignments. Transferring knowledge from the F2F material to the online class can be time-consuming and increase class preparation time tremendously. Faculty can also find it difficult to communicate the exact meaning of the information they are trying to convey due to the barriers created by the lack of personal interaction experienced in the online course. Thus, the method of communication is often reduced to emails and, sometimes, online chatting. People may be very direct and straight to the point in their communiques, but the messages can still be taken out of context, possibly causing major misunderstandings among students and faculty. In the F2F setting, the student/faculty interactions can easily be interpreted and there is the opportunity to address any misunderstandings immediately (Bejerano, 2008).

Wilkes, Simon, and Brooks (2006) also found that faculty perceptions of online teaching were negative due to the online delivery and integrity of that delivery. Faculty were not confident that the students are actually learning the material intended for the course, particularly at the undergraduate level. That is, they were not clear that the students achieved the learning objectives of the course. Conversely, the undergraduate students in the study were quite receptive to the online delivery of course material, particularly the "traditional" students. Online course delivery allowed them more freedom to do other things with their time and gain easier access to a degree.

The variation in the type of student (traditional versus non-traditional) in online courses, the variation in students' familiarity with online learning norms and the course formats, the mode of course delivery, and the faculty's familiarity with and usage of the course formats' features all affect students' course performance. This study investigates this issue by examining the course performance of non-traditional students in online versus F2F courses. The first research question is "How does students' performance in online courses compare to their performance in the same courses delivered F2F?" The study also addresses the question, "How does students'

knowledge of the online course platform and familiarity with online interaction norms contribute to their perceptions of their course performance?"

Most studies of undergraduate education focus on traditional student populations. However, online education attracts many non-traditional students. This study contributes to the body of literature regarding non-traditional students' performance in online courses. It concerns students who are new to the academic environment (or returning after a long absence), but are fairly experienced in terms of age and years of work experience. As noted in the literature review, their learning needs and course expectations may differ from those of traditional college students. In addition, the study addresses the extent to which familiarity with online course software can affect students' perceptions of their course performance.

STUDY METHODS

This research examines the course performance of upper level undergraduate, non-traditional students, who are business majors. The focus is on students who were enrolled in Management and Marketing courses. The data stem from F2F and online Marketing and Management courses taught during the Fall, Spring, and Summer terms of 2012-2014. The courses were taught at a mid-size university located in the Southwest region of the U.S. One professor taught all of the Management courses and another professor taught all of the Marketing courses. The courses were required for students' earn a business degree. Though the university has some dormitories, it is primarily a commuter school. Most of the undergraduate students do not live on campus, they work 30 or more hours per week, and many have infants and/or school-aged children. Students tend to arrange their class schedules around their work schedules. The average age of the undergraduate population is about 26 and the university is about 45% male and 55% female. About 30% of students transfer from community colleges to attend the university. Most students pay for their schooling through loans, grants, their employers and with their own monies. In addition to F2F degree programs, the university also has three 100% online graduate degree programs and offers many undergraduate courses in online and F2F formats. However, neither students nor faculty are required to complete an online course platform orientation prior to enrolling in or teaching an online course.

This study is qualitative, such that it does not involve inferential statistics. It consists of numerical data and open-ended survey data to address the research question. The numerical data are students' final numerical grade earned in a total of 20 online and F2F Management and Marketing courses. The courses are in pairs, such that each pair consists of the same course taught in both formats. The courses were evenly divided between Management and Marketing; five Management courses (each taught online and F2F) and five Marketing courses (each taught online and F2F). Each F2F class had about 45 students and each online class had at least 20 students. As noted in Table 1 below, the total sample analyzed was 664 students and was relatively evenly split numerically between Management and Marketing students. The authors analyzed the numerical data by comparing the proportions of course performance (grades) between the online and F2F students on whether students were passing the course (earning at least a "C" grade) or not (earning below a "C" grade). The authors also compared the proportions of online versus F2F students who dropped the class prior to the semester's end.

Table 1

Students	F2F Courses	Online Courses	Total
Marketing Students	229	100	329
Management Students	225	110	335
Total	454	210	664

Seventeen students were surveyed about their experience and performance in the online and F2F courses. They were recruited to complete the survey by way of snowball sampling and their participation was voluntary. No incentives were given for students to complete the survey beyond the request itself. The students who completed the survey had at least one complete semester pass after they had taken the course. This was done to ensure they would remember their course experience and also allowed some time to pass for them to be somewhat objective in their assessment of the course. The students voluntarily completed an open-ended questionnaire that had these five questions: 1. How would you describe your experience in this course? 2. What did you learn from the course? 3. What was your grade in the course? 4. Why do you think that you received that grade in the course? 5. Do you think your grade was affected by the course being F2F or online? If yes, explain

why. If no, explain why not. Nine respondents were from the online courses (four in Management; five in Marketing) and eight were from the F2F courses (four in Management; four in Marketing).

The objective of the questionnaire was to obtain the participants' thoughts regarding their course experience and performance perceptions to determine if they believed that the course delivery method had any impact. The authors focused on patterns in the participants' responses, which provided a nuanced understanding of the numerical results. The patterns were identified by inputting the text into Atlas ti.; a qualitative analysis software program. Then, the replies were coded based on a grouping (i.e. impact of course delivery method on course experience and performance) that was defined prior to analyzing the comments to ensure that the phenomena revealed in the data were properly identified. The results were determined by whether the respondents' comments stated or, otherwise, utilized language suggesting that the course delivery format (online or F2F) impacted their course experience and performance.

RESULTS

Though there was some variation in the course performance and the proportions of retention versus dropout rates between the Management and Marketing courses, the pattern of the results were similar. Students performed better in the F2F courses than online and were less likely drop out of the F2F courses, too. In Management, 30% of the online students earned a "D" (defined as between a 60-69% final grade) or less in their classes versus 24% of the F2F students. In addition, 40% of the online students dropped the class versus 20% of the F2F students. In Marketing, 47% of the online students earned a "D" or less in the class versus 6% of the F2F students. Forty percent of the online Marketing students dropped the class compared to 5% of the F2F students.

Thus, in this sample, online education did not yield similar academic outcomes for students as F2F. This is particularly interesting, given that this student population is precisely the group for whom online education is expected to benefit the most: non-traditional students who work full-time and often have familial obligations. The results from the questionnaire below provide insight into students' perceptions regarding why they did not perform well in their online courses.

One common concern that students expressed related to lack of familiarity with online academic interactions, which hindered their course participation. A few also were not familiar with the course platform, which they suggested negatively affected their ability to access course assignments and stay abreast of course deadlines.

"I think my face to face courses offered many different levels of input my online course didn't, such as instant peer feedback on class topics, relevant examples about the course material by the professor, and effortless collaboration with group assignments. It took a long time for the professor to answer questions" (Male student, online Management course).

"I wasn't too sure how to use [the course platform] at first, it took a while get that, but it's why I got behind on a couple assignments" (Female student, online Management course).

"In the beginning of the course, my thoughts were that this course is easy and I should make an A. But, I soon figured out, I had to get acclimated to an online class; it was not the same as my other (F2F) classes with the exact same professor" (Female student, online Marketing course).

"We had a lot of work due twice per week. The instructor only used YouTube videos of himself to give some instruction; this was not as easy as I thought it would be" (Female student, online Marketing course).

"I had a hard time with [the course platform]. I think the professor should've allowed for the fact that some of us had never used [the course platform] before" (Male student, online Management course).

"Personally, I learn best face to face. If the class were an online class, I would not be as engaged. I like getting instant answers to questions [from professors], not waiting for an email" (Female student, F2F Management course).

"I, personally, prefer face-to-face classes over online classes because you are able to learn and ask questions with the professor present; and you are in an environment with students which gives you more interactive learning experiences over the course of the semester" (Male student, Marketing F2F class).

Of course, some students had excellent F2F or online course experiences. They tended to attribute their experiences to the professor's classroom management and their own internal motivation to perform.

"I had a very good experience. I have taken online courses before in which students were able to "wing it". This course was not the case. Students were required to participate and participation was monitored and evaluated. I appreciated the prompt feedback that I received from [the professor]. I learned that it could be challenging to work in online teams, but through effective communication, accountability, and follow up online teams can be as productive as in person teams. [My grade] was not affected by the class being online. The

energy and effort that was required of me would have yielded success in any environment" (Male student, online Management course).

"The course content was engaging. I feel as though I learned more from reading the books than reading a textbook. I learned about the responsibility of an organization on a social, political, and ethical/unethical levels. I also embraced my ability to be more assertive and effectively communicate my point of view as well as facts regarding certain topics….I was engaged and met the expectations of the course" (Male student, F2F Management course).

"I learned a lot in my online class. I earned an A for doing all my work and being dedicated to the class. My grade was not affected because it was an online class. The instructor made this class very easy, but we had a lot of work due" (Female student, online Marketing course).

Sometime students do not have access to online classes because of a lack of space in an online course section or the class is not offered online at all. In these cases, they are often times forced to take a F2F class. Some respondents felt this is not the best option to accommodate their lifestyle, especially if the class required class attendance and participation, because of their work and family obligations. Hence, their performance in F2F classes was negative, relative to online classes. One student who completed the questionnaire had that experience:

"This course was face-to-face. The delivery in the course was not as I thought it should have been. The professor slightly strayed away from the subject from time to time and the exams weren't over his lectures. If the course was online, I could have completed the work at hand at my own leisure (also completing the assignments on schedule). Attendance would not be a factor in my grade. I scored relatively high on the exams, project and assignments. The attendance score dropped my grade down to a B-. If it were online, I would not have had this issue." (Female student, F2F Marketing course)

The students in this study did not perform better or equally as well as their F2F counterparts. This supports prior research (Bejerano, 2008) that students don't always experience the expected learning outcomes from online education. However, based on the admittedly small sample of comments from the respondents, performance in online courses is also affected by professor's online classroom management and, importantly, the extent to which students are comfortable with using the course platform. Not knowing how to use the course platform can cause students' to not complete assignments or complete them incorrectly, which hurts their grades. In addition, if they are not used to online academic interaction norms, this can also hurt their course performance.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Though online education has grown in the past decade, its contribution to students' learning and performance is mixed (Omar, Kalulu, Alijani, 2011). Issues surrounding students' familiarity with online teaching norms and the course platform and the extent to which faculty foster interactions online and effectively utilize the course platform's features all affect the viability of online education. This is in spite of the fact that online education is expected to benefit non-traditional students in ways that are not present with F2F classes or traditional student populations. Namely, online education enables working adults to gain an education without interrupting their work or family lives. However, the benefits of online education may be more applicable to the delivery method (online), but not necessarily apply to students' performance. This dichotomy may not be a function of online education itself. Rather, it may be a function of students' and faculty's knowledge of and comfort with the online learning environment.

This study examined the course performance of online versus F2F undergraduate students majoring in business, with specific focus on their performance in Management and Marketing courses. Performance was measured by students' numerical final course grades and the study also investigated the proportions of online and F2F students who dropped the class prior to the course's completion. The investigation included the proportions of students who dropped the class because students generally drop if they are not performing well in a class and studies have found that online students are more likely to drop courses than F2F students (Bejerano, 2008).

Overall, a greater proportion of online students failed their courses than F2F students. This pattern was true in both Management and Marketing courses. While there were obviously variations in course content, faculty teaching styles and grading rubrics between the two types of courses, that was not the focus of this study. Instead, the study examined students' performance across the two courses, Management and Marketing. The outcomes were similar: more online students received a "D" or lower grade in the courses than F2F students. Also, a greater proportion of online students dropped their course before completing the term than F2F students.

Though there can be extenuating circumstances that cause students to drop classes, students generally don't drop classes that they are passing. Though not tested directly in this study, it is reasonable to suggest that most of the students who dropped the class were probably not performing well in it, anyway.

As the courses were required major courses, the students who dropped the class would probably have to take it again in order to complete their degree. The decision for juniors and seniors in college to drop a major course is not usually taken lightly because they have to earn a passing grade (at least a "C") in the class in order for it to count towards their graduation requirements. As this student population is non-traditional, their education is generally be funded by themselves and/or their employers. Therefore, dropping a required class prolongs graduation and is costly, as they have to retake (and pay for) the class.

The second purpose of this investigation was to explore the extent to which students' familiarity with the online course platform and online academic interactions affected their perceptions of their course performance. Seventeen students completed a questionnaire regarding their course experiences. The authors' goal was to gain insight as to why students believed that they received their course grade and to determine if they thought the mode of delivery (online or F2F) was a contributing factor.

Generally, the students who performed well in the online and F2F courses attributed their performance mostly to their own initiative and, secondarily, to the faculty who taught the class. They expressed confidence in their own abilities to perform well in the class. Also, they perceived that the course content, the class interaction fostered by the faculty and the faculty's performance feedback to the students were clear contributors to their final course grade.

None of the F2F students who completed the survey reported failing the course, unlike seven of the online students who completed the survey. The latter blamed their course failures mostly on their own lack of knowledge of the course platform and online learning norms, and the faculty's online classroom management. They believed that their difficulty with navigating the course platform and, generally, not being familiar with the self-driven nature of online learning were primary reasons why they failed the class. They also suggested that the faculty did not enhance students' online engagement, such as by not responding to students' questions quickly. Though the authors realize that students were probably motivated not to disclose their own possible lack of effort towards passing the course, this was not the focus of this study.

Instead, in this study, it was evident the online classes may have provided convenience benefits to the students, but did not positively contribute to students' course performance to the same degree as F2F classes. However, the reasons for this performance dichotomy do not appear to be caused by online education, itself. Instead, the issues might be related to students' comfort with the online learning environment.

First, students in F2F classes have visual and verbal interactions with their peers and the faculty. Even if a student is failing the class, they may not drop it in the belief that their class attendance, class participation, and rapport with the faculty will help them earn a passing grade in the class. However, in online classes, students typically don't have those immediate visual and verbal interactions with classmates and faculty. They probably don't believe that they will gain rapport-related concessions in their final grade from the faculty, as F2F students may. So, if an online student is failing a class, they will probably drop it prior to the course withdrawal deadline.

Faculty in online courses can foster both an interactive learning environment and develop a rapport with students. These authors argue that this is probably crucial to first-time online learners' course experience. Professors can provide detailed feedback on students' work within 24 hours, they can host online office hours using video and telephone, they can host real-time video classes (though it is suggested that professors not mandate students to attend/log in at a specified time as that defeats the asynchronous value of online education), they can record and archive lectures, they can host discussion board forums that require students to share information about themselves (e.g. employment; career-aspirations, etc.) and they can require students to respond to each other's work on the forums with detailed comments. Also, by developing an online rapport with students, faculty gain a baseline from which to check on a student if their performance decreases suddenly, as this could be due to extenuating circumstances, such as a job loss. It is important to remember that the faculty set the tone for the classroom, both online and F2F. If the faculty member is not leading the way for engagement nor participation, the entire classroom dynamic will be affected and reflected in the students' performance.

These proposed online course norms can be time-consuming for faculty who teach online. However, this can be managed by faculty not only stating the course expectations and format up front in the syllabus, but then adhering to it religiously. If, for example, the syllabus states that the professor will respond to all emails within 24 hours of being received, then he/she can allow a set time each day to address those emails. This is more time efficient than responding to every email as they are received.

Some students seemed to have challenges with understanding and fully utilizing their university's online course platform. In this study, students could enroll in an online class without having advance knowledge of how to use the platform and faculty could also teach online without any advance course platform preparation.

Therefore, some students had difficulty fully participating in the course because they were learning the platform while simultaneously taking the class that utilized the platform. Though the study obviously did not survey faculty, it's possible that faculty were also not well-versed in using the platform, though they were using it to teach their online class. This is akin to learning how to swim when one is thrown into a pool. It's not the most efficient nor effective way to learn.

Instead, universities should mandate that all faculty and students complete an online course platform orientation before they either teach or enroll in an online course (Harrell, 2008). The orientation can part of the platform itself and managed by the school's information technology department or whichever entity already manages the school's online course platform. There are several benefits of this suggestion for students and universities. First, students may perform better in their online courses, which can improve their own graduation rate and, ultimately, universities' retention rates. Second, it will probably increase the usage of all the platform's features by both faculty and student. This increases the usage return on the school's investment in the technology. Second, more faculty may be willing to teach online, if they are taught how to use the technology fully and correctly. This can benefit traditional universities who seek to increase their online course offerings.

All studies have limitations and the study herein is no exception. As this is a qualitative study, the results are not generalizable to the larger population. In addition, as is common with open-ended questionnaires, the participant responses were small in number.

REFERENCES

Allen, E. & Seaman, J. (2011). *Going the distance: Online education in the United States, 2011.* Retrieved December 29, 2014: http//www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED529948.pdf.

Bejerano, A. (2008). Face-to-Face or online instruction? Face-to-Face is better. *Communication Currents*, 3(3), 1.

Bressler, L.A., Bressler, M. E. & Bressler, M.S. (2010). The role and relationship of hope, optimism and goal setting in achieving academic success: A study of students enrolled in online accounting courses. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal,* 14(4).

Brown, B. & Liedholm, C. (2002). Can web courses replace the classroom in Principles of Microeconomics? *The American Economic Review,* 92(2), 444-448.

Brown, J. R. & Hoxby, C. R. (2014). *How the financial crisis and great recession affected higher education.* University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL**.**

Brown, J. C. & Park, H. (2015). Comparing student research competencies in online and traditional face-to-face learning environments. *The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning*, 3(1).

Carthan, E.J. (2007). *An analysis of faculty attitudes toward online courses at selected Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).* www.ce.ucf.edu/asp/aln/cfp/presentations/1209587688560.ppt.

Casselman, B. (2013). Number of the Week: "Non-Traditional students are majority on college campuses". *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved July 6 from http://www.wsj.com.

Cater, J. J., Michel, N., & Varela, O.E. (2012). Challenges of online learning in management education: An empirical study. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship,* 17(4), 76-96.

Coates, D., Humphreys, D., Kane, J., & Vachris, M. (2004). No significant distance between face-to-face and online instruction: Evidence from Principles of Economics. *Economics of Education Review*, 23, 533-546.

Crys, T.E. (Ed.) (1997). *Teaching and learning at a distance: What it takes to effectively design, deliver, and evaluate programs*. Jossey-Bass: San Fransciso, CA.

DiRienzo, C. & Lilly, G. (2014). Online versus face-to-face: Does delivery method matter for undergraduate business school learning? *Business Education & Accreditation,* 2(1), 1-11.

Dykman, C.A. & Davis, C.K. (2008). Online education forum: Part Two – teaching online versus teaching conventionally. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 19(2), 157-164.

Evans, J.R & Haase, I.M. (2001). Online business education in the twenty-first century; An analysis of potential target markets. *Internet Research*, 11(3), 246-260.

Harrell, I. L. (2008). Increasing the success of online students. *Inquiry*, 13(1), 36-44.

Humphrey, P. & Hardin, J. (2010). An exploratory study of the effect of rewards and deadlines on academic procrastination in web-based classes. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 14(4).

Omar, A., Kalulu, D. & Alijani, G. S. (2011). Management of innovative e-learning environments. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 15(3).

Smith, T.C. (2005). Fifty-one competencies for online instruction. *The Journal of Educators Online*, 2(2).

Sull, E.C. (2013). Student engagement in the online classroom. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 31 from: http://chronicle.com/article/STduent-Engagement-in-the/136897/?cid=ja&utm_source=ja&utm_medium=en.

Wilkes, R.B., Simon, J.C., & Brooks, L.D. (2006). A comparison of faculty and undergraduate students' perceptions of online courses and degree program. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 17(2), 131-140.