Handbook of Research on Innovative Pedagogies and Technologies for Online Learning in Higher Education

Phu Vu
University of Nebraska at Kearney, USA

Scott Fredrickson
University of Nebraska at Kearney, USA

Carl Moore
University of DC, USA

IGI GLOBAL
DISSEMINATOR OF KNOWLEDGE

www.igi-global.com

Chapter 6
Instructor Presence

Beth Allred Oyarzun
University of North Carolina Wilmington, USA

Sheri Anderson Conklin
UNCW, USA

Daisyane Barreto
UNCW, USA

ABSTRACT

Student isolation and retention rates are persistent issues in online learning. Research has shown that an important component of student performance and satisfaction is instructor presence (Picciano, 2002). Instructor presence includes three elements: 1) Teaching presence, 2) Instructor immediacy, and 3) Social presence (Mandemach, Gonzales, & Garrett, 2006). This chapter will use this definition of instructor presence to outline best pedagogical practices with concrete examples to increase instructor presence in asynchronous online courses. Each section will begin with a definition and research on that construct followed by best practices with concrete examples.

INTRODUCTION

Online education is an area that continues to grow, especially in higher education settings. The number of students taking at least one online course has increased by over five million to a new total of 6.7 million students (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Still, student isolation and retention rates are persistent issues in online learning. Research has shown that an important component of student performance and satisfaction is instructor presence (Borup, West, Graham, 2012; Griffiths & Graham, 2009; Picciano, 2002). Instructor presence includes three elements:

1. Teaching presence,
2. Instructor immediacy, and
3. Social presence (Mandemach, Gonzales, & Garrett, 2006).

This chapter will use these elements of instructor presence to outline research based best pedagogical practices with concrete examples to increase instructor presence in asynchronous online courses.

Teaching and social presence are both constructs of the popular Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework developed by Garrison, Anderson and Archer (2010). This framework is designed to assist instructors in designing online courses to ensure that transactional distance, which refers to the separation of teacher and learner in online educational programs (Moore, 2007), is lessened and that deep meaningful learning occurs. There are three interdependent elements associated with CoI framework that foster deep and meaningful learning experiences: social presence, cognitive presence, and teaching presence. Even though a considerable number of studies investigating the CoI framework has been conducted, few studies reported any objective measures of learning to support the claims that application of the CoI framework leads to deeper levels of learning (Rourke & Kanuka, 2009). Still, the research does connect the CoI framework with increased learner satisfaction and perceived learning (Akyol, Garrison, & Ozden, 2009; Richardson & Swan, 2003; Swan & Shih, 2005).

Learner satisfaction and motivation is often influenced by the interactions that happen in the online environment, which leads us to the topic of instructor immediacy. Instructor immediacy is a concept defined from two communication theories: Moore's (1973) transactional distance theory and Mehrabian's (1971) communication immediacy theory. Transactional distance is defined as the psychological distance between online learners and instructors. Moore's theory proposes that more interaction between instructors and learners lessens transactional distance. Communication immediacy refers to the physical and verbal behaviors that reduce psychological and physical distance between individuals. The verbal behaviors can be translated into online learning. In this case, instructor immediacy involves communication strategies that reduce social and psychological distance between learners and instructors in online learning (Arbaugh, 2001). A level of instructor immediacy has been shown to increase retention and achievement (Bodie & Bober-Michel, 2014).

This chapter will discuss research and provide examples of the best practices for teaching presence, instructor immediacy, and social presence. Each section will begin with the definition and research on the concept followed by discussion and best practices with concrete examples.

TEACHING PRESENCE

The concept of teaching presence evolved from social presence research. Garrison and colleagues (2000) differentiated teaching presence from social presence as part of the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework. While social presence is the ability to project or perceive others as real, teaching presence is conceptualized as the design and facilitation of cognitive and social processes for the purpose of realizing intended outcomes. Teaching presence begins at the design phase with course design and organization and continues into the implementation of the course through facilitation of discourse. The central focus of teaching presence is to increase social presence and student learning (Lowenthal & Parscal, 2008).

According to the CoI framework, teaching presence is directly related to both social and cognitive presence through the following categories:

1. Design and organization,
2. Materials and learning activities, and
3. Facilitation and encouragement.

Through these three categories, students can reach meaningful and educational outcomes (Anderson, Rourke, Garrison, & Archer, 2001). Design and organization refers to the macro level structure of the online course. Materials and activities pertains to the content and assessments used within the structure of the course. Both the design and the delivery are interrelated and require effective responsiveness to developing needs and events. Facilitating reflection and discourse develops cognitive understanding in a positive environment and involves pedagogical, interpersonal, and organizational skills. Through reflection, students construct personal meaning of the content and confirm a mutual understanding. Direct instruction contradicts being a "guide on the side," but it is needed to diagnose misconceptions and to bring expertise to the class (Garrison & Akyol, 2013). Teaching presence is important for perceived learning and satisfaction (Akyol, Garrison, & Ozden, 2009; Richardson & Swan, 2003; Swan & Shih, 2005) and the development of a community (Brook & Oliver, 2007; Ice, Curtis, Phillips, & Wells, 2007; Shea, Li, & Pickett, 2006). Teaching presence is force that combines all the aforementioned factors (Garrison & Akyol, 2013). The following sections will present the research in each category of teaching presence.

Design and organization refers to the planning and design of the course structure, process, interactions (Anderson et al., 2001). During this process, the instructor establishes the course goals, provides clear instructions for participation behaviors and course activities, set deadlines and timeframes, and define boundaries for student and instructor interaction (Arbaugh & Hwang, 2006; Shea, Li, & Pickett, 2006). This planning for interactions and online classroom management is essential to allow students the ability to meet course goals and learning objectives. Without this type of planning and direction, students may be lost and the ability to seek immediate assistance is not always available (Easton, 2003).

Course structure for asynchronous online courses is critical as online learners are often frustrated for being unable to find needed material or feeling lost in their courses (Swan 2001). It is essential that online faculty and instructional designers create a consistent and sequenced course structure. For example, Fredericksen and colleagues (2000) developed a course design process to create a 'solid' course structure. They advised faculty follow the following steps:

1. Get started by reflecting and conceptualizing the course,
2. Create an orientation,
3. Chunk course content,
4. Create learning activities,
5. Walk through the course,
6. Get ready to teach, and
7. Evaluate and revise.

The combination of a consistent course structure and engaged instructors who create dynamic interactions have been found to be the most consistent predictors of successful online courses (Swan, 2003). Typically, the course structure is developed prior to course implementation yet adjustments can be made throughout the implementation process.

Materials and learning activities refers to course content presentation and assessments. Course organization should be consistent and enable learners to find all necessary course materials. Course materials should also be "chunked", following segmenting principles (Clark & Mayer, 2011), and presented into modules. Modules are the fundamental method for delivering online course content (Draves, 2007) and often the most time consuming to design. Modules should consist of three basic elements: overview, instructional content, and assessment. The overview should provide an introduction to the module, con-

taining specific instructions and learning outcomes for learners. It is also a means to orient students to the other elements of a course content.

The instructional content can include video lectures, scholarly articles, textbook readings, multimedia, and/or internet resources. If video lectures are used, the length of the video should be short. Additionally, informal language should be used when presenting the video content (Guo, Kim, & Rubin, 2014), which follows the personalization principle (Clark & Mayer, 2011) to improve student learning and promote motivation. This content can and should vary from module to module in order to retain student engagement. Presenting content in multiple formats such as text, audio, and video, is a concept support by Universal Designs for Learning (UDL). This also assists in Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance as well as providing students access to the content that matches their learning preferences (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). For example, provide a video lecture along with an audio podcast and a text script of the content. This allows the student to choose a method of reviewing the content and that method may change depending on circumstances.

The assessment part of a course can include an assignment, project, quiz, group activity, and/or discussion. Assessments should be directly aligned to course goals. Provide a chart in the syllabus that shows how assessments align to course goals. Again, the assessments should vary and happen frequently in order to retain student engagement (Orlando, 2011). Assessments drive students into the content. Students will access content based upon the perceived degree in which it will positively influence better outcomes and assessments (Murray, Perez, Geist, & Hedrick, 2012). Low stakes grading or assessments, such as quizzes or small assignments, should occur in each learning module to ensure students are retaining the content (Warnock, 2013). Low stakes grading creates a grade transparency for students and also allows for a steady flow of information. Warnock (2013) stated that low stakes grading has several advantages such as creating dialogue between the student and instructor, building confidence in the students through multiple opportunities to succeed, and increasing motivation. High stakes grading or assessments should occur in the form of authentic assessments or applied learning activities in which the students apply the information learned into a new situation. High stakes assessments should span multiple modules and have multiple products that are assessed.

Applied learning activities can take on many forms including service learning, professional development activities, and other activities that apply classroom concepts to real-world situations (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). Students who were involved with applied learning activities have more positive course evaluations (Markus, Howard, & King, 1993). For example, in an online physical education course, learners might be required to attend several specific types of exercise classes and blog about their experience. The blog instructions and rubric would require them to connect their experiences to course content such as cardiovascular or strength training. Learners could visit classmate's blogs to comment or get ideas for types of classes to attend.

Facilitating reflection and discourse is the interaction students engage in to develop cognitive understanding in a positive environment and involves pedagogical, interpersonal, and organizational skills. Indicators of the facilitation of discourse include identifying areas of agreement and disagreement, seeking to reach consensus, drawing in participants, prompting discussion, and assessing the efficacy of the process (Shea, et al., 2006). Akyol and Garrison (2014) found facilitation of discourse was high at the beginning of the semester and would drop after about three weeks. A tentative explanation for the drop in discourse was that students needed more facilitation at the beginning of a course to understand the instructor's expectations. Research on facilitation and encouragement has typically focused on dis-

cussion boards, but Shea and colleagues (2010) found that 80-90% of teaching presence occurs outside discussion forums in the forms of emails and private feedback.

Facilitation and encouragement can happen both publicly, such as in a discussion board, or privately (e.g. feedback on an assignment). In the public atmosphere, the instructor should guide the students to delve deeper into the content through scaffolding. This can include probing questions, referencing other students' thoughts, and direct instruction. This would occur during a discussion or group activity. Other public feedback can occur after a discussion or group activity has ended in the form of an announcement, a summery in a discussion, or a class email. The encouragement and feedback should be personalized to highlight specific students and their achievements or thoughts as well as provide constructive feedback for future activities. This encourages others to strive and participate as well as continued encouragement for those students highlighted.

Instructors also can provide facilitation and encouragement privately through individual email and assessment feedback. Through private facilitation, the student receives encouragement and feedback specific to their needs. For example, if a student posts a response to a discussion board but did not cite properly, the instructor can copy and paste the prompt into an email and give student specific feedback (see Table 1). Studies have shown an increase in motivation and perceived learning when there is deliberate facilitation and encouragement (Williams, 2000).

The combination of course structure, materials and activities, learning and facilitation of discourse can lead to high teaching presence (Wisneski, Ozogul, & Bichelmeyer, 2015). Simply presenting the material in a fashion where the students can engage with the materials and learning activities is not enough. Instructors who engage students in a communicative process of learning combined with solid course structure and materials and learning activities achieve higher teaching presence (Wisneski et al., 2015).

DISCUSSION AND BEST PRACTICES

As stated previously, course design and organization should happen prior to delivery. The organization is an outline of how students will access course materials. There are two main ways of organizing materials:

1. Organization by material type such as articles, assignments, etc; and
2. Organize material by time period such as unit, week, or chapter.

The latter option is preferable for online classes because it allows students to access all material for a given time period in one location versus having to click around to find various materials for an assignment. An example outline is provided below.

I. Start Here
    A. Welcome video and letter
    B. Instructor Introduction and Contact Information
    C. Technical Support
    D. Introduce yourself
II. Syllabus
III. Schedule
IV. Learning Modules

    A.   Module 1 - Orientation
        1.   Overview
        2.   To-Do List
        3.   Content
        4.   Assessment
    B.   Module 2
        1.   Overview
        2.   To-Do List
        3.   Content
        4.   Assessment
    C.   Etc…
V.   Grades

However, the course is organized, instructors are advised to create a student orientation to become familiar with the course, instructor, and course-related material. The orientation should include the following:

1. Welcome from instructor
2. Contact information
3. Course overview and objectives
4. Readings and materials
5. Course learning activities
6. Assessments
7. Instructor expectations
8. Course schedule
9. Next steps

The welcome introduces the instructor to the course and students. This can be done via text or through the use of audio and video. If using text, an appropriate image of the instructor should be included (Conrad, 2002).

Contact information describes specific details about how to contact the instructor. Contact information should be detailed and include expected turnaround time for types of communication and assignments (Fisher, 2010). For example, *I will respond to emails within 24 hours.* It is important to be specific information such as *I answer emails until 5pm EST.* By following these practices, the instructor sets the expectations for the course and how to communicate with the instructor. Once the course design has been established, then the instructor needs to establish and implement facilitation and discourse.

Although course structure should remain consistent, materials and learning activities should vary. For example, learning modules or units for a course may be organized in the following structure:

1. Overview
2. To-do list
3. Content presentation
4. Assessment, but the materials and learning activities might vary

Table 1. Feedback communication plan example

Assignment Type	Estimated Feedback Timeframe
Discussion boards	Discussions will be graded 48 hours after due date
Case Studies	Feedback and grade will be provided within 72 hours of due date
Research paper	Feedback and grade will be provided one business week after due date

The material presentation for one module might be a series of research articles on a particular topic with the learning activity being a synthesis paper of research presented. Whereas another module may have a series of videos for the content presentation with a cooperative learning assignment as the learning activity. The selection of the materials and learning activities should be in alignment with the goals and objectives of the course in addition to a variety of materials.

As discussed earlier, facilitation of discourse can happen either privately, publicly or both. Whether the communication happens publicly or privately, studies have shown there is a correlation between instructor timeliness with communication and feedback for assignments and teaching presence (Sheridan & Kelly, 2010; Skramstad, Schlosser, & Orellana, 2012). Sheridan and Kelly (2010) found students expected responses within 24 hours. Therefore, providing a communication plan regarding feedback for assignments and discussions is important. An example is provided in Table 1. Providing an instructor timeliness plan informs students of the instructor expectations. This information can also be seen as instructor immediacy, which is discussed in further detail in the following section.

Instructor Immediacy

Instructor immediacy is a term used to describe instructor communication behaviors used to reduce the transactional distance between learners and the instructor (Anderson & Anderson, 1982). Interaction has proven to influence student motivation, participation among learners, and achievement of learning outcomes (Du, Harvard, & Li, 2005; Sargeant, Curran, Allen, Jarvis-Selinger, & Ho, 2006; Tu, 2005).

Communication immediacy is defined as the extent that communicative behaviors enhance physical or psychological closeness (Mehrabian, 1971; Richmond, 2002), which could be achieved by reducing the distance between instructors and students (Ni & Aust, 2008) especially in online spaces. Immediacy can be in the form of both verbal and nonverbal communication. Non-verbal cues include maintaining eye contact or leaning forward. Verbal communication includes asking questions, use of humor, and addressing students by name (Baker, 2004). Garrison and colleagues (2000) stated it is possible to establish instructor immediacy in online courses, but a lack of nonverbal cues can be a barrier to creating a strong social presence. Through careful course design, instructor immediacy can be established.

For example, in a study examining teacher immediacy in online courses, Ni and Aust (2008) found that teacher verbal immediacy was positively correlated with satisfaction, perceived learning and posting frequency in online courses. However, further data analysis indicated that teacher verbal immediacy was not a significant predictor of satisfaction or perceived learning. The potential explanation for this issue might be due to a discrepancy between the intended audience for the original teacher immediacy scale and the intended audience for this study (i.e., adults). According to the authors, adult learners might focus more on the content instead of verbal immediacy behaviors. Indeed, these findings seem to corroborate with another study conducted in a massive and fully online critical thinking course. In

this particular study, Campbell (2014) found that personalized messages to individual students did not influence course activity, learning outcomes, or course dropout rate. According to the author, cognitive learning seems to be connected with the time students spend with the course materials and assessments rather than with social contacts, including the instructor, within the online course. Thus, a thorough careful course design for instructor immediacy approach needs to be established.

Designing instructor immediacy in an online course can range from simplistic such as using inclusive pronouns, which creates a sense of belongingness and provides personalization, to more complex such as the use of multimedia. With the use of text, establishing verbally immediate behaviors can be done through the use of discussion boards. If discussion boards are a part of the course design, the instructor can initiate questions, address students by name, respond frequently to students and offer praise (O'Sullivan, Hunt, & Lippert, 2004). Gorham (1988) stated that sharing personal stories with the students or adding humor to text can improve instructor immediacy. This can be established with an instructor introduction using text and images on a course homepage. Multimedia content, such video introductions, can facilitate instructor immediacy more effectively since it provides the opportunity for verbal and nonverbal cues.

A communication plan is a detailed overview of how the instructor intends to communicate with the students and how students are expected to communicate with one another. Communication with the instructor includes one-to-one communication through email, phone, or appointments as well as personalized feedback on assignments. Communication with each other may include cooperative learning assignments, discussions, or team activities. The communication plan should be included in the syllabus or at the beginning of the course so students are aware of how to communicate with their instructor. Sheridan and Kelly (2010) indicated that clear course requirements and being responsive to student needs are the highest indicators of instructor presence that are the most important to students.

Multimedia supports both verbal and nonverbal cues and therefore provides a strong instructor immediacy and social presence (Borup, Graham, & Velasquez, 2011). Feedback is an example of providing instructor presence and immediacy. Timely and quality feedback can be provided in various ways using text, graphics, and/or multimedia. Some online students report that they receive limited, mechanical, or impersonal feedback in online classes (Jennings & McCuller, 2004). Instructors report that providing feedback in online courses can be more time consuming than providing feedback in face-to-face courses (Herrmann & Popyack, 2003). With the advancements in technology, providing feedback can be less time consuming and more personal (Jones, Georghiades, & Gunson, 2012). Instructors can mark-up written assignments using tablets and stylus pens or create audio/video feedback instead of typing out comments. Both of these options add instructor presence to feedback through seeing the instructor's handwriting, hearing the voice of the instructor or seeing the instructor.

Discussion and Best Practices

Multiple modes of communication should be included along with hours of availability, and any other pertinent information such as what should be included in the subject line of email communication. The communication plan may also direct students to use the discussion board or other public forums for content related questions. Estimated response times for each communication method and estimated feedback turnaround times for each type of assignments should also be detailed in the communication plan (Fisher, 2010). Overall, communication plans should be specific and detailed to ensure students understand instructor expectations and are able to follow the clear expectations. A chart could be an effective way to communicate this information. An example instructor communication plan chart is provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Instructor Communication Plan Example Chart

Communication Mode	Estimated Response Time
E-mail	24-48 hours
Phone Call	Immediate if available/less than 24 hours if message left
Instant Message	Immediate when online May not receive messages when offline
Text Message	Less than 1 hour
Assignment	Estimated Feedback Return
Written Projects	1 week
Quizzes	Immediate - self grading
Discussions	Intermittent responses to various students except for the Instructor Question Board. Response will be posted within 24 hours of a question being posted.

Table 3. shows an example of a communication expectations chart that details instructor and student expectations.

The use of multimedia for providing feedback is burgeoning due to improvements with technology making it more accessible and easier to use. One example for providing dynamic feedback is through the use of screen capture tools such as Camtasia, Jing, or Screencast-o-matic. For example, when grading written work, typically the instructor writes many comments and explanations which can be time consuming. Using screen capture tools, the instructor could write fewer comments, then use screen capture to record an explanation of the comments to the student providing examples or further instructions such as, "apply this to the rest of your paper." Students found that screen capture feedback to include more detail, provide clarification from the intonation and avoid misunderstandings, and felt the feedback overall was more efficient (Jones et al., 2012). This method of providing feedback is more personal than providing text only yet one has to remember that screen capture technology is only a means to provide the feedback, it is still up to the instructor to provide the quality of feedback.

Tablet computers and stylus pens allow instructors to mark-up assignments as they would with paper assignments. One caveat to this method is that files submitted must be in pdf format. Color and shape can be used as a cues for feedback in addition to handwritten comments. There are several mobile applications that are available at low costs enhance annotating on tablet computers. Instructors need the ability to access the student files from a tablet, a tablet computer, a stylus, and a mobile application that enables annotation such as iAnnotate. If the learning management used does not allow for mobile access to student submission, then the use of cloud storage could be helpful. There are several cloud storage options such as Dropbox and Google Drive.

Social Presence

Social presence, a term initially coined by Short and colleagues (1976), is defined as the degree of salience or awareness between two or more communicators through a communication medium. Short and colleagues (1976) first conceptualized social presence as the quality of the communication medium. Later researchers such as Gunawardena (1995) re-conceptualized social presence as the way people utilized communication mediums. In other words, in a learning environment social presence refers to the degree

Table 3. Communication Expectations Example

Instructor Expectations	Student Expectations
• Respond to questions and concerns in a timely manner (outlined in syllabus).	• Review materials and assignments within 1-2 days of the module start date
• Clarify questions	• Manage your time appropriately
• Clarify assignments	• Ask questions when you are confused (remember this is part of the learning process)
• Guide students through researching topics (note - I state 'guide' not 'tell' or 'direct')	• Collaborate with your peers
• Participate or summarize (depending on the task) in discussions	• Engage with the material, colleagues, and instructor
• Provide timely feedback to assignments (within 3-5 days depending on the scope of assignment).	• Ask questions or for examples when needed

Note that many of the items above involve answering your questions. I am not able to read your mind so it is important to ask questions. I will not seek you out to be sure you understand the material as no news is good news to me. You must seek me or another classmate out when you are confused

to which a learner feels personally connected with other students and/or instructors. Later, Garrison and colleagues (2000) developed the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework, which incorporated social, teaching, and cognitive presence. Specifically, the authors argued that teaching presence is utilized to foster social presence and in turn, create cognitive presence. Two components of social presence have emerged over the years: intimacy and immediacy. Intimacy was introduced by Argyle and Dean (1965) and refers to nonverbal communication factors such as physical distance, eye contact, physical proximity, smiling, facial expressions, and personal topic of conversation. Immediacy was introduced by Wiener and Mehrabian (1968) and refers to the psychological distance, which includes verbal and nonverbal cues, between a communicator and the recipient of the communication. Research has shown that instructors with high degree of social presence in online learning environments are viewed by learners as being more positive and effective (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997; Shin, 2002). Likewise, direct engagement between students and their instructors has also had significant effect on student's learning engagement (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Kuh, 2009).

According to Argon (2003), methods for creating social presence include strategies in the following three categories: course design, instructors, and participation. Table 4 details the strategies recommended for each category.

The instructor and participant strategies are helpful when implementing an online course. Many of these strategies relate to personalizing content and feedback. The next section further explores these strategies.

The personalization principle is one of the multimedia principles defined by Clark and Mayer (2011) that addresses presentation style. The principle includes three elements:

1. Conversational style
2. On-screen coaches
3. Instructor visibility

For the purpose of this chapter, only conversational style and instructor visibility is discussed in this section since the instructor has control on the integration of these items. On-screen coaches are typically

Table 4. Strategies to establish social presence

Course Design	Instructors	Participants
Develop welcome messages	Contribute to discussions	Contribute to discussions
Include student profiles	Promptly answer email	Promptly answer emails
Incorporate audio	Provide frequent feedback	Strike up a conversation
Limit class size	Strike up a conversation	Share personal stories and experiences
Structure collaborative learning activities	Share personal experiences and stories	Use humor
	Use humor	Use emoticons
	Use emoticons	Use appropriate titles
	Address students by name	
	Allow students options for addressing the instructor	

created and produced by various publishers such as McGraw-Hill or Pearson and therefore we will not be addressing this element.

The use of conversational style language should be implemented to assist learners in retaining more information. Conversational style language means using the first or second person (e.g., "you" for students, and "I" for the instructor) instead of formal academic language. This allows the learner to engage with the screen as a social conversational partner as opposed to a machine. Kurt (2011) examined the differences in achievement and cognitive load between students receiving conversational and formal styled instruction. There were significant differences between the two groups for cognitive load. Conversational style can be used for text, audio and video components of course material and feedback to create a more user-friendly tone.

Instructor visibility requires the instructor to speak directly to the learner to increase motivations and inject their personal style. This can be done through the personal conversational style of text, video, and audio in addition to adding images and video of the instructor to content throughout the course. Video provides students with both verbal and non-verbal cues that may otherwise be missing from text based feedback. The ability to view the instructor also allows the students to gain insight into the instructor's personality. Evidence has shown that instructors' emotional expression is higher due to use of the video (Borup et al., 2011; Borup et al., 2012; Griffiths & Graham, 2009). One limitation with using video for instructor visibility is effective asynchronous video communication pedagogy. In order to effectively leverage the benefits of video, instructors need to explore or gain assistance from those who are experienced in the various software tools and pedagogy for asynchronous video integration (Borup et al., 2012).

Research has confirmed that learner centered principles and practices produce high-quality instruction regardless of context (McCombs, 2015). Learning center approaches focus on student learning where the students are more active participants with their own learning and instructors become facilitators of the instructional materials (Weimer, 2002). Online courses provide opportunity for learning to become more personalized or individualized and for students to reflect and take an active part in their learning process. Immediate and direct feedback on performance can be offered (Khan, 1997) and students are able to take a more active role in their own learning (Lambert & McCombs, 2000). Table 5 details the differences between an instructor centered approach and a learner centered approach to designing instruction (Garrett, 2008).

Table 5. Instructor vs. Learner Centered Approaches

Instructor Centered Approach	Learner-Centered Approach
Instructor is sole leader	Instructor is facilitator/leadership is shared
Learners work individually	Learners work together
Instructor chooses topics	Students have some choice of topics
Focus is on Instructor	Focus is on learners and instructors
Rewards are mostly extrinsic	Rewards are mostly intrinsic
Knowledge is disseminated	Knowledge is constructed through gathering and synthesizing information
Teaching and assessing are separate	Teaching and assessing are intertwined
Assessment is used to monitor learning	Assessment is used to promote and diagnose learning
Emphasis on right answer	Emphasis on generating better questions and learning from errors.
Culture is competitive and individualistic	Culture is cooperative, collaborative, and supportive.

Some learner centered strategies focus on creating a community of learners working together to achieve goals or learning outcomes such as problem based learning, cooperative learning, and/or active learning strategies. Community has several definitions in the educational research literature. However, community can be synthesized from these varying definitions as a sense of belonging and trust experienced by learners engaging in meaningful discourse in the learning environment (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997; Picciano, 2002). Designing a learning experience that incorporates these ideas can be accomplished by creating a collaborative or cooperative assignment or activity. A qualitative analysis of instructors with face-to-face university teaching experience transitioning to online teaching for the first time conducted by Conrad (2002) revealed that novice online instructors have little awareness of collaborative learning, social presence, or the role of community plays in online learning. These novice online instructors' reflections showed that they viewed themselves as deliverers of content. The following section describes techniques for designing such experiences within online course.

Two strategies that aid in community development are collaborative learning and cooperative learning (Palloff & Pratt, 2010). Although these terms are often used interchangeably or simply referred to as group work, for the purpose of this chapter, cooperative learning is defined as a set of instructional methods in which learners are required to complete academic assignments together as a whole class or small groups, while collaborative learning will be defined as the social interaction and engagement among groups of learners to complete academic assignments by choice (Panitz, 1996). Hence, cooperative learning is designed by the instructor and collaborative learning is student generated. With this difference in mind, the remainder of this chapter will focus on designing cooperative learning activities in online courses.

Cooperative learning is comprised of five elements according to Johnson and Johnson (1991):

1. Positive interdependence
2. Promotive interaction
3. Individual and group accountability
4. Social skills
5. Group processing

Positive interdependence refers group members having a role and believing that they are responsible for their learning and the learning of the group. Promotive interaction is the concept that learners perceive that need the group to be successful. Individual and group accountability indicates that there should be multiple products produced for grading in order to ensure each group member is held accountable at an individual and group level. Social skills refer to communication and interpersonal skills that should be demonstrated particularly online. Group processing requires the group depends on one another for explanations or assistance.

Koh, Hill, and Barbour (2010) offered instructional design and group work processing strategies citing that group work is becoming more popular in online learning. The instructional design strategies are:

1. Providing multiple communication methods
2. Providing an overall plan for the class
3. Preparing for technology
4. Building virtual team skills

The group work process strategies are:

1. Assisting group formation
2. Building a sense of connection
3. Being involved in group processes
4. Evaluating group processes

These echo some of the cooperative learning recommendations and add some other helpful tips. The cooperative learning strategies can be incorporated into the plan for the class, building virtual teams, assisting group formation, and evaluating group processing. The other recommendations can assist in building the community and instructor presence.

Discussion and Best Practices

Content and feedback can be personalized using a variety of formats and techniques from text to asynchronous video. A personalized sample text statement or direction in a course might read: "read chapter 1 of the text and submit assignment 1." Using the personalization principle this could be re-written as "read chapter 1 of *your* textbook and submit *your* first assignment" (emphasis added). This same principle can be applied to feedback given to students on assignments. Personalization can also be integrated using asynchronous video. Students have stated that the use of video "humanized" the instructor and they felt there was more of a student-instructor relationship (Borup et al., 2011; Griffiths & Graham, 2009). This is due to the verbal and visual cues that video can provide. This is also an example of instructor visibility where the students are able to see the instructor and the non-verbal cues as well as the instructor's mannerisms. Students have also stated that providing some self-disclosure assisted with gaining insight to the instructor's personality and made them more "real" (Borup et al., 2012). Whether using text or asynchronous video personalizing the content and feedback can impact the perception of the instructor and increase social presence and course satisfaction for the students (Borup et al., 2011; Borup et al., 2012; Griffiths & Graham, 2009).

Many learner centered practices that are applied in a face-to-face classroom can be translated to an online environment. For example, students need to be involved with course tasks to develop their own learning. This can be accomplished through collaboration with other students in a discussion forum or group project (Saxena, 2013). Group work covers a variety of learner centered strategies such as problem based learning, collaborative learning, cooperative learning, and small group learning. There are many factors to address when implementing group work in the online environment such as communication tools, student grouping and setting clear expectations.

Students find online group work difficult due to time zones, distance, lack of visual cues and hidden identities (McConnell, 2000; Smith, 2005; Straus & McGrath, 1994). Although students can be resistant to group work, when implemented properly can optimize student learning (MacNeill, Telner, Sparaggis-Agaliotis, & Hanna, 2014). When creating group work assignments, provide students with instructions on various collaboration tools. These tools could be integrated into the LMS or open source tools such as Google docs and Google Hangouts, which will allow students to hear voices and see each other and compensate for the lack of verbal and non-verbal cues (Chang & Kang, 2016). Also, give the students the option to group themselves, which gives students group ownership and autonomy (Brindley, Walti, & Blaschke, 2009). This is particularly important for graduate programs in which students are working adults who may group themselves with others sharing similar work times. Finally, provide clear goals for the group project including timelines and expectations as well as provide feedback throughout the group process on learning content, tasks and participation can help students build strong relationships (Coll, Rochera, de Gispert, & Diaz-Barriga, 2013).

Applying these recommendations can be challenging for novice online instructors. Hopefully the following example will assist in a more concrete understanding of how to apply these concepts in online course design and teaching practices. The example is an assignment or project designed for an online mathematics. Traditionally mathematics is comprised of demonstration, practice, and assessment of problem solving skills individually. Face-to-face assessments typically involve quizzes and tests to ensure students are able to apply problem-solving methods.

A cooperative online project in algebra might begin with requiring students to search the internet for algebraic problems and solutions that relate or interest them in some way. The instructor then requests that students share their findings with course participants and allow them to react to other's findings. This could be done through a discussion. The instructor could use the information posted to group students by interests. For example, if several students find an algebraic card trick then they would be grouped together. Once students are grouped they will be asked to generate an instructor approved algebraic word problem based upon their theme. Once the instructor approves the problem via e-mail, the group will share it with the class and request their peers to solve the problem. This can also be done through the discussion too or the instructor could compile the problems and create an assignment. Depending on number of groups generated, there will be four to eight original problems to solve. The instructor could increase motivation by incentivizing the students to be the first to solve one of the problems correctly. Solutions could be submitted publicly via discussion or privately via the assignment.

CONCLUSION

Instructor presence has more opportunities to grow organically in face-to-face courses, but needs to be more deliberately planned for online courses due to the transactional distance between instructors and students. Faculty teaching online for the first time might assume that uploading lectures and other instructional materials to online environments are enough for teaching in this delivery format. Assumptions similar to this one need to be debunked, which was one of the goals of this chapter when presenting best practices for instructors. Innumerous practices discussed in this chapter could be incorporated into professional development for new and even veteran faculty teaching online.

The value of instructor social presence in the literature is strong. For instance, in a large-scale study investigating the importance of social presence in online courses, Lear and colleagues (2009) found the instructor elements that had the most impact were instructional designs for interaction and evidence of instructor engagement. Pollard and colleagues (2009) also suggested that the Community of Inquiry framework be edited to include instructor social presence as a fourth construct. Besides these studies, books designed for online teaching have also emphasized the importance of instructor social presence (e.g., Miller, 2014; Palloff & Pratt, 2011) in online courses. Instructors are encouraged to establish a social presence by not only being present in the online environment, but also developing a social connection with their learners. Several strategies discussed in this chapter to establish instructor social presence include, but are not limited to: contribute to the discussion board, promptly answer students' emails, provide and elicit feedback, address students by name and others. A major limitation for instructors teaching in online asynchronous environments is the lack of non-verbal cues, which is often mediated by text and prone to misinterpretations. This limitation might affect instructor social presence in an online course. Therefore, further research should be conducted to examine instructor social presence. Researchers and scholars could also focus on identifying practical strategies to assist online instructors in effective creating instructor presence through course development and implementation.

This chapter outlined course development strategies such as:

1.   Creating a consistent course structure with varied presentation of materials and learning activities
2.   Providing detailed and clear instructions and expectations for all assessments that are clearly aligned to goals and materials using personal language
3.   Designing opportunities that allow students to apply concepts learned in a personal context

Implementation strategies such as providing prompt and quality personal feedback, frequent communication, and becoming a facilitator of instruction as opposed to a lecturer or deliverer of content. Application of such strategies may allow for a learning community to be developed in which the students are more comfortable and motivated to participate. Implementing the suggested strategies effectively in an asynchronous online course may aid in increasing student motivation, satisfaction, and perceived learning. This chapter's contribution to the field focused on strategies to be incorporated in online environments. Still, the list of strategies presented in the chapter is by no means comprehensive. Further research needs to be conducted to verify the effectiveness and outcomes of such strategies as well as other emerging techniques in online environments to establish and develop social presence.

REFERENCES

Akyol, Z., & Garrison, D. R. (2014). The development of a community of inquiry over time in an online course: Understanding the progression and integration of social, cognitive and teaching presence. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *12*, 2–3.

Akyol, Z., Garrison, D. R., & Ozden, M. Y. (2009). Online and blended communities of inquiry: Exploring the developmental and perceptual differences. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *10*(6), 65–83.

Allen, E. I., & Seaman, J. (2013). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. Quahog Research Group, LLC and Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved from http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/changingcourse.pdf

Andersen, P., & Andersen, J. (1982). Nonverbal Immediacy in Instruction. In L. Barker (Ed.), *Communication in the Classroom* (pp. 98–120). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Anderson, T., Rourke, L., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (2001). Assessing teacher presence in a computer conferencing context. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *5*(2), 1–7.

Arbaugh, J. B. (2001). How instructor immediacy behaviors affect student satisfaction and learning in web courses. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *64*(4), 42–54. doi:10.1177/108056990106400405

Arbaugh, J. B., & Hwang, A. (2006). Does teaching presence exist in online MBA courses? *The Internet and Higher Education*, *9*(1), 9–21. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2005.12.001

Argon, S. (2003). Creating social presence in online environments. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, *100*(100), 57–68. doi:10.1002/ace.119

Argyle, M., & Dean, J. (1965). Eye-contact, distance and affiliation. *Sociometry*, *28*(3), 289–304. doi:10.2307/2786027 PMID:14341239

Baker, J. D. (2004). An investigation of relationships among instructor immediacy and affective and cognitive learning in the online classroom. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *7*(1), 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.11.006

Bodie, L. W., & Bober-Michel, M. (2014). An Experimental Study of Instructor Immediacy and Cognitive Learning in an Online Classroom. *Proceedings of the2014 International Conference on Intelligent Environments*, Shanghai, China. IEEE. doi:10.1109/IE.2014.50

Borup, J., Graham, C. R., & Velasquez, A. (2011). The use of asynchronous video communication to improve instructor immediacy and social presence in a blended learning environment. In A. Kitchenham (Ed.), *Blended learning across disciplines: models for implementation* (pp. 38–57). Hershey, PA, USA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-60960-479-0.ch003

Borup, J., West, R. E., & Graham, C. R. (2012). Improving online social interaction through asynchronous video. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *15*(3), 195–203. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.11.001

Brindley, J. E., Walti, C., & Blaschke, L. M. (2009). Creating effective collaborative learning groups in an online environment. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *10*(3), 1–18.

Brook, C., & Oliver, R. (2007). Exploring the influence of instructor actions on community development in online settings. In N. Lambropoulos & P. Zaphiris (Eds.), *User-centered design of online learning communities* (pp. 341–364). Hershey, PA, USA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-59904-358-6.ch015

Brook, C., & Oliver, R. (2007). Exploring the influence of instructor actions on community development in online settings. In N. Lambropoulos & P. Zaphiris (Eds.), *User-centered design of online learning communities* (pp. 341–364). Hershey, PA, USA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-59904-358-6.ch015

Campbell, D. (2014). The Influence of Teacher Immediacy Behaviors on Student Performance in an Online Course (and the Problem of Method Variance). *Teaching of Psychology*, *41*(2), 163–166. doi:10.1177/0098628314530351

Chang, B., & Kang, H. (2016). Challenges facing group work online. *Distance Education*, *37*(1), 73–88. doi:10.1080/01587919.2016.1154781

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, *39*(7), 3–7.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, *3*, 7.

Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2011). *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning*. John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9781118255971

Coll, C., Rochera, M. J., de Gispert, I., & Diaz-Barriga, F. (2013). Distribution of feedback among teacher and students in online collaborative learning in small groups. *Digital Education Review*, *23*, 27–45.

Conrad, D. (2002). Engagement, excitement, anxiety and fear: Learners experience of starting an online course. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *16*(4), 205–226. doi:10.1207/S15389286AJDE1604_2

Draves, W. A. (2007). *Advanced teaching online* (3rd ed.). River Falls, WI: LERN Books.

Du, J., Havard, B., & Li, H. (2005). Dynamic online discussion: Task-oriented interaction for deep learning. *Educational Media International*, *42*(3), 207–218. doi:10.1080/09523980500161221

Easton, S. S. (2003). Clarifying the instructors role in online distance learning. *Communication Education*, *52*(2), 87–105. doi:10.1080/03634520302470

Fisher, C. (2010). Discussion, participation and feedback in online courses. *Proceedings of Information Systems Educators Conference*. Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter114/hixon114.html

Fredericksen, E., Pickett, A., Shea, P., Pelz, W., & Swan, K. (2000). Student satisfaction and perceived learning with on-line courses: Principles and examples from the SUNY learning network. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *4*(2), 7–41.

Garrett, T. (2008). Student-centered and teacher-centered classroom management: A case study of three elementary teachers. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 43(1), 34–47.

Garrison, D. R., & Akyol, Z. (2013). The community of inquiry theoretical framework. In M. G. doi:10.4324/9780203803738.ch7

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *2*(2/3), 87–105.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2010). The first decade of the community of inquiry framework: A retrospective. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *13*(1-2), 5–9. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2009.10.003

Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, *37*(1), 40–53.

Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, *37*(1), 40–53. doi:10.1080/03634528809378702

Griffiths, M. E., & Graham, C. R. (2009) Using asynchronous video in online classes: Results from a pilot study. *Instructional technology & distance Learning,* 6(3), 65-76.

Gunawardena, C., & Zittle, F. (1997). Social presence as a predictor of satisfaction within a computer mediated conferencing environment. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *11*(3), 8–26. doi:10.1080/08923649709526970

Guo, P. J., Kim, J., & Rubin, R. (2014). How video production affects student engagement: An empirical study of mooc videos. *Proceedings of the first ACM Learning@scale conference* (pp. 41–50). ACM.

Herrmann, N., & Popyack, J. L. (2003). Electronic grading: When the tablet is mightier than the pen. Syllabus: Technology for Higher Education.

Ice, P., Curtis, R., Phillips, P., & Wells, J. (2007). Using asynchronous audio feedback to enhance teaching presence and students' sense of community. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *11*(2), 3–25.

Jennings, S. E., & McCuller, M. Z. (2004). Meeting the challenges of grading online business communication assignments. *Paper presented at the69th Annual Convention*, Association for Business Communication, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1991). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Jones, N., Georghiades, P., & Gunson, J. (2012). Student feedback via screen capture digital video: Stimulating students modified action. *Higher Education*, *64*(5), 593–607. doi:10.1007/s10734-012-9514-7

Khan, B. H. (Ed.). (1997). *Web-based instruction*. Educational Technology.

Koh, M. H., Hill, J. R., & Barbour, M. K. (2010). Strategies for instructors on how to improve online groupwork. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *43*(2), 183–205. doi:10.2190/EC.43.2.c

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *4*(2), 193–212. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2005.17268566

Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*(6), 683–706. doi:10.1353/csd.0.0099

Kurt, A. A. (2011). Personalization principle in multimedia learning: Conversational versus formal style in written word. *The Turkish Journal of Educational Technology*, *10*(3), 185–192.

Lambert, N., & McCombs, B. (2000). Introduction: Learner-centered schools and classrooms as a direction for school reform. In N. Lambert & B. McCombs (Eds.), *How students learn* (pp. 1–15). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. doi:10.4000/books.pur.16454

Lear, J. L., Isernhagen, J. C., LaCost, B. A., & King, J. W. (2009). Instructor Presence for Web-Based Classes. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, *51*(2), 86–98. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.liblink.uncw.edu/docview/195592989?accountid=14606

Lowenthal, P., & Parscal, T. (2008). Teaching presence. *The Learning Curve*, *3*(4), 1–2.

MacNeill, H., Telner, D., Sparaggis-Agaliotis, A., & Hanna, E. (2014). All for one and one for all: Understanding health professionals' experience in individual versus collaborative online learning. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Profession*, 34, 102-111. doi:10.1002/chp.21226

Mandermach, B. J., Gonzales, R. M., & Garrett, A. L. (2006). An examination of online instructor presence via threaded discussion participation. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *2*(4), 248–260.

Markus, G. B., Howard, J. P., & King, D. C. (1993). Notes: Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *15*(4), 410–419.

McCombs, B. (2015). Learner-Centered Online Instruction. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2015*(144), 57–71. doi:10.1002/tl.20163

McConnell, D. (2000). *Implementing computer supported cooperative learning* (2nd ed.). London: Kogan Page.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Miller, M. (2014). *Minds online: Teaching effectively with technology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. doi:10.4159/harvard.9780674735996

Moore, M. (1973). Toward a theory of independent learning and teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *44*(12), 661–679. doi:10.2307/1980599

Moore, M. G. (2007). The theory of transactional distance. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 89–105). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Moore, M. G. (Ed.), *Handbook of Distance Education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Murray, M., Perez, J., Geist, D., & Hedrick, A. (2012). Student interaction with online course content: Build it and they might come. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, *11*, 125–139.

Ni, S., & Aust, R. (2008). Examining teacher verbal immediacy and sense of classroom community in online classes. *International Journal on E-Learning*, *7*(3), 477–498. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.liblink.uncw.edu/docview/210333926?accountid=14606

O'Sullivan, P. B., Hunt, S., & Lippert, L., Owens, S/. & Whyte, A. (2001, November). Mediated immediacy: Affiliation at distance in educational contexts. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association*, Atlanta, GA, USA.

Orlando, J. (2011). *How to effectively assess online learning* (White Paper). Retrieved from http://www.stjohns.edu/sites/default/files/documents/ir/f63bd49dcf56481e9dbd6975cce6c792.pdf

Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2010). *Collaborating online: Learning together in community* (Vol. 32). John Wiley & Sons.

Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2011). *The excellent online instructor: Strategies for professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Panitz, T. (1996). *A Definition of collaborative vs cooperative learning*. Retrieved from http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/deliberations/collaborative-learning/panitz-paper.cfm

Picciano, A. G. (2002). Beyond student perceptions: Issues of interaction, presence, and performance in an online course. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *6*(1), 21–38.

Pollard, H., Minor, M., & Swanson, A. (2014). Instructor Social Presence within the Community of Inquiry Framework and Its Impact on Classroom Community and the Learning Environment. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *17*(2), n2.

Richardson, J., & Swan, K. (2003). Examining social presence in online courses in relation to students' perceived learning and satisfaction. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *7*(1), 68–88.

Richmond, V. P. (2002). Teacher nonverbal immediacy: Uses and outcomes. In *Communications for teachers* .

Rourke, L., & Kanuka, H. (2009). Learning in Communities of Inquiry: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Distance Education*, *23*(1), 19–48.

Sargeant, J., Curran, V., Allen, M., Jarvis-Selinger, S., & Ho, K. (2006). Facilitating interpersonal interaction and learning online: Linking theory and practice. *The Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, *26*(2), 128–136. doi:10.1002/chp.61 PMID:16802307

Saxena, S. (2013). Best classroom practices for student-centric teaching. *EdTechReview*. Retrieved from http://edtechreview.in/news/news/trends-insights/insights/775-best-classroom-practices-for-student-centric-teaching?goback=%2Egde_5092459_member_58104299914867843076#%21

Shea, P., Hayes, S., & Vickers, J. (2010). Online instructional effort measured through the lens of teaching presence in the community of inquiry framework: A re-examination of measure and approach. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *11*(3), 127–154.

Shea, P., Li, C., & Pickett, A. (2006). A Study of Teaching Presence and Student Sense of Learning Community in fully Online and Web-enhanced College Courses. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *9*(3), 175–190. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2006.06.005

Sheridan, K., & Kelly, M. A. (2010). The indicators of instructor presence that are important to students in online courses. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *6*(4), 767. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1497198590?accountid=14606

Shin, N. (2002). Beyond interaction: The relational construct of transactional presence. *Open Learning*, *17*(2), 121–137. doi:10.1080/02680510220146887

Short, J. A., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunications*. London: Wiley.

Skramstad, E., Schlosser, C., & Orellana, A. (2012). Teaching presence and communication timeliness in asynchronous online courses. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, *13*(3), 183.

Smith, R. O. (2005). Working with difference in online collaborative groups. *Adult Education Quarterly, 55*, 182-199. doi:10.1177/0741713605274627

Straus, S. G., & McGrath, J. E. (1994). Does the medium matter? The interaction of task type and technology on group performance and member reactions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 87-97. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.1.87

Sue, B. S., Sarah, C. W., & Warren, S. H. (2006). Reaching through the screen: Using a tablet PC to provide feedback in online classes. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 25*(2), 8-12. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.liblink.uncw.edu/docview/227213654?accountid=14606

Swan, K. (2001). Virtual interaction: Design factors affecting student satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online courses. *Distance Education*, *22*(2), 306–331. doi:10.1080/0158791010220208

Swan, K. (2003). Learning effectiveness online: What the research tells us. *Elements of Quality Online Education*. *Practice and Direction*, *4*, 13–47.

Swan, K., & Shih, L. F. (2005). On the nature and development of social presence in online course discussions. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *9*(3), 115–136.

Tu, C. H. (2005). From presentation to interaction: New goals for online learning. *Educational Media International*, *42*(3), 189–206. doi:10.1080/09523980500161072

Vaughan, N., & Garrison, D. R. (2005). Creating cognitive presence in a blended faculty development community. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *8*(1), 1–12. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.11.001

Warnock, S. (2013, April 18). Frequent, Low-Stakes Grading: Assessment for Communication Confidence. Retrieved from http://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/educational-assessment/frequent-low-stakes-grading-assessment-for-communication-confidence/

Weiner, M., & Mehrabian, A. (1968). *Language within Language: Immediacy, a channel in verbal communication*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Williams, P. E. (2000). Defining distance education roles and competencies for higher education institutions: A computer-mediated delphi stud [Doctoral Dissertation].

Wisneski, J. E., Ozogul, G., & Bichelmeyer, B. A. (2015). Does teaching presence transfer between MBA teaching environments? A comparative investigation of instructional design practices associated with teaching presence. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *25*, 18–27. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2014.11.001