Journal of Innovative Education Strategies
Volume 2, Issue 1, Fall 2013

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS ABOUT DISTANCE EDUCATION TO TEACH MODERN LANGUAGES

Nancy Broughton, Wright State University
Elfe Dona, Wright State University
Sheri Stover, Wright State University

Abstract

This research study presents the results of a survey given to faculty in a Modern Languages Department to measure their perception of Distance Education (DE). The survey used was modified from the Community of Inquiry (CoI) survey which has three subscales of measuring teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence. Faculty ranked the ability to have cognitive presence the highest (56% agreeing), ability to have social presence the second highest (52% agreeing), and ability to have teaching presence the third highest (35% agreeing).

Keywords: modern languages, distance education, faculty perceptions, community of inquiry

INTRODUCTION

The industry standard definition for distance education is Sloan Consortium's decade old definition which has remained unchanged, with online or distance education (DE) classes having 80% of course content delivered online (Allen & Seaman, 2008). Allen and Seaman (2011) found that over two-thirds of chief academic officers believe that the quality of distance education is as good as or better than face-to-face instruction, but felt that less than one-third of the faculty at their institution accept the value and legitimacy of DE.

There are pressures on Modern Language departments to offer DE class options to their students in order to provide more flexibility for students whose schedules do not permit attending face-to-face classes (Blake & Delforge, 2004; Zhang & Cui, 2010). While DE is growing (U. S. Department of Education NCES, 2011), many faculty teaching Modern Languages simply feel it will not work for their discipline (MLA Executive Council, 2001). Modern Language faculty feel that teaching a language is different from teaching other subjects because it requires significant social interactions (Dörnyei, 2003). This would be challenging to complete in a DE learning environment. Traditional online courses are heavily developed with text communication that resemble a high-tech correspondence course and does little to encourage interaction needed to provide effective instruction for Modern Languages (Crawford, 2006). The Modern Languages Association (MLA) and the American Association of University Professors

(AAUP) question the use of DE for teaching Modern Languages. They state that there are unique demands for teaching a second language, (L2) and faculty need to employ pedagogical strategies that go beyond mere acquisition of linguistic knowledge such as requiring students to negotiate meaning by

speaking, listening, reading, and writing the L2. They go further to say that "this learning process requires a high level of human contact, one that is traditionally facilitated by face-to-face interaction in the language classroom" (MLA Executive Council, 2001). There have been many technological advancements since the MLA Executive Council in 2001 that have enhanced the ability to develop DE classes, but the question remains whether faculty perceptions about DE have changed since then.

There have been some research studies to show success in teaching foreign languages in a DE environment. Chenoweth and Murday (2003) found that students taking Elementary French I in a DE environment had no significant differences in learning from their face-to-face counterparts in "grammatical knowledge, written production, oral production, listening comprehension, and reading comprehension". Students in the DE class had statistically higher differences in their writing than the face-to-face students. Blake and Delforge (2004) conducted research to find that students enrolled in a DE Spanish course performed significantly better than their face-to-face counterpart on discrete grammar tests. Despite research showing success in teaching foreign languages in a DE environment, L2 faculty continue to show high levels of skepticism about teaching L2 classes online.

This research study measures the perceptions of DE by one Modern Language department at a mid-sized Midwest university. It is important to understand faculty perceptions of DE because it is becoming increasingly popular and becoming the preferred mode of learning by many students (Allen & Seaman, 2011). Higher education administrators are beginning to pressure academic departments to develop DE programs because over 90% of chief academic officers rate DE classes as having "superior" or "somewhat superior" scheduling flexibility (Allen & Seaman, 2011). Offering DE courses can result in additional enrollments and ease university scheduling challenges.

Literature Review

There are many foreign language faculty that are skeptical of using DE as a method of delivery to successfully teach L2 classes (Blake, Wilson, Cetto, and Pardo-Ballester, 2008). They believe that there is little interaction between instructors and students in DE classes, that content is posted online, and that there is a one-way content delivery from the all-knowing teacher to the passive student (Jaschik & Lederman, 2013). This type of DE model does not work well for Modern Language classrooms because students need practice in their foreign language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). This can prove to be challenging in a distance learning environment (Solé & Hopkins, 2007; Sussex, 1991). Modern Language learners need ample amounts of oral and written input (Krashen, 1985) and also ample opportunities to produce robust oral and written output (Swain, 1995) in their target language. Students learning a second language must collaborate closely with their instructor (Gass, 1997; Pica, 1996; Roberts, 1998) and cannot simply be passive recipients of a lecture. Teacher-centered text-based DE learning environments do not work effectively for Modern Language learning environments.

Modern Language course developers are now being influenced to move away from teacher-centered course design in order to implement DE classes using learner-centered principles (White, 2007). The responsibility of learning shifts from the instructor to the students who take more control of their own learning (Williams & Burden, 1997). Learner-centered classes place the teacher in the role of "guide on

the side" to help mentor students. As a result, participants have significant interaction with each other and implement active-learning strategies (Doyle, 2011). This is important for teaching Modern Languages because second language learners cannot learn in isolation. They must have social interaction with other students and the instructor so that they can practice expressing themselves and become aware of various cultural differences (Mollaei & Rahnama, 2012).

Advances in technology now allow Modern Language faculty to begin to consider the possibility of developing learner–centered classes that incorporate technology (Moharrer, 2012; Wang & Vasquez, 2012) to allow students to assume more responsibility of their own learning. Newly introduced cloud-based Web 2.0 tools that are free or inexpensive allow Modern Language instructors to include interactive and engaging tools that enhance the language learning skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing. O'Reilly (2005) coined the term Web 2.0 to identify technology tools that have gone beyond the static, onedimensional web page to "a Web technology that aims to enhance creativity, information sharing and collaboration among users" (Tu, Blocher & Ntoruru, 2008, p. 336). Students can easily use their speaking skills and sometimes interact online using Web 2.0 tools such as Skype (http://skye.com), Voki (http://voki.com), Blabberize (http://blabberize.com), Glogster (http://edu.glogster.com), VoiceThread (http://voicethread.com), and World of Warcraft (http://us.battle.net/wow/en/). Students can practice their listening skills online using Web 2.0 tools such as YouTube (http://youtube.com), FilmArobics (http://filmarobics.com), Discovery Education Streaming (http://streaming.discoveryeducation.com), Beeline TV (http://beelinetv.com), and Lyrics Training (http://lyricstraining.com). Students can improve their reading skills online using Web 2.0 tools such as Newseum (http://www.newseum.org), ePals (http://epals.com), and Diigo (http://diigo.com). Students also can write online using Web 2.0 tools such as Wikispaces (http://wikispaces.com), Mixbook (http://mixbook.com), Google Docs (https://drive.google.com/), Blogging (http://edubogs.org and http://blogger.com) and Weebly (http://weebly.com).

While technology is being used to teach foreign language classes, most foreign language teachers are not excited about using a DE format to teach their courses. Blake, Wilson, Cetto, and Pardo-Ballester (2008) reported they met with repeated resistance and skeptical attitudes from other language faculty members and language departments when they were in the process of gaining approval from the UC Berkeley senate to develop an Arabic DE program. The authors felt as if: *Some foreign language (FL) teachers tend to harbor deep-seated doubts as to whether or not a [DE] course could ever provide L2 learners with a way to gain linguistic proficiency, especially when oral language skills are in question. Perhaps others secretly worry that these new [DE] classes might displace them. (Blake, Wilson, Cetto, and Pardo-Ballester, 2008, p. 114)*

Teaching Modern Languages requires significant and meaningful interaction between the instructor and the student, which creates a community of learners working together to inquire about the discipline of learning a new language.

Garrison (2011) defines an educational community of inquiry as a "group of individuals who collaboratively engage in purposeful critical discourse and reflection to construct personal meaning and confirm mutual understanding" (p. 15). To create successful educational communities of inquiry, instructors need to prepare learning environments that include ample opportunities in which participants are actively engaged in the content using pedagogically effective teaching methodologies (Garrison, 2011). Worthwhile education experiences are composed of teachers and students interacting

in the three essential elements of teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000). Teaching presence is defined as the design and facilitation of the cognitive and social processes for students to be able to construct meaningful learning outcomes (Anderson, Rourke, Garrison, & Archer, 2001). Teaching presence is measured by looking at the:

1. Design and organization
2. Facilitation
3. Direct instruction.

Social presence is defined "as the ability of participants in a community of inquiry to project themselves socially and emotionally, as 'real' people (i.e., their full personality), through the medium of communication being used" (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000, p. 94). Social presence is measured by looking at the:

1. Affective expression 2. Open communication

3. Group cohesion.

Cognitive presence is at the core of education and is defined "as the extent to which learners are able to construct and confirm meaning through sustained reflection and discourse in a critical community of inquiry" (Garrison, Anderson & Archer, 2001, p. 11). Cognitive presence is measured by looking at the:

1. Triggering event
2. Exploration
3. Integration 4. Resolution.

Allen, Seaman, Lederman, and Jaschik (2012) conducted a survey of 4,564 faculty and found there are many faculty that are conflicted about the ability of DE classes to have adequate levels of instructor presence, social presence, and cognitive presence. The results of the survey showed that faculty questioned the cognitive presence in DE classes with nearly two-thirds (66%) of respondents believing that the learning outcomes for DE classes are inferior or somewhat inferior to face-to-face classes. Faculty also question the ability of DE classes to have adequate levels of social presence. 85% of faculty indicated they feel that interaction with students in DE classes is of lower quality than interaction in face-to-face classes (Jaschik & Lederman, 2013). Faculty also question the ability of DE classes to have adequate levels of teacher presence with two-thirds (67%) of them rating DE classes as being inferior to face-to-face classes in answering students' questions (Jaschik & Lederman, 2013).

A Community of Inquiry (CoI) survey containing 34 questions was developed to measure the interactions of teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence from the students' perspective (Swan, Richardson, Ice, Garrison, Cleveland-Innes, & Arbaugh, 2008). The survey posed statements such as, "The instructor clearly communicated important course topics" and students responded using the Likert scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The CoI survey is divided in three sections to measure three subscales. The first thirteen questions measure Teaching Presence, the next nine questions measure Social Presence, and the last twelve questions measure Cognitive Presence. The researchers in this study modified the CoI survey to create a tool that is intended to measure the faculty perception of the ability to teach a DE course that included Teaching Presence, Social Presence, and Cognitive Presence. The modifications included will be discussed in the methodology section.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions we will be asking for this study are to investigate the perceptions of faculty in Modern Languages about the ability of DE classes to have adequate levels of teacher presence, social presence and cognitive presence.

METHODOLOGY Subjects

Participants in this survey included faculty in the Modern Languages Department at a mid-sized university located in the Midwest. A total of 43 full time and adjunct faculty were asked to complete the survey with 23 responses (54%). There were 3 male, 19 female and one person who identified as other. Most of the respondents were inexperienced with DE with 83% (N= 19) of participants indicating they have never taken an online course and 78% (N = 18) never taught a DE course. When asked whether they planned to teach DE classes in the future, 52% (N = 12) indicated that they never plan to do so, 35% (N = 8) reported that they did plan to teach and 4% stated they are already teaching a DE class.

Instrument

A modified version of the CoI survey (Arbaugh, Cleveland-Innes, Diaz, Garrison, Ice & Richardson, 2008) was used to measure the faculty perception of DE. Since the original CoI was developed to measure students' perception of the level of CoI, each of the survey questions needed to be adapted to measure the faculty perceptions. The survey posed statements such as "Distance Education classes allow faculty to communicate effectively with their online students." Participants responded using a 4-scale Likert rating. The DE CoI survey on faculty perception was based on the original CoI subscales with the first thirteen questions measuring Teaching Presence, the next nine questions measuring Social Presence, and the last twelve questions measuring Cognitive Presence. A survey method was chosen to gather data from faculty in an attempt to get their perceptions of the incorporations of DE in the Modern Languages department at this university. This method, rather than conducting individual interviews, was chosen due to their busy schedule.

Procedure

Permission to conduct this survey was requested and granted from the CoI author and the university Institutional Review Board. The online survey was created in Qualtrics, an online survey tool. A link to the survey was sent out via email to the full time and adjunct faculty members of the Modern Languages Department. Responses from each person were gathered anonymously. The survey results were sent to and compiled by a researcher outside the department.

DATA RESULTS

There were 23 faculty that completed the DE Faculty Perception CoI Survey. The

Cronbach's Alpha showed internal consistencies with .78 for Teaching Presence, .89 for Social Presence, and .94 for Cognitive Presence, which is an acceptable level of consistency (George & Mallery, 2003).

Teaching Presence

The first thirteen questions of the survey measured Teaching Presence, which is the ability of an instructor to maintain a strong presence with the class participants while teaching the DE class. The mean response for Teaching Presence ranged from 1.08 to 2.77, with a collective mean score of 2.15 (s.d. = .39). The majority of respondents disagreed with the idea that it is possible to have acceptable levels of Teaching Presence in a DE classroom (M = 2.15). The top statements that participants disagreed with the strongest were (1) Q2-Most faculty would know the process to design an effective DE class (M = 1.52), (2) Q4-Most faculty have the pedagogical knowledge to design an effective DE class (M = 1.87), (3) Q1- Designing a DE class is the same amount of work as designing a face-to-face class (M = 1.95), and (4) Q6-Most faculty would know the process to teach an effective DE class (M = 1.95). The top statements that participants agreed with the strongest were (1) Q10-Faculty can clearly communicate important due dates/time frames for learning activities to help keep their online students on track in DE classes (M = 3.0), (2) Q13- Faculty can help guide students toward deep learning in DE classes (M = 2.63), and (3) Q11Faculty can identify student misconceptions and help them get back on track in DE classes (M = 2.58).

TABLE 1 CoI Survey

Questions measuring Teaching Presence

Question	N	1 SD	2-D	3 A	4 SA	M	SD
1) Designing a distance education class is the same amount of work as designing a face-to-face class.							
10 4 5 2 47.6% 19%	21						
2) Most faculty would know the process to design an effective distance education class.							
11 12 0 0 47.8% 52.2%	23						
3) Most faculty have the technical skills to design an effective distance education class.							
	23	5 21.7%	13 56.5%	4 17.4%	1 4.3%	2.04	.77
4) Most faculty have the pedagogical knowledge to design an effective distance education class.							
	23	7 30.4%	12 52.2%	4 17.4%	0 0%	1.87	.69
5) Teaching a distance education class is the same amount of work as a face-to-face class.							
	20	7 35%	6 30%	6 30%	1 5%	2.05	.95

6) Most faculty would know the process to teach an effective distance education class.							
	22	6 27.3%	12 54.5%	4 18.2%	0 0%	1.91	.68
7) Most faculty have the technical skills to teach an effective distance education class.							
	22	3 13.6%	13 59.1%	6 27.3%	0 0%	2.14	.64
8) Most faculty have the pedagogical knowledge to teach an effective distance education class.							
	22	4 18.2%	11 50.0%	7 31.8%	0 0%	2.14	.71
9) Distance education classes allow faculty to communicate effectively with their online students.							
	20	1 5%	10 50%	9 45%	0 0%	2.40	.60
10) Faculty can clearly communicate important due dates/time frames for learning activities to help keep their online students on track in distance education classes.							
	21	1 4.8%	1 4.8%	16 76.2%	3 14.3%	3.00	.63
11) Faculty can identify student misconceptions and help them get back on track in distance education classes.							
	19	1 5.3%	7 36.8%	10 52.6%	1 5.3%	2.58	.69
12) Faculty can communicate to their online students as effectively in a distance education class as a face-to-face class.							
	20	2 10%	15 75%	1 5%	2 10%	2.15	.75
13) Faculty can help guide students toward deep learning in distance education classes.							
	19	1 5.3%	6 31.6%	11 57.9%	1 5.3%	2.63	.68

Social Presence

The next nine questions of the survey measured Social Presence, which is the ability of participants in an online course to be able to see each other as real people (Garrison, Anderson, and Archer, 2000, p. 94). The mean response for Social Presence ranged from 1.33 to 3.78, with a collective mean score of 2.53

(s.d. = .56). The majority of respondents agreed that it is possible to have Social Presence in a DE classroom (M = 2.53). The statements that participants disagreed with the strongest were (1) Q14- Faculty can develop close relationships with their students in DE classes (M = 2.16), (2) Q18- Online students have the ability to get to know each other in DE classes that helps to give them a sense of

belonging (M = 2.26), and (3) Q19- Online students are able to form distinct impressions of the participants in their DE classes (M = 2.26). The statements that participants agreed with the most were (1) Q15- Faculty can help their online students make connections to relevant issues in DE classes (M = 3.0), (2) Q16- Faculty can provide feedback to their online students in DE classes to help them understand their strengths and weaknesses (M = 2.95), and (3) Q22- Faculty feel comfortable communicating to their online students in a DE class (M = 2.83).

TABLE 2 CoI Survey Questions measuring Social Presence

Question	N	1 SD	2- D	3 A	4 SA	M	SD
1) Faculty can develop close relationships with their students in distance education classes.							
19 4 9 5 1		2.16 21.1%	.834 47.4%	26.3%	5.3%		
2) Faculty can help their online students make connections to relevant issues in distance education classes.							
	20	0 0%	3 15%	14 70%	3 15%	3.00	.562
3) Faculty can provide feedback to their online students in distance education classes to help them understand their strengths and weaknesses.							
	20	1 5%	2 10%	14 70%	3 15%	2.95	.686
4) Distance education classes allow faculty to provide the same amount of feedback they give their students in a face-to-face class.							
	19	4 21.1%	5 26.3%	9 47.4%	1 5.3%	2.37	.895
5) Online students have the ability to get to know each other in distance education classes that helps to give them a sense of belonging.							
	19	2 10.5%	12 63.2%	3 15.8%	2 10.5%	2.26	.806
6) Online students are able to form distinct impressions of the participants in their distance education classes.							
	19	2 10.5%	12 63.2%	3 15.8%	2 10.5%	2.26	.806
7) Group projects can be completed as effectively in distance education classes as face-to-face classes.							
	18	2 11.1%	8 44.4%	7 38.9%	1 5.6%	2.39	.778
8) Distance education classes allow participants to develop a sense of collaboration among participants.							
	18	1 5.6%	10 55.6%	6 33.3%	1 5.6%	2.39	.698
9) Faculty feel comfortable communicating to their online students in a distance education class.							

	18	0 0%	4 22.2%	13 72.2%	1 5.6%	2.83	.514

Cognitive Presence

The last twelve questions of the survey measured Cognitive Presence, the ability of learners to make meaning of the content while working within the learning community (Garrison, Anderson & Archer, 2001, p. 11). The mean response for Cognitive Presence ranged from 1.58 to 3.75, with a collective mean score of

2.58 (s.d. = .55). The majority of respondents agreed that it is possible to have Cognitive Presence in a DE classroom (M = 2.58). The statements that participants disagreed with the most were (1) Q25- DE is an effective method to teach ALL academic disciplines (M = 1.95), (2) Q24- DE is an effective method to teach in MY academic discipline (M = 2.10), and (3) Q31- There is no difference between students staying on track in DE classes and face-to-face classes (M = 2.37). The statements that participants agreed with the strongest were (1) Q29- DE classes allow students to learn the academic content and apply it in practice (M = 2.90). (2) Q30- DE classes can help students develop deep learning that will transfer to their work or other non-class related activities (M = 2.85) and (3) Q33- Students complete as much (or more) work in a DE class as in a face-to-face class (M = 2.84).

TABLE 3 CoI Survey

Questions measuring Cognitive Presence

Question	N	1 SD	2- D	3 A	4 SA	M	SD
1) Students are able to learn as much in a distance education class as a traditional face-to-face class.							
	21	2 8.7%	9 42.9%	8 38.1%	2 9.5%	2.48	.814
2) Distance education is an effective method to teach in MY academic discipline.							
	20	4 20%	10 50%	6 30%	0 0%	2.10	.718
3) Distance education is an effective method to teach ALL academic disciplines.							
	21	5 23.8%	12 57.1%	4 19%	0 0%	1.95	.669
4) Distance education classes can incorporate learning activities that allow students to master the course material.							
19 0 6 10 3		2.84 0%	.688	31.6% 15.8%	52.6%		
5) Distance education classes have the same amount of academic rigor as faceto-face classes.							
	19	2 10.5%	7 36.8%	7 36.8%	3 15.8%	2.58	.902

6) Distance education classes allow for effective assessment of students' learning.							
	19	0 0%	9 47.4%	7 36.8%	3 15.8%	2.68	.749
7) Distance education classes allow students to learn the academic content and apply it in practice.							
	21	0 0%	5 23.8%	13 61.9%	3 14.3%	2.90	.625
8) Distance education classes can help students develop deep learning that will transfer to their work or other non-class related activities.							
20 1 4 12 3		2.85 5%	.745 20%	60%	15%		
9) There is no difference between students staying on track in distance education classes and face-to-face classes.							
	19	3 15.8%	8 42.1%	6 31.6%	2 10.5%	2.37	.895
10) Distance education classes get students motivated to explore content related issues.							
	20	2 10%	6 30%	11 55%	1 5%	2.55	.759
11) Students complete as much (or more) work in a distance education class as in a face-to-face class.							
	19	0 0%	4 21.1%	14 73.7%	1 5.3%	2.84	.501
12) Distance education classes are a valid method to teach students.							
	21	1 4.8%	5 23.8%	13 61.9%	2 9.5%	2.76	.700

DATA ANALYSIS

Since the majority of participants that completed this survey had little experience with DE, either taking a DE course (85%) or teaching a DE course (78%), it was not surprising that they would have concerns about the development of DE classes. The three lowest ratings indicated that the participants had concerns with the preparedness of faculty in designing and teaching DE classes. 100% disagreed that faculty know the process to design an effective DE class, 83% disagreed that faculty have the pedagogical knowledge to design an effective DE class, and 82% disagreed that faculty would know the process to teach an effective DE class. On the surface, these data indicated that the faculty completing the survey did not have access to training, however, robust courses are available at this university to support faculty in learning the technologies, skills, and pedagogies to design and teach DE courses. Allen and Seaman (2011) found that only 6% of higher education institutions have no training or mentoring programs for online teaching faculty. Since 87% of faculty indicated they are not currently teaching an online class, the most likely conclusion is that it was their choice not to attend the distance education professional development classes.

Teaching Presence

The results of the CoI survey indicated that faculty ranked the ability to have teaching presence in DE classes the lowest CoI element with only 35% of faculty agreeing it is possible to have teaching presence in a DE class. This result is not surprising since research has found that teachers teach the way they were taught (Conti, 2004) and the faculty that completed this survey all were taught in a faceto-face format. Accepting the DE format would require many faculty to unlearn their current pedagogy and adopt new learning practices (McWilliam, 2005).

Social Presence

The results of the CoI survey indicated that faculty ranked the ability to have social presence in DE classes the second highest CoI element with 52% of faculty agreeing it is possible to have social presence in a DE class.

Many participants indicated it is possible to effectively communicate to students in online classes with 90% of respondents agreeing that faculty can clearly communicate important due dates and keep students on track, 85% indicating they agreed that faculty can help online students make connections to relevant issues, 85% agreeing that faculty can provide feedback to their students and help them understand their strengths and weaknesses, 78% agreed that faculty feel comfortable communicating with their online students, and 58% agreeing that faculty can identify student misconceptions and help get them back on track.

Cognitive Presence

The results of the CoI survey indicated that faculty ranked the ability to have cognitive presence in DE classes the highest CoI element with 56% of faculty agreeing it is possible to have cognitive presence in a DE class. There were also many participants who indicated that it is possible to have effective instruction with 79% agreeing that students complete as much (or more) work in a DE class as in a face-to-face class. 76% agreed that DE classes allow students to learn the content and apply it in practice. 75% agreed that DE classes can help students develop deep learning that will transfer, and 71% agreed that DE classes are a valid method to teach. 68% agreeing that DE classes can incorporate learning activities that allow students to master the course material, 63% agreed that faculty can guide students toward deep learning, 53% agreed that DE classes have the same rigor as face-to-face and 53% agree that DE classes allow for effective assessment.

DISCUSSION Conclusions

Teaching Modern Languages has unique demands that require high levels of interaction. The authors agree with the Modern Languages Association (MLA) statement that emphasizes the importance of faculty having the “right, responsibility, and authority” to make decisions about implementing DE technologies into their classroom (MLA Executive Council, 2001). Garrett (1991) made an insightful

prediction about the use of technology over two decades ago when she said there was good and bad news about the use of technology to support Modern Language learning. The good news was that technology has the potential to offer enormous enhancements to Modern Language learning. The bad news is that incorporating technology is not easy, and it "will always require a teacher's considered analysis of that situation and detailed information on the currently available options" (p. 717). Ultimately, it is not the use of any particular technology that will make a Modern Language learning environment successful, but the instructional planning that the instructor does while designing the course (Salaberry, 2001).

As technology continues to advance, there are now many online technologies that allow for high interaction between participants in DE classes. Some of these new technologies will allow our students to reach out and have global interactions with people all over the world, which will open up significantly higher levels of multicultural education in our classes. Modern Language faculty are beginning to incorporate these new technologies into their classes by combining parts of their face-to-face courses into a blended learning environment. As faculty begin to identify technologies that are pedagogically suited to teaching Modern Languages, they can benefit from incorporating them to migrate face-to-face classes to blended learning or fully online learning environments.

The faculty responding to this survey did indicate that learning can take place using DE, but understandably have concerns about their ability to design effective learning activities and have interactions with their students. Since the participants completing this survey had little experience with DE, faculty development programs might help change faculty perceptions. Faculty can attend the generic workshops that are conducted by their centers of teaching and learning to discover how to operate their learning management systems. In addition to the generic learning management system training, L2 faculty need to have faculty development opportunities that are geared to their specific needs for their discipline. In addition to faculty development opportunities, mentoring programs could be set up to provide L2 faculty opportunities for 1-on-1 support and strategy sessions to help them implement new technologies. Rather than faculty comitting to a full-scale DE class, they can begin to implement online lessons into their face-to-face class to gradually build their comfort levels to a point they feel ready to teach a class entirely online.

Study Limitations

The survey tool used to conduct this study was based on an existing tool: the CoI survey (Arbaugh et al., 2008). The CoI Survey was designed to measure students' perception of the level of CoI in their class, so the survey needed to be significantly modified to measure faculty perception of DE that might have an impact on the validity of this survey. The same subscales of teaching presence, social presence and cognitive presence have been capitalized throughout to develop the survey. Another limitation was the fact that only 23 responses to the survey were received, therefore, the information gathered from this survey cannot be generalized to other settings. Since this study was designed to measure the faculty perceptions of DE in Modern Languages at one institution, there are only 43 faculty asked to complete the survey, as a result the number of responses was expected to be small. While the response rate to the survey was acceptable, there were only 43 faculty in the population to begin with. Another

limitation is that this study includes only the results of a quantitative survey and does not provide the types of information that could be provided by a qualitative study.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study was conducted at only one institution and provided a limited number of responses. The authors would recommend that this survey be conducted at multiple institutions to measure the faculty perceptions of DE in Modern Languages. This would allow the validation of the survey tool and a comparison of perceptions from different colleges and universities. When this tool was developed, the questions were intentionally left generic so that the survey could be given to faculty in other disciplines. Another recommendation for further research would be to give the survey to faculty in other disciplines and examine whether there are differences in perceptions about DE among disciplines. Additionally, follow up qualitative research studies could be conducted to gather further information from the faculty about their DE perceptions. A qualitative survey could help gather data about the specific issues that L2 faculty have with DE to help gain deeper levels of the challenges or misconceptions they have with teaching L2 classes using DE.

REFERENCES

Allen, I. E. & Seaman, J. (2008). Staying the course: Online education in the United States. Sloan-C. Retrieved from

http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/staying_course

Allen, I. E. & Seaman, J. (2011). *Going the Distance: Online Education in the United States, 2011*. Sloan-C. Retrieved from the Sloan Consortium web site @ http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/going_distance_2011

Allen, I. E., Seaman, J., Lederman, D., & Jaschik, S. (2012). *Conflicted: Faculty and online education*. BABSON Survey Research Group. Retrieved from http://babson.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_bJHd6VpmahG2NGB

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), 1-17.

Arbaugh, J.B., Cleveland-Innes, M., Diaz, S.R., Garrison, D.R., Ice, P., Richardson, & Swan, K.P. (2008). Developing a community of inquiry instrument: Testing a measure of the Community of Inquiry framework using a multi-institutional sample. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *11*(3-4), 133-136.

Blake, R. & Delforge, A.M. (2004). *Language learning at a distance: Spanish without walls*. Selected papers from the 2004 NFLRC Symposium. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW44/Blake.htm

Blake, R., Wilson, N. L., Cetto, M., & Pardo-Ballester, C. (2008). Measuring oral proficiency in distance, face-to-face, and blended classrooms. *Language Learning & Technology*, *12*(3), 114-127.

Chenoweth, N. A., & Murday, K. (2003). Measuring student learning in an online French course. *CALICO Journal*, *20*(2), 285-314.

Conti, G. J. (2004). Identifying your teaching style. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction* (pp. 73-77). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Crawford, D. L. (2006). *Characteristics leading to student success: A study of online learning environments*. Texas A&M University- Commerce, United States – Texas: Ed.D. Dissertation.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003) Attitudes, orientations and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research and applications. *Language Learning*, *53*(1), 3–32.

Doyle, T. (2011). *Learner-centered teaching: Putting the research on learning into practice*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.

Garrett, N. (1991). Technology in the service of language learning: Trends and issues. The *Modern Language Journal*, *75*, 74-101.

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

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2001). Critical thinking, cognitive presence and computer conferencing in distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *15*(1), 7-23.

Garrison, D. R. (2011). *E-Learning in the 21st Century: A framework for research and practice*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.

Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

George, D. & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Jaschik, S. & Lederman, D. (2013). *The 2013 inside higher ed survey of faculty attitudes on technology*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/survey-faculty-attitudestechnology

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implication*. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McWilliam, E. (2005). Unlearning pedagogy. *Journal of Learning Design*, *1*(1), 1-11.

MLA Executive Council. (2001). Special considerations for language and literature: The AAUP statement on distance education. Retrieved from the MLA web site from http://www.mla.org/statement_aaup_distance_ed

Moharrer, Z. (2012). A review on learning style preferences for EFL language learners in online context. *Language in India*, *12*(1), 527-548.

Mollaei, F. & Rahnama, H. (2012). Experiential education contributing to language learning. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *2*(21), 268 – 279.

O'Reilly, T. (2005). *What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software*. Retrieved from http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html

Pica, T. (1996). Second Language Learning Through Interaction: Multiple perspectives. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *12*(1), 1 – 22.

Roberts, J. (1998). *Language Teacher Education*. London: Arnold.

Salaberry, M. R. (2001). The use of technology for second language learning and teaching: A retrospective. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*, 39-56.

Solé, C. R., & Hopkins, J. (2007). Contrasting two approaches to distance language learning. *Distance Education*, *28* (3), 351-370.

Sussex, R. (1991). Current issues in distance language education and open learning: an overview and an Australian perspective. In G.L. Ervin (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Foreign Language Education* (PP. 177193). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & G. Seidhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, K. P., Richardson, J. C., Ice, P., Garrison, D. R., Cleveland-Innes, M., & Arbaugh, J. B. (2008). Validating a measurement tool of presence in online communities of inquiry. *E-Mentor*, *2*(24), 1-12.

Tu, C., Blocher, M., & Ntoruru, J. (2008). Integrate Web 2.0 technology to facilitate online professional community: EMI special editing experiences. *Educational Media International*, *45*(4), 335–341.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2011).The Condition of Education 2011(NCES 2011-033).

Wang, S. & Vasquez, C. (2012). Web 2.0 and second language learning: What does the research tell us? *CALICO Journal*, *29*(3), 412-430.

White, C. (2007). Focus on the language learner in an era of globalization: Tensions, positions and practices in technology-mediated language teaching. *Language Teaching*, *40*, 321-326.

Williams, M. & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press.

Zhang, X. & Cui, G. (2010). Learning beliefs of distance foreign language learners in China: A survey study. *System*, *38(1)*, *30-4*