

**Dispelling the Myths of Generalized Online “Best Practices”:
What Approaches are Best for Accounting Classes Taught Online**

By: Nancy Albers, Amy Wren and Tami Knotts

Abstract

The Covid 19 pandemic forced US institutions of higher learning to seriously and aggressively consider the best methods for teaching our courses without the luxury and familiarity of a classroom. For many, the experience of teaching online was new and uncomfortable. In the midst of the rush to online, a great deal of reliance was placed on theoretical best practices for online courses. Now that pressure has lessened, it is an appropriate time to consider if the information we have been given really represents “best practices.”

Dispelling the Myths of Generalized Online “Best Practices”:

What Approaches are Best for Accounting Classes Taught Online

Impact of the COVID 19 pandemic on the economy, health institutions, social behaviors, political outcomes, and educational approaches may take decades to unravel. What we do know is that the higher educational academy was forced into a reactive mode in March of 2020 that generated an insufficiently planned and blindingly rapid conversion of face-to-face classes to classes taught remotely by way of technology. In that process, the academy performed with the resilience consistent with a history of success. Fortunately, we are now in a position to move from reaction to reflection and concentrate on utilizing what we have learned to proceed for a tactical plan for the future. As academics in higher education, we have the skills and training to empirically examine pathways to improvement.

Despite our skills as researchers, there appears to be little empirical evidence to guide us in the move from classroom-based teaching to technology-delivered content. In part, we are victims of our own diligent concentration on basic research aimed at adding to the body of knowledge in our respective disciplines and discouraging the most skilled quantitative researchers from applying their skills on the research areas related to pedagogy and teaching effectiveness. Our highest tier journals seem to have little to no interest in methods for successful teaching. The inevitable result is that in the moment of *sine qua non*, the unavoidable response to the pandemic shutdowns was to rely on extensively antidotal “best practices” for online learning without empirical testing and top tier peer review scrutiny.

Across the United States, even the more revered institutions have provided online content or recommendations to faculty regarding the development of online content. A review of more than 100

websites found a lack of discipline specific recommendations and “best practices” that were typically not traced back to a rigorous empirical validation. The vast majority of the advice comes from scholars in the fields of Psychology, Sociology, English, and Education. Only rarely were references to publications in peer-reviewed journals provided. Furthermore, there was an underlying presumption that the purveying of knowledge and content can fit a standardized, uniform online template that will ensure universal success. Very little to no academic attention has addressed differences in disciplines. The implication appears to be that the same skills and delivery methods are equally applicable across all disciplines and content areas (e.g. that teaching literature is the same as teaching accounting). Suggestions that the advice may not be applicable to all disciplines will typically come in a side comment such as a suggestion that statistics or finance might benefit from problem solving. The advice often includes a recommendation to poll the students and ask them how they want to be taught. This may accompany a recommendation to alter the course and content to please the students or to customize the course for individual students that allows them to choose their own methods of being taught or assessed. While this may have been a triage method for accommodating a rapid conversion from face-to-face to online, triage is not meant to replace long term care.

The purpose of this paper is to address the advice provided by “best practices” for online learning with input from students regarding influences on their learning. These respondents come from a number of academic fields, including accounting, other business disciplines and non-business disciplines. Furthermore, the researchers provide qualitative insight gathered by six years of observation in online delivery of business classes for large, successful online programs in the United States. This study provides recommendations and conclusions that directly address the delivery of accounting knowledge and concepts delivered remotely.

Educational “Best Practices” for Online Learning

The development of higher education teaching best practices using online delivery appears to draw heavily from respected publications in teaching and learning in general. The degree to which traditional classroom methods are applicable to the online setting have not always been rigorously or empirically validated. Furthermore, the literature on “best practices” seems to have an underlying assumption that the accepted best practices are universal in application across all academic disciplines. Such an assumption could be erroneous and misleading.

The early efforts to develop best practices draw heavily on the previous works from Chickering and Gamson (1987). Their book, *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*, provide the tenants on which much of the foundation for appropriate online teaching has been formed. They carefully stated that their recommendations “seem like good common sense” and indicated that they are based on 50 years of research on the way teachers teach and students learn. Unfortunately, the article does not directly state what scholarly research was used and how it was applied in this heavily referenced article. They do state that it is not intended for their recommendations to be a set of “ten commandments”.

It appears that the seven bullet points of recommendations in this four-page article have become the guiding principles for many universities. A search of universities endorsing the principles quickly rose to more than 100 institutions directly providing the entire set of principles, or some subset, as the primary source of information for developing online course content. While these principles have been created for an undergraduate audience, they are often applied to all programs offered online. Applicability to the *professional fields of study* lacks empirical validation on a discipline-by-discipline basis.

The concepts provided in the book promote the utilization of seven principles that encourage student learning. The principles provided by Chickering and Gamson as good practices for undergraduate education include:

1. Contact between students and faculty
2. Reciprocity and cooperation among students
3. Active learning
4. Prompt feedback
5. Time on task
6. High expectations
7. Respect for diverse talents and ways of learning

The purpose of this article is not to attempt to discredit or even disservice the concepts of the original article, but rather, to bring to the conversation that there is no one right way to be effective teachers and that best pedagogical practices may vary by discipline. Additionally, the hope of the authors is that each discipline will take ownership of developing a broader understanding of how their discipline may have different challenges or opportunities. Educators in each discipline should take responsibility for understanding those differences. Over time, it appears that some of the concepts have been lost in the translation of the concepts to alternative learning environments, particularly online learning. The good practices for undergraduate education have been used by some educational support companies and universities to justify boilerplate or standardized best practices for all online learning, giving little room for considering different ways of learning.

Despite a lack of empirical tests of these assumptions, the concepts in the book moved from “good practices” to “best practices” for undergraduate education in the application of the concept in academic practice. “These guidelines represent a philosophy of quality education that has been widely used and accepted for both face-to-face courses and online learning” and in both undergraduate and

graduate education (Baldwin & Trespalacios, 2017). Unfortunately, the acceptance of these principles may not translate into effectiveness for online learning.

In the transition from good to best practices and face-to-face to online, the vast majority of the available materials come from the fields of education, literature, psychology, library science and sociology.

Contact between Students and Faculty

The principle of encouraging contact and interaction between students and faculty members was explained as follows:

Frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important in student motivation and involvement. Faculty concern helps students get through rough times and keep on working. Knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans (Chickering, 1987).

The explanation for this recommendation is related directly to the student's well-being and motivation. Clearly, there are valuable outcomes from students making a connection with one or more faculty mentors to provide them with support. However, simply adding assignments is not the suggestion here.

This concept has been extrapolated into the online environment, with recommendations for the faculty to engage the students. The guidelines, or even policies, are often provided to the faculty creating online classes including specific recommendations, such as using all types of interactions, keeping students on topic in discussion forums, and asking students for feedback about the course on a regular basis and revising content as needed. (Pasadena City College, 2020).

Variations of these recommendations are common on a number of university websites that were designed to help traditional faculty prepare for online delivery due to COVID 19. Recommended means for communication with students have included email, forums, discussion boards, phone calls,

Zoom and Skype meetings, and social media such as Twitter and Instagram. Some recommendations have suggested that an instructor should go to the place where the student is present. “The importance of the faculty member being there and being mentally present with the students” (O'Malley, 2017) cannot be understated. Online classes are successful when the instructor cultivates caring, positive relationships with students (Whitten et al., 2017). As a result, the student's sense of belonging may be enhanced and persistence improved (Whitten et al., 2017). These recommendations seem to imply that all methods of communication work equally well in all online classes across all disciplines.

Reciprocity and Cooperation among Students

The principle of encouraging contact and interaction between students and faculty members was explained as follows:

Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated. Working with others often increases involvement in learning. Sharing one's own ideas and responding to others' reactions sharpens thinking and deepens understanding (Chickering, 1996).

The explanation for this recommendation is related directly to the enhancement of student's learning which may be derived from social sharing. The benefit to having a shared learning experience is based on the idea that the collaborative sharing of ideas leads to deeper understanding.

In an online environment, the recommendation is for faculty to create peer-to-peer environments. As before, the guidelines and/or policies, are often provided to the faculty creating online classes including specific recommendations, such as using “all types” of interactions, having weekly, or even daily, assignments requiring peer interactions, using discussion boards, and providing an open forum for questions regarding course assignments (Pasadena City College, 2020). Some methods for implementation that are recommended are student online introductions, personal interviews of other students, group projects and study groups. Petroschius (2004) recommended study groups because

students “often benefit from the explanation of a concept that can be provided by another student.”

However, no empirical research supported the suggested benefit or addressed the concern that students may be misdirected with inaccurate information from an untrained peer leading to a larger scale misunderstanding of complex problems. While group projects are often recommended, the “best practice” recommendation does not appear to address appropriate methodology for facilitating group rules, project requirements, and the management of freeloaders, which may be more pronounced in large online classes.

Active Learning Techniques

The active learning principle was explained as a good practice as follows:

Learning is not a spectator sport. Students do not learn much just by sitting in classes listening to teachers, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. They must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves (Chickering, 1996).

The explanation for this recommendation is clearly defined in terms of a traditional classroom setting and is specific to conceptual material. Even so, the concept is applicable in a wide range of applications when the definition of active learning is expanded from “write about it” to include experimentation, problem solving, and computations.

In an online environment, the recommendation has been extrapolated in a number of ways, with the guidelines and/or policies, including a variety of “active” techniques, such as opinion polling on Zoom, Think-Pair-Share application discussions, and reflective minute papers (Columbia Center for Teaching and Learning, 2020). The descriptions of the concepts are fairly specific to conceptual classes and seem to not provide recommendations for classes based around quantitative reasoning. Educators of complex quantitative and scientific concepts tend to receive little guidance by “online best practices” on methods for the development of an online science laboratory environment or quantitative analysis.

Fortunately, when the experts in their own fields are given the latitude to customize their courses outside of a standardized course template of required activities, these scholars have developed and/or used virtual labs, complex critical-thinking simulations, and computer-based quantitative problem-solving applications. It appears that many of the approaches applying active learning typically ignore “best practices” for online learning.

Prompt Feedback

The explanation of the prompt feedback principle was:

Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Students need appropriate feedback on performance to benefit from courses. When getting started, students need help in assessing existing knowledge and competence. In classes, students need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement (Chickering, 1996).

The explanation for this recommendation establishes the value for students to be able to correct any misunderstanding of the content throughout the course. Carefully monitoring discussion boards and directing the conversation can be a method of providing feedback (Watson et al., 2017).

In an online environment, the concept has been relatively unchanged in implementation. Prompt feedback online is often assumed to be the same as the traditional classroom with recommendations for implementation online. Unfortunately, this may not be appropriate. While students desire “feedback and grades to students asap” (Watson et al., 2017), current students are mostly from a culture of sharing (Albers & Knotts 2019). This propensity to engage in peer-to-peer “sharing” creates a unique online challenge. Many current students have developed an educational expectation that class peers can and will legitimately exchange information regarding a course. This “sharing” extends to the exchanges of exam content, correct answers on exams and homework, and purchase of professionally written papers. Naturally, this is not a problem unique to online learning, but

best practices, as a body of literature on effective learning, do not fully address the challenges of cheating which can be exacerbated by “prompt feedback.” The intended learning cannot take place when submission of assessment is a result of another. The classroom imposition of a person watching the exam in progress is not as simple online.

Online methods of preventing oversharing are critical to effective assessment. There are a large number of assessment tools available to deter sharing and to determine the degree of originality of work, but these may be undermined if feedback is overly prompt. Asynchronous testing, windows of submission of original works, and uncontrolled social media exchanges all create a need for considering the appropriate time to provide feedback. Feedback that is provided during the window of availability for tests, homework, and other assessments, facilitates the sharing of correct answers for graded work.

Time on Task

The principle of time on task was explained as follows:

Time plus energy equals learning. There is no substitute for time on task. Learning to use one's time well is critical for students and professionals alike. Students need help in learning effective time management. Allocating realistic amounts of time means effective learning for students and effective teaching for faculty. How an institution defines time expectations for students, faculty, administrators, and other professional staff can establish the basis for high performance for all (Chickering, 1996).

It is not surprising that a recommendation for good time management skills is a good practice. In a traditional academic environment, it is common for universities to have student success centers, counselors, and advisers available to recommend effective time management skills to students.

However, communication about appropriate time management and expectations for time commitment do not receive emphasis in best practices for online learning. This is unfortunate because students taking online classes for the first time may be underprepared for the necessary time

commitment for being successful. This can be compounded if a student is taking an accelerated version of course, which is typical in summer and in some online programs. The misperception is not isolated to online classes; some students are unwilling or unable to commit the out of class time to course work as recommended by conventional wisdom (2 to 3 hours per credit hour per week for undergraduate students in a traditional long semester). Students often fail to consider that hours that would have been spent in a classroom must now be added to the expectation (e.g. 3 to 4 hours per credit hour per week for a long semester). If the student is enrolled in a 3 semester credit hour online course, the time commitment is 9 to 12 hours per week. If the course is offered in a shortened time frame, such as a 7 to 8 week accelerated course or a 4 to 5 week summer session, the hours of commitment increase. A 7 to 8 week accelerated course would require 18 to 24 hours per week. A 5 week summer class would require 27 to 36 hours per week. A 4 week summer course would require 36 to 48 hours per week. Students in online classes can benefit from explicit communication about time commitment, which is absent from online best practices.

High Expectations

High expectations as an important principle for undergraduate learning is defined as follows:

Expect more and you will get more. High expectations are important for everyone, for the poorly prepared, for those unwilling to exert themselves, and for the bright and well-motivated. Expecting students to perform well becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy when teachers and institutions hold high expectations of themselves and make extra efforts (Chickering, 1996).

It is a positive recommendation to set high expectations in traditional undergraduate learning. Students do not always arrive from high school with high expectations for their own potential achievement.

This is another area where the best practices for traditional students may have been overlooked in the online recommendations for best practices. The proliferation of commercialized degree programs has not set a high bar for success. Many students often misunderstand the differences in expectations for success across courses offered from open courseware, unaccredited for-profit institutions, and regional and program accredited universities. Therefore, it is imperative for students to understand the value of striving to be successful in a rigorous environment.

Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning

The principle of diversity in talents and learning is described as:

There are many roads to learning. People bring different talents and styles of learning to college. Brilliant students in the seminar room may be all thumbs in the lab or art studio. Students rich in hands-on experience may not do so well with theory. Students need the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work for them. Then they can be pushed to learning in new ways that do not come so easily (Chickering, 1996).

The good practices for traditional classrooms recognize a variety of ways for demonstrating success across a range of disciplines. The foundation of this concept is that some students will have natural abilities that are not shared by all. In a traditional learning environment, once students complete a core of general education classes, students are allowed to choose a major that aligns with the skills they wish to perfect. In doing so, the students must learn to achieve using the skills necessary for that discipline and/or career choice. An engineer is not excused from learning higher mathematics because he/she is naturally more conceptual than quantitative. Once a student chooses a degree pathway, the student must either learn to excel in the required areas or consider other degree plans.

Online best practices can often be driven by course templates, mandatory weekly assignments, standardized exams schedules, etc. regardless of the academic level of the course or the discipline. There may be little to no flexibility beyond the cookie cutter template. Few recommendations regarding

alternative learning expectations for online best practices seem to exist. When there are recommendations, they tend to focus on allowing a student alternative methods for synchronous lectures. “Backchannel communication is a secondary conversation that takes place at the same time as a conference session, lecture, or instructor-led learning activity. This might involve students using a chat tool or Twitter to discuss a lecture as it is happening, and these background conversations are increasingly being brought into the foreground of lecture interaction” (Educause Learning Initiative, 2010). What appears to be typically absent from the recommendations is a consideration if all recommendations are appropriate for all disciplines.

The Myth of Online Best Practices

The purpose of this research is to examine the student perspective on the desirability of standardized online “best practices” for facilitating their learning based on discipline. Specifically, this research examines the degree to which postulated online best practices are appropriate for accounting majors.

Hypotheses

The literature on best practices gives rise to several questions regarding guidance for online course development and delivery in accounting. In addition to the rise in demand for more online courses, the recent pandemic has created a new pressure to prepare our classes for the unfortunate possibility that one or more of our students may be absent from class for an extended period of time. If we look to the good practices for traditional undergraduate classes as a structure for this discussion, it is immediately apparent that we should expect that students in different disciplines may have different pedagogical needs and desires. Our hypotheses are structured around the first two good practices that are commonly recommended for online learning.

The first good practice recommends an established method of contact between faculty and students. In the extrapolation of this concept to online, the recommendations have included the

suggestions that the sharing of personal and professional characteristics of the professor will be desired by online students. It is conceivable that this recommendation is not unilateral and that students in some disciplines may desire less personal sharing. The manner in which a professor might share could include personal life (photos of family, zoom sessions with pets, etc.), professional experiences (previous work history and earn credentials, such as a CPA), and course related sharing (such as course content and research related to the course subject). We hypothesize that:

H₁: In general, Accounting majors will desire less professor sharing than students in non-business majors.

H_{1a}: Accounting majors will desire less professor sharing about their personal lives than students in non-business majors.

H_{1b}: Accounting majors will desire more professor sharing about their professional lives than students in non-business majors.

H_{1c}: Accounting majors will desire more professor sharing about their course related activities than students in non-business majors.

H_{2a}: Accounting majors will find less personal means of contact (such as email and LMS messages) more desirable than students in non-business majors

H_{2b}: Accounting majors will find more personal means of contact (such as personal text message and twitter messages) less desirable than students in non-business majors

H₃: Accounting majors will find recorded faculty lectures more desirable than students in non-business majors.

H₄: Accounting majors will find supplemental videos in course content areas (such as YouTube viewing assignments) more desirable than students in non-business majors.

H₅: Accounting majors will find electronic office hours (such as Zoom meetings) less desirable than students in non-business majors.

A second good practice recommends an established level of cooperation and exchanges between peers. Establishing student-to-student engagement is suggested as an aid to student learning. One method that has been recommended is the development of procedures that allow students to work together to study and prepare for course work. It is possible that student study groups may be more effective in conceptual courses and students in more applied or quantitative courses may prefer different methods for learning content. We hypothesize that:

H₆: Accounting majors find study groups less desirable than students in non-business majors.

H₇: Accounting majors find individual homework problems more desirable than students in non-business majors.

H₈: Accounting majors find textbook reading assignments more desirable than students in non-business majors.

H₉: Accounting majors find supplemental reading assignments more desirable than students in non-business majors.

H₁₀: Accounting majors find detailed written instructions more desirable than students in non-business majors.

Results

The data for this study were collected using an online survey of a panel of current students and recent graduates. The survey produced 95 usable responses. The respondents consisted of 31 accounting majors and 64 majors in the traditional areas of arts and sciences. The average age of respondents was 27 years old. The respondents were 68 percent female and self-reported a GPA of 3.4. The respondents attend or attended universities around the US with many states represented. About half of the respondents prefer online classes.

The respondents demonstrated differences between disciplines in the area of faculty sharing. In general, accounting majors desired less faculty sharing than non-business majors. This result was

significant at the 0.01 level. Specifically, accounting majors desire much less personal sharing by a faculty member (significant at the 0.01 level) and somewhat less sharing about professional experiences (but not a level of significance). All students in the survey desired some level of sharing regarding course content related material, such as the faculty's research.

Hypotheses were tested using t-test comparisons for differences between group means.

Table 1: Desire for Faculty Sharing

	Accounting	Not Business	P-value
N	31	64	
Sharing	2.19	3.22	<0.001
Course	0.48	0.45	n.s.
Professional	0.71	0.83	<0.10
Personal	0.65	0.89	<0.001

Accounting majors were only partially different in their preferred method of communication. Most students, regardless of discipline preferred email as the appropriate method of contact. Accounting majors were less likely to prefer to be contacted within the Learning Management System (significant at the 0.05 level). They were more likely than non-business majors to desire personal text messages from their professors (but not a level of significance). Universally, students did not want to be contacted on Twitter.

Table 2: Preferred Method of Communication

	Accounting	Not Business	P-value
N	32	64	
Email	0.58	0.48	n.s.
LMS	0.19	0.44	<0.05
Twitter	0.03	0.00	n.s.
Text Msg	0.38	0.21	n.s.

Accounting majors were expected to be more accepting on non-personal methods of receiving instruction. To some extent, this was true. Accounting students preferred prerecorded lectures

(significant at the 0.01 level) and supplemental instructions, such as YouTube videos (significant at the 0.01 level) than non-business majors. Both accounting majors and non-business majors reported a desire for synchronous office hours with the faculty member (no significant difference).

Table 3: Preferred Course Delivery

	Accounting	Not Business	P-value
N	32	64	
Professor E-Lectures	1.84	1.45	<0.01
YouTube	1.32	0.91	<0.01
Zoom Office	1.20	1.25	n.s.

These findings provide mixed results with support for some of the hypotheses.

- H₁: In general, Accounting majors will desire less professor sharing than students in non-business majors. (supported)
- H_{1a}: Accounting majors will desire less professor sharing about their personal lives than students in non-business majors. (supported)
- H_{1b}: Accounting majors will desire more professor sharing about their professional lives than students in non-business majors. (not supported)
- H_{1c}: Accounting majors will desire more professor sharing about their course related activities than students in non-business majors. (not supported)
- H_{2a}: Accounting majors will find less personal means of contact (such as email and LMS messages) more desirable than students in non-business majors (not supported)
- H_{2b}: Accounting majors will find more personal means of contact (such as personal text message and twitter messages) less desirable than students in non-business majors (not supported)
- H₃: Accounting majors will find recorded faculty lectures more desirable than students in non-business majors. (supported)

- H₄: Accounting majors will find supplemental videos in course content areas (such as YouTube viewing assignments) more desirable than students in non-business majors. (supported)
- H₅: Accounting majors will find electronic office hours (such as Zoom meetings) less desirable than students in non-business majors. (not supported)

A second area of consideration examined peer-to-peer engagement. Accounting students were expected to desire less peer-to-peer experiences and desire more individual methods of learning. Accounting majors reported a stronger desire for individual learning, including textbook assignments (significant at the 0.05 level), homework (significant at the 0.01 level), supplemental readings (significant at the 0.05 level), and written detailed instruction (significant at the 0.01 level). The desire to have study groups was in the opposite direction hypothesized with accounting majors preferring group work more.

Table 4: Group versus Individual Learning

	Accounting	Not Business	P-value
N	32	64	
Textbook	1.68	1.41	<0.05
Homework	1.76	0.89	<0.001
Supplemental Readings	1.68	1.34	<0.05
Detailed Instructions	1.64	0.65	<0.001
Study Group	0.83	0.41	<0.01

These findings provide partial support for the hypotheses.

- H₆: Accounting majors find study groups less desirable than students in non-business majors. (not supported)
- H₇: Accounting majors find individual homework problems more desirable than students in non-business majors. (supported)

- H₈: Accounting majors find textbook reading assignments more desirable than students in non-business majors. (supported)
- H₉: Accounting majors find supplemental reading assignments more desirable than students in non-business majors. (supported)
- H₁₀: Accounting majors find detailed written instructions more desirable than students in non-business majors. (supported)

Conclusions, Recommendations and Limitations

These findings provide insight into methods for better online classes for accounting students. The best practices often attributed to successful online learning may be less applicable than they are to courses in the arts and sciences. The extension of good practices for traditional undergraduate students to best practices for all online classes may be limited in foresight. Online classes should consider what is best in the online environment that appears to deviate from traditional face-to-face classes.

The results from this study should be considered tentative. The study is limited by a relatively small sample size and simple t-test comparisons of accounting majors to a diverse group of arts and science majors. Future research should look at more specific comparisons, including other business majors. Additional comparisons might explore comparisons between public and private institutions.

References

- Albers, Nancy D., and Tami L. Knotts (2019), Cultural influences on academic sharing: A challenge to academic honesty. In J. Keengwe, & K. Kungu (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Cross-Cultural Online Learning in Higher Education*, Chapter 12 (pp. 230-252).
- Baldwin, Sally J., & Trespalacios Jesús (2017). Evaluation instruments and good practices in online education. *Online Learning*.
- Chickering, A. a. (1996, October). Implementing the seven principles. *AAHE Bulletin*.
- Chickering, A. and Zelda F. Gamson (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bullitin*, 3 - 7.
- Columbia Center for Teaching and Learning. (2020, August 16). *Active learning for your online class*. Retrieved from Columbia University: <https://ctl.columbia.edu/resources-and-technology/teaching-with-technology/teaching-online/active-learning/>
- Educause Learning Initiative. (2010). *7 things you should know*.
- O'Malley, Sharon. (2017, July 12). *Effective teaching online*. Retrieved from Inside Higher Ed: <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2017/07/12/7-guidelines-effective-teaching-online>
- Pasadena City College. (2020, August 16). *Faculty handbook*. Retrieved from Pasadena.edu: <https://pasadena.edu/academics/pcc-online/faculty/handbook/course-quality-and-standards.php>
- Petroshius, Susan (2004, Fall). Impementing the seven principles for good practice in education: Leveraging human touch to develop reciprocity and cooperation among students. *Marketing Management Association Proceedings*, pp. 120-121.

Watson, Firm, Marianne Caston Bishop, Debra Ferdinand-James. (2017). Instructional strategies to help online students learn: Feedback from online students. *TechTrends*, 420-427.

Whitten, D., James, A., & Roberts, C. (2017). Factors that contribute to a sense of belonging in business Students on a small 4-Year public commuter campus. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, Practice*, 99-117.