

# COMMUNICATING WITH THE ONLINE STUDENT: THE IMPACT OF E-MAIL TONE ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND TEACHER EVALUATIONS

Amber Dickinson, Oklahoma State University

---

## ABSTRACT

*Students are more commonly completing coursework online and as such many professors teach online courses. Due to the popularity of online courses and the need for professors to teach in a format varying from the traditional classroom setting, it is important to evaluate whether or not certain teaching approaches, such as establishing rapport, should be altered to accommodate the needs of the online student. While previous research has given some consideration to the importance of verbal immediacy in the online classroom, this research seeks to fill a gap in the online teacher immediacy literature by looking more specifically at instructor tone. Through a two-semester evaluation of online courses, it is evident consideration must be given to teachers establishing a rapport with online students. After evaluating e-mail communication with students and examining student success rates and teaching evaluation data, there is a connection between e-mail tone and student performance in an online class.*

*Keywords: professor-student communication, verbal immediacy, professor-student rapport*

## INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, college students attend classes in person and on campus to achieve academic success. Attending classes regularly and engaging in face-to-face interaction with professors and peers has been the norm for a student attending university. However, this traditional college experience is changing in favor of a computer-oriented education in which students learn from their homes or offices and perhaps never see the faces of their instructor or fellow students (Stone & Perumean-Chaney, 2011). Online course offerings are gaining popularity in higher education. Over 69% of universities in the United States report online offerings are a large part of their long-term educational plans, and over 6.7 million students reported taking at least one online course during a semester (Allen & Seaman, 2010). Through online venues students have access to courses otherwise unavailable to them due to time, geographic, and/or accessibility

constraints. Online courses are becoming a staple for institutions of higher learning and it is therefore important to examine the nuances of distance education, including specific choices made by a professor teaching an online course.

When considering online courses, it is important to know whether traditional classroom instructional methods are effective in an online educational setting. Each individual instructor develops his or her own preferred manner of teaching in the traditional classroom. Some prefer a relaxed style in which classrooms are run organically and without much of a structured plan. Others prefer to operate following a premeditated plan for the day, and may tend to be stricter when dealing with students. While I personally prefer a more laid-back, discussion-oriented classroom, I tend to be strict when teaching in a traditional face-to-face classroom setting.

My in-person introductory courses have around

400 students in each section and I cannot afford to be lax on the rules. I do not allow late work or make-up exams. I have little tolerance for students who do not read the syllabus or instructions before asking questions in which the answer may be found in the syllabus or instructions. The use of cell phones or talking with other students is prohibited, and students are reprimanded when these rules are violated. When I began teaching online a few years ago, I found out quickly the same strict adherence to rules, penchant for firm deadlines, and assuming students would be self-sufficient in terms of answering their own questions regarding course procedures made teaching an online course very difficult. Students did not respond well to the strict adherence to deadlines and my unwillingness to accept late work or answer basic questions, even if the information was readily available to them in online modules. I found these negative reactions to go well beyond the normal grumbles one hears from students in a traditional large classroom.

Something about the online student and what they needed from me as an instructor was very different from what the traditional classroom student needed. As a result I began to reflect on my online teaching methods, including my verbal immediacy behavior. Immediacy behavior refers to both the verbal and nonverbal things teachers do to reduce the psychological distance between people, such as using humor or citing personal examples, while nonverbal cues include making eye contact, smiling, and nodding your head (Anderson, Anderson, and Jenson 1979; Arbaugh, 2001; Baker, 2004; Gorham, 1988; Sung & Mayer, 2012). When thinking about my own verbal immediacy behaviors, I thought about the things I was saying and how the signals I was sending when communicating could have impacted my online students. More specifically, I was considering the rapport I was building with students through the tone of my correspondence.

Upon reflection, I realized my communication style was being interpreted negatively and my verbal immediacy behaviors were having a harmful impact on students. Was I composing messages to students in a way that was somehow failing to break down the psychological distance between professor and student? To address this situation, I began to make changes in the way I constructed e-mail communications. Primarily, I began to add

personal touches to e-mail announcements and made efforts to write in a friendly and welcoming tone to establish better rapport with students. The result was an overwhelmingly positive response from students, with students telling me they felt I was helping them succeed.

I made few exceptions to due dates or missed tests. For example, students were only allowed to submit late work or reschedule a test when they had documentation (doctor's note, etc.) explaining why they were not able to take the test or turn in the assignment as scheduled, which is no different than the traditional classroom policy. I never bent the rules simply because a student asked me to. My grading habits did not change, as I was using identical rubrics for the same assignments from semester to semester. I was not in any way changing my strict policy, but something was happening in my communication efforts with students to make them feel better. There was no change in the content of the course or the way the course was run, but there was a change in the tone I was using and the rapport I was building with students by considering the way I communicated with them. Therefore, I became curious to discover if this was translating into higher levels of course success rates for students enrolled in my online class. Furthermore, I wanted to find out if a positive change in my tone translated to higher ratings on my teaching evaluations.

This research attempts to draw and expand upon online learning and immediacy behavior research by looking for a connection between e-mail tone and a positive change in student success rates and teacher evaluations. While previous research has primarily used student survey data to gauge online learning and student satisfaction in relation to teacher immediacy, this research offers a unique examination of this theory through a two-semester course comparison. Furthermore, the immediacy behavior literature has focused on verbal and nonverbal communication, but it has not necessarily examined this area by looking at professor tone. This research should add the knowledge we have to date regarding immediacy behavior and its impact on online student learning.

## **ONLINE COURSES**

In order to keep up with the demand for accessible and convenient courses, many colleges

and universities are offering a wide-variety of classes online (Stone & Perumean-Chaney, 2011). Online courses are comprised of computer-based learning tools that students use to engage in a virtual classroom setting. Students enrolled in online classes purposefully elect to take them because there is something about their life that makes attending classes in a traditional setting difficult or impractical (Keengwe & Kidd, 2010). Online courses do not require students to meet as a group on a regular basis, but instead they allow the flexibility and freedom for students to learn at their own pace in the environment most convenient for the demands of their schedules (Stone & Perumean-Chaney, 2011). Students in online courses are expected to learn in a self-directed manner (Keengwe & Kidd, 2010). While instructors must provide material to students in order to facilitate learning, online courses demand the student take on a more prominent role when learning material and completing course expectations. Teaching an online course differs significantly from teaching a traditional introductory course, and this depends largely on the choices the professor of the course makes.

### ONLINE INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

One of the most common mistakes an online instructor makes is to try to mimic the teaching methods used in the traditional classroom setting (Grant & Thornton, 2007). Teaching online requires an emphasis on a different instructional skill set that stresses building connections with students enrolled in the course (Arbaugh, 2001; Boling, Hough, Krinsky, Saleem, & Stevens, 2012). The social online presence—how connected a student feels to the course—is crucial to an online learning community (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997; Sung & Mayer, 2012). Online instructors are responsible for the difficult job of creating an engaging learning environment for online students in order to promote positive learning outcomes and aid in student success. They must pay attention to promoting positive verbal teaching immediacy behaviors to help students feel connected to their online community (Sung & Mayer, 2012). In some cases, this can prove to be more difficult than teaching an in-person course because it is hard for students to get a sense of the instructor's personality and teaching style through online communication.

Effective online instructors must go beyond simply providing information; they must engage online learners and encourage interaction between students (Palloff & Pratt, 2005). When examining the successful implementation of online courses, Bailey and Card found that when material was presented in an organized manner, instructors conveyed an interest in helping students learn, and students were engaged through e-mail and discussion boards, an online course appeared to be as effective as a traditional course taught in a classroom setting (2009). While the design of the course is very important, what appears to be more significant is building an online community where students feel supported and connected to peers and instructors (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997). Teaching students online goes beyond effectively presenting the course material to requiring instructors to find ways to develop a welcoming and supportive online atmosphere (Arbaugh, 2001). This means online instructors may need to employ tactics significantly different from their traditional classroom teaching methods.

In response to a survey regarding online course satisfaction, students claimed to be most satisfied with an online course when staff and student contact was encouraged, students felt welcomed to the course, and instructors had an established online presence (Grant & Thornton, 2007; McKerlich, Riis, Anderson, & Eastman, 2011). A positive social environment is a mandatory component to promoting success in an online course (Coppola, Hiltz, & Rotter, 2002). While it is not uncommon for professors in a traditional classroom setting to make students feel welcomed and comfortable, it takes a different type of effort to ensure students in an online setting feel a connection to their professor (Grant & Thornton, 2007). Face-to-face interaction is much easier than online communication for students to interpret. For example, information administered directly from a professor to a student in a traditional classroom could be misinterpreted when sent in the form of an e-mail. A professor in a classroom may provide succinct instructions that students understand and appreciate, but a short e-mail from a professor may be interpreted as cold or uncaring. E-mail interactions are more likely to be perceived as impersonal because facial expressions, vocal inflections, and body language are not available to

help the recipient interpret the tone of the message (Woods, 2002). As such, it is vitally important that an online professor be mindful of the way e-mails and other course communications are constructed.

One of the most difficult hurdles an online instructor must overcome is the potential for e-mails, discussion posts, and announcements to come off as cold or impersonal (Boling, et al., 2012). It is easy for students to misinterpret the meaning of an instructor's e-mail. For example, an e-mail designed to be concise and to the point may be interpreted by a student as short-tempered or unsympathetic. A friendly, welcoming, and social environment is important to the success of an online student (Coppola, Hiltz, & Rotter, 2002). Therefore, the online instructor must go out of his or her way to generate communication designed to help the online student feel comfortable, safe, and welcome in a virtual classroom (Grant & Thornton, 2007). While this may require some instructors to step outside of their comfort zone and engage students in a more personal manner, it is mandatory in order to support online student success. A professor can establish a rapport with online students through e-mail communication.

#### **RAPPORT IN THE TRADITIONAL CLASSROOM VS. THE VIRTUAL CLASSROOM**

Students in a traditional classroom setting respond positively to professors who treat them with dignity and seem approachable, even if those professors are more formal in their speech and demeanor (Bain 2004; Wilson, Ryan, & Pugh, 2010). They make judgements regarding how approachable their instructors might be by evaluating both verbal and nonverbal cues (Arbaugh, 2001; Baker, 2004; Gorham, 1988), such as body language, hand gestures, and facial cues like smiles. This is in conjunction with the way the professor verbally addresses students to show how accessible he or she may be or how invested the instructor is in the students' success (Wilson, Ryan, & Pugh, 2010). Because students in traditional courses have the opportunity to interact face-to-face with professors and professors have the opportunity to use both verbal and nonverbal cues to establish rapport, it tends to be easier to establish a positive communication style with students. In fact, a positive rapport can be established within minutes of the first classroom

encounter in traditional settings, whereas it is more difficult for online instructors to establish a rapport with students (Jones, Warren, & Robertson, 2009).

Online instructors who make their presence known, provide detailed information about the class, and offer timely feedback are often the most successful in terms of student satisfaction and performance (Deubel, 2003; Jones, Warren, & Robertson, 2009). There is an abundance of literature emphasizing the importance of course structure and curriculum design, but very little commenting on the importance of rapport between professors and students in online courses. This study begins to examine the importance of tone when communicating with students participating in online coursework. The goal of this research is to prove the importance of a professor's e-mail tone in connection with student success, as evidenced by a two-semester evaluation of e-mail content analysis, student success rates, and teaching evaluations.

#### **DATA AND METHODS**

I analyzed the language of e-mails for tone, evaluated student success rates, and examined teaching evaluation data across two consecutive semesters. I looked for differences in the rates of student success between the two semesters in comparison to e-mail tone to find out if there were changes in the way students rated the teacher's performance in the classroom. From one semester to the next, I changed my tone in e-mail communications by adopting a more social, friendly, and personal tone in e-mails and announcements. Therefore, the change in e-mail tone should reflect a higher rate of student success between the two semesters, and teaching evaluations should reflect a more positive critique of the professor.

For each semester included in this study I was careful to ensure all course assessments remained the same. All quizzes, homework assignments, exams, and power point presentations were unaltered for the semesters examined in this study. There were no changes made to the syllabus (aside from changing the date to reflect the current semester) or any other type of course handout presented to students. I did not change the visual appearance of the online course, nor did I add any new videos or other multimedia effects to the course. I did not alter the way assignments were graded, as ensured by the strict adherence to



rubrics. This was done to ensure changes in student success rates and/or teacher evaluations could not be attributed to changes in material, course design, or grading practices, but instead could be connected to the manner in which I addressed students.

Student demographic information found in Table 1 shows there are no major differences that could account for an increase in success rates or more positive teaching evaluations. There were 68 students in semester one and 72 in semester two. Because course content was identical, student demographics were so similar, and enrollment numbers were close, I feel confident claiming a connection between change in tone of communication and success rates and teaching evaluations.

Table 1: Student Demographics

Demographic	Semester 1	Semester 2
Gender		
Male	22	23
Female	46	49
Age		
18-20	28	27
21-23	21	21
24-26	5	6
27-29	9	10
30 and above	5	8
Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian	49	50
Black/African American	2	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0
American Indian/Alaskan Native	9	6
Hispanic/Latino	2	5
Multiple Ethnicities	5	5
Unknown/Refuse	1	4

## ANALYSIS OF E-MAILS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The primary way I communicate with students in online courses is by posting an announcement for all students to see. When an announcement is posted, an e-mail containing the announcement information is immediately sent to all students enrolled in the course. The content of the announcement is not changed when it is sent out in e-mail form. Therefore, in this discussion of the findings, e-mails and announcements are one in the

same. Table 2 displays the number of e-mails sent out to students enrolled in the online course during each of the semesters being examined in this study.

Table 2: Subject and Frequency of E-mails/Announcements

Semester	Power Points	Exams	Quizzes	Homework	Total
1	5	11	2	5	23
2	6	12	3	5	26

As evidenced in the table, the amount of communication students received from me did not significantly change. The only reason there was a difference in the number of e-mails sent was due to circumstances beyond my control. For example, in the second semester we experienced issues with Blackboard and I needed to move the date of a test. However, the difference in the number of e-mails sent to the class was so small I do not believe it was great enough to impact the overall findings of the study. The number of personal e-mails sent directly from me to individual students in the class did not change considerably from semester one to semester two. In semester two, I sent four more e-mails in response to student inquiries than I did in the first semester. Therefore, I feel confident the change in success rates can be attributed to the e-mail announcements sent to the entire class as opposed to the number of e-mails I sent directly to individual students in response to their questions.

The most deliberate change in e-mail communication came in the form of personal touches to e-mails, which consisted of information meant to encourage the students and make them feel comfortable in the course. For example, I included content to offer general encouragement by saying things such as “don’t give up, the semester is almost over and your hard work will pay off,” or reminding students I was happy to help them in any way. In the first semester of the study this type of content was not included in e-mail messages. More examples of e-mails from both semesters may be found in the Appendix, and they reflect the overall types of changes made across the semesters.

In semester one of the study, the e-mail tone was very formal. The signature line in all communications read “Respectfully, Dr. (my last name).” I did not post a biography of myself and

I did not encourage students to share something about themselves. I wished students “good luck” a total of two times over the course of the entire semester, and not once did I sent e-mails or post announcements for the sole purpose of offering encouragement on tasks or the semester in general. The majority of e-mails students received from me in semester one dealt primarily with exams or other tasks associated with the course. The actual tone of these e-mails is strict, to the point, and did not do much in the way of encouraging an open line of communication between student and professor.

For example, when explaining homework expectations, I wrote, “I will not accept homework that is e-mailed to me,” and “do not ask me to explain the homework if you have not read the current chapter.” I did not explain why students could not e-mail the work to me or why I would not explain the assignment further; I simply expected students to follow the directions telling them to upload the homework to the online classroom. My attempt to offer clear and concise directions could be interpreted by students as harsh. For example, when students were preparing to take an exam I would instruct them to “contact me if you have technical difficulties.” However, I did not reassure them they would be let back into the exam if there was an issue. Additionally, I failed to mention technical difficulties were a common problem and should not be a source of stress. Overall, the tone was not particularly welcoming, and I did not put much effort into making social connections with students. This was not done intentionally, I simply felt it was more efficient to communicate in a precise manner. In turn, I did not receive any unsolicited positive feedback from students regarding the course, which is not the norm for me. The lack of a positive response led me to reconsider the way I approached students through online communications.

In the second semester of the study, I attempted to make more of an effort to change my tone and become more approachable from the perspective of my online students. I began signing e-mails/announcements with the line “Sincerely, Dr. D,” and I began the semester with a welcome e-mail and a brief personal biography about myself and why I love teaching (my instructor bio can be found in the Appendix). I also encouraged students to post something about themselves in a discussion

forum, and over half of the students in the class chose to post an optional biography of themselves. I wished students “good luck” a total of nine times throughout the semester, and I offered general encouragement towards the end of the semester. In addition to these changes, I began using a more friendly tone within the bodies of the e-mails I was sending out to students.

For example, when posting homework announcements, I would include notes like, “I am happy to help you if you are struggling with the assignment.” In response to the homework I received I would say things such as, “I can tell you put a significant amount of effort in to your work, and I greatly appreciate what you did.” I also began including messages like, “have a safe weekend” if an e-mail was sent close to the start of the weekend. Additional notes of encouragement such as, “keep studying hard and it will pay off in the long run,” were added to e-mail notifications regarding new power points or upcoming quizzes. I always reassured students that technical issues were normal and they would never be penalized for those types of difficulties. I received several unsolicited e-mails from students at the end of the semester saying things like: “Thank you for all your help this semester. I really enjoyed the class and felt like I really learned a lot.”

Table 3 displays student success rates over the course of the two semesters. Success is defined as earning a C or better in the course. Students must earn a C or better in this course to fulfill graduation requirements, and as such failure rates include grades of D or F in the course. The number of withdrawals ranged from four to seven students throughout the semesters. However, withdrawals are not included in the success/failure figures, because there is no reasonable way to determine if these students would have been successful had they stayed in the course.

Table 3: Student Success Rates in Online Courses

Semester	Number Enrolled	Successful	Unsuccessful
1	68	62%	38%
2	72	79%	21%

Upon evaluation of the information in Table 3 it is clear the success rates of students increased

from semester one to semester two. There was a 17% increase in success rates from semester one to semester two. In semester one, eight students earned a D and 18 students earned an F. In semester two, only four students earned a D and 11 earned an F, as illustrated in Table 4. This is a remarkable change, especially given the fact course content was controlled for. Keeping in mind I did not change any content, alter assignment expectations, change textbooks, or use any different types of media presentations, it stands to reason students were positively affected by the tone of the e-mail communications.

Table 4: Grade Breakdowns

Grade	Semester 1 Grade Count	Semester 2 Grade Count
A	21	24
B	15	27
C	6	6
D	8	4
F	18	11

#### TEACHING EVALUATION DATA

Teaching evaluation data indicate students offered a more positive critique of my teaching efforts from the first semester to the second semester. It should be noted that 34 students filled out evaluations for semester one, while only ten students filled out evaluations for semester two. The response rates are assumed to be low because of the institution's transition to a new online evaluation format unfamiliar to students. The large difference is clearly a flaw in this study; however, I do think it is important to note the differences in the evaluations, particularly when it comes to highlighting the optional written comments provided by students. There is a clear trend in the evaluation data for the first and second semesters that should be recognized and discussed.

As noted in Table 5, more students in semester one answered "neither agree nor disagree" or "strongly disagree" to the evaluation questions regarding whether the instructor enjoys teaching the subject, if the instructor displays respect for students, whether the instructor exhibits an attitude

that encourages learning and active participation, and whether the instructor was effective. In semester two, students were much more likely to "strongly agree" or "agree" to those questions. Knowing none of the course content changed it seems likely the changes in the evaluations are due to the difference in my e-mail tone, especially given the nature of the questions on the evaluations. This is particularly clear when looking at the question regarding whether or not students feel the instructor displays respect for students. In semester one, 47% strongly agreed, 50% agreed, and 3% strongly disagreed with this statement. However, in semester two when significant changes were made in tone of e-mails and announcements, 80% of students strongly agreed and 20% of students agreed. This could indicate my purposeful change in tone and the way I addressed students was interpreted by students as being more friendly and more willing to respect the attitude and opinions of students in the online course. I am particularly inclined to believe this is the case, given the nature of the written comments found in the teaching evaluations from semester two.

Table 5: Teaching Evaluation Data

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Instructor enjoys teaching the subject.					
Semester 1	53%	38%	9%	0	0
Semester 2	80%	20%	0	0	0
Instructor displays respect for students.					
Semester 1	47%	50%	0	0	0
Semester 2	80%	20%	0	0	0
Instructor was well-prepared and organized.					
Semester 1	44%	7%	9%	0	0
Semester 2	80%	20%	0	0	0
Instructor exhibits an attitude which encourages learning and active participation.					
Semester 1	47%	38%	12%	0	3%
Semester 2	80%	10%	10%	0	0
This instructor was effective.					
Semester 1	44%	53%	3%	0	0
Semester 2	70%	30%	0	0	0

Note: Semester 1: 34 respondents, Semester 2: 10. There were no written comments for Semester 1.

Written comments are of particular interest to me when examining teaching evaluations. Students are not forced to make written comments and are offered very little in the way of a prompt when asked for additional comments. There is no incentive offered for students to take the time to make written comments; students are simply given the option to include “any additional comments.” Not a single student out of 34 offered either a favorable or unfavorable comment on the first semester’s evaluation forms, but as Table 6 indicates, three out of the ten students filling out the semester two forms chose to leave extremely positive comments.

## CONCLUSION

When I first began teaching online courses, I did not realize the importance of considering tone when I sent e-mails to students. I thought students were simply going to log on, complete course work, earn their grade, and be done with the class. What I quickly learned was that students engaging in online course work need to feel socially connected and supported in their academic efforts. With this realization, I began to change my approach to my immediacy behaviors by being more thoughtful in my communication efforts with students in my online classes. I took more care to ensure e-mails did not come across as cold or harsh, and I even went so far as to share personal biographical information about myself with students. As a result, I began to see changes in the grades and attitudes of my students. When I set out to look empirically at the changes, I found promising results.

Table 6: Written Comments from Semester Two Teaching Evaluations

Student	Comment
Student 1	Dr. D did an awesome job! I love her class. She is organized and involved without overloading students. She is also super encouraging
Student 2	Amazing teacher! I wish I could take her for all my classes.
Student 3	The instructor was very accommodating and easy to work with.
Note: Written comments are optional. Students are given the option to respond to the following prompt: Any additional comments.	

Student success rates in my online courses

changed positively from semester one to semester two, which on the surface seems to be connected to my implementation of a more considerate tone when addressing students. There was a 17% increase in success rates, with 12 fewer students earning a D or an F from semester one to semester two. Additionally, teaching evaluations became more positive in the semester where I made personal changes in my approach to students. What is particularly revealing about the changes in success rates and teaching evaluations is that these changes are evident even though all course material, assignments, quizzes, exams, and other course documents remained exactly the same from semester one to semester two. Students succeeded at a higher rate and evaluated my performance in a more positive manner.

These findings seem to point to a connection between the conscious effort to make students feel more welcome and supported in my online courses through communication tone and student success. While I believe this paper is an interesting discussion regarding what an instructor can do to have a positive impact on student success and teaching evaluations, it is by no means definitive this will happen in every case. What I have presented here is a promising start to research regarding tone and success, but it must be supported by statistical findings. Therefore, my future research plans include looking for a statistical correlation between instructor tone, student success, and improved teaching evaluations.

These findings suggest that while students in an online course may be taking the course to fit the demands of their personal lifestyle, it does not mean they do not want to be connected on some level with their professor. In general, online students appear to want a positive connection with their professor and these students need to feel supported in order to be successful. Taking additional time to craft thoughtful e-mail messages in addition to adding more personal touches, such as professor and student biographies, to an online course appears to increase the opportunity to positively impact student success rates in an online course and may cause students to offer a more positive evaluation of an online instructor.



## REFERENCES

- Allen E., & Seaman, J. (2010). Class differences: Online education in the United States. Babson Park, MA: Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved from [sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/pdf/class\\_differences.pdf](http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/pdf/class_differences.pdf)
- Anderson, Janis F., Peter A. Anderson, and Arthur D. Jensen. (1979). The Measurement of Nonverbal Immediacy. *The Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 7(2).
- Arbaugh, J. B. (2001). How instructor immediacy behaviors affect student satisfaction and learning in web-based courses. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 64(4), 42–54. doi:10.1177/108056990106400405
- Bailey, C. J., & Card, K. A. (2009). Effective pedagogical practices for online teaching: Perception of experienced instructors. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 12(3-4), 152–155. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2009.08.002
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 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
- Boling, E. C., Hough, M., Krinsky, H., Saleem, H., & Stevens, M. (2012). Cutting the distance in distance education: Perspectives on what promotes positive online learning experiences." *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(2), 118–126. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.11.006
- Coppola, N. W., Hiltz, S. R., & Rotter, N. (2002). Becoming a virtual professor: Pedagogical roles and ALN. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(4), 169–190.
- Deubel, P. (2003). Learning from reflections: Issues in building quality online courses. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 6(3).
- Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, 37(1), 40–53. doi:10.1080/03634528809378702
- Grant, M. R., & Thornton, H. R. (2007). Best practices in undergraduate adult-centered online learning: Mechanisms for course design and delivery. *MERLOT Journal of Online Teaching and Learning*, 3(4), 346–356.
- Gunawardena, C. N., & Zittle, F. J. (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
- Jones, J., Warren, S., & Robertson, M. (2009). Increasing student discourse to support rapport building in web and blended courses using a 3D online learning environment. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 20(3), 269–294.
- Keengwe, J., & Kidd, T. T. (2010). Towards best practices in online learning and teaching in higher education. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 533–541.
- McKerlich, R., Riis, M., Anderson, T. & Eastman, B. (2011). Student perception of teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence in a virtual world. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 7(3).
- Palloff, R., & Pratt, K. (2005). Online learning communities revisited. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Conference on Distance Teaching and Learning, Madison, WI. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8490/9e0607d60010516900a81ae1d34feb0514a6.pdf>
- Stone, M. T., & Perumean-Chaney, S. (2011). The benefits of online teaching for traditional classroom pedagogy: A case study for improving face-to-face instruction. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 7(3).
- Sung, E., & Mayer, R. E. (2012). Five facets of social presence in online distance education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(5), 1738–1747. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.04.014
- Wilson, J. H., Ryan, R. G., & Pugh, J. L. (2010). Professor-student rapport scale predicts student outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 37(4), 246–251. doi:10.1080/00986283.2010.510976
- Woods, R. H., Jr. (2002). How much communication is enough in online courses? Exploring the relationship between frequency of instructor-initiated personal e-mail and learners' perceptions of, and participation in online learning. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 29(4), 377–394.

## APPENDIX

### Examples of E-mails/Announcements

#### **Semester One:**

##### *E-mail Example 1:*

Homework assignments will be posted approximately two weeks prior to their due date. You will receive notification when assignment details are posted.

Dr. \*\*\*

##### *E-mail Example 2:*

I have received several e-mails about confusion over the homework. If you click on the Homework #2 heading under the content section you should be able to create a new thread in the discussion board and complete the assignment.

Let me know if you still have questions.

Dr. \*\*\*

##### *E-mail Example 3:*

New power point slides are now available. These are to be used in addition to your textbook, not as a replacement for the assigned readings.

Dr. \*\*\*

##### *E-mail Example 4:*

The exam is now available in the content section. Please refer to the syllabus for exam details.

E-mail me immediately if you have technical difficulties.

Dr. \*\*\*

#### **Semester Two:**

##### *E-mail Example 1:*

Dear Students,

Your second assignment is posted in the content section. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. I am happy to help!

GOOD LUCK!

Dr. D

##### *E-mail Example 2:*

Dear Students,

Just a friendly reminder that you have until midnight tonight (Friday, Nov. 1) to complete Exam 3.

Also, your media bias assignments have been graded. Please do not hesitate to e-mail me if you have questions about your grade. Almost all of you put a significant amount of effort into your work, and I greatly appreciated what you did. I hope you learned something from the assignment!

Have a safe weekend,

Dr. D

##### *E-mail Example 3:*

Dear Students,

Your power point slides for chapters 14–18 are now available in the content section!

You are very close to the end of the semester. Don't give up!

Sincerely,

Dr. D

##### *E-mail Example 4:*

Dear Students,

Exam 4 is now posted in the content section. There are 40 questions on this exam. Once you begin the test you must finish it.

If you have technical difficulties please e-mail me as soon as possible so I can help resolve the issue.

Good luck on the exam! I would love to see everyone make an A.

Sincerely,

Dr. D