ABSTRACT

Distance education courses have become popular due to the increased number of commuter students as well as people already in the workforce who need further education for advancement within their careers. A graduate-level Web-based course entitled Special Topics—Poultry Food Safety Microbiology was developed from an existing senior undergraduate advanced food microbiology course in the Poultry Science Department at Texas A&M University. Conversion of standard lecture material into a distance education course can provide unique challenges to maintain comparable course content in an asynchronous manner. The overall objective for this course was to examine bacterial activities including ecology in food, animals, raw and processed meat, eggs, and human pathogenesis. Students were surveyed at the end of the class and the majority agreed that they would be willing to take the course as an online course, although they were not willing to pay an extra fee for an online course. The majority of students used the online version of the course as a supplement to the classroom rather than as a substitute.
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INTRODUCTION

The poultry industry in the United States produces 43 billion pounds (19.5 billion kg) of chicken meat annually, a total farm value of $20 billion (ERS, 2009). In 2008, US per capita consumption of poultry meat was 115 pounds (52 kg), over 40% of all red meat, poultry, and fish tracked by the USDA (ERS, 2010). In spite of the prominence of the US poultry industry, individual active departments of poultry science at universities have declined from 45 in the 1940s to 7 at the present time (Yegani, 2009). This decline presents challenges for educating the next generation of poultry scientists because there may be economic barriers to students being able to be physically present at these few universities, which leads to the opportunity to use distance education. Poultry companies need personnel that are educated in food safety, especially topics related to human pathogens.

In 2005, around 17% of all students took classes online as a part of their degree-seeking program (Allen and Seaman, 2006). It has been predicted that by 2014, only 5.14 million students will take all of their courses in a physical classroom, whereas 3.55 million will take all of their classes online and 18.65 million will take some of their classes online. Braun (2008) surveyed students enrolled in online or hybrid courses and discovered the most frequent reasons for enrolling in the online courses included financial (81%), flexibility (80%), and ability to work at home (74%).

Distance education and online classes can offer communication in either a synchronous or an asynchronous manner (Wu and Hiltz, 2004). Asynchronous communication allows students to access the online classroom any time or anywhere, whereas synchronous discussions involve the use of chat rooms or discussion boards to allow students to meet at the same time but in different locations.
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INTRODUCTION

The poultry industry in the United States produces 43 billion pounds (19.5 billion kg) of chicken meat annually, a total farm value of $20 billion (ERS, 2009). In 2008, US per capita consumption of poultry meat was 115 pounds (52 kg), over 40% of all red meat, poultry, and fish tracked by the USDA (ERS, 2010). In spite of the prominence of the US poultry industry, individual active departments of poultry science at universities have declined from 45 in the 1940s to 7 at the present time (Yegani, 2009). This decline presents challenges for educating the next generation of poultry scientists because there may be economic barriers to students being able to be physically present at these few universities, which leads to the opportunity to use distance education. Poultry companies need personnel that are educated in food safety, especially topics related to human pathogens.

In 2005, around 17% of all students took classes online as a part of their degree-seeking program (Allen and Seaman, 2006). It has been predicted that by 2014, only 5.14 million students will take all of their courses in a physical classroom, whereas 3.55 million will take all of their classes online and 18.65 million will take some of their classes online. Braun (2008) surveyed students enrolled in online or hybrid courses and discovered the most frequent reasons for enrolling in the online courses included financial (81%), flexibility (80%), and ability to work at home (74%).

Distance education and online classes can offer communication in either a synchronous or an asynchronous manner (Wu and Hiltz, 2004). Asynchronous communication allows students to access the online classroom any time or anywhere, whereas synchronous discussions involve the use of chat rooms or discussion boards to allow students to meet at the same time but in different locations.

As part of the Poultry Science Department at Texas A&M University’s distance education Masters of Agriculture program, a graduate-level course entitled Special Topics—Poultry Food Safety Microbiology was designed from an existing undergraduate course in ad-
Advanced food microbiology. This course was offered as a Web-based asynchronous course designed for students not able to attend class and who were voluntarily seeking further education. Students were surveyed over a 2-yr period to determine their reactions to the class being made available online as compared with physical onsite classroom instruction.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Conversion to Online Class**

The lecture overheads and handouts were converted to PowerPoint (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA) presentations. Note packets with skeleton outlines of the PowerPoint lectures were purchased by students. The professor’s voice, slides, and notes were recorded using the Smart Sympodium (Smart Technologies ULC, Calgary, Alberta, Canada). The Shure Presenter cordless microphone (KRM Technologies Inc., Alpharetta, GA) was used to produce an audio file with the slides and notes. The program coordinator used an FTP program to transfer the file to the media center, where the file was converted to a streaming video to be viewed on RealPlayer (RealNetworks, Seattle, WA). The classroom lecture remained the same in meeting 3 times a week for 50 min. The students taking the course at a distance could access the lectures at any time from any computer with access to the internet.

**Questionnaire**

After completion of the class, a total of 68 students were asked to complete a 14-question survey. Each question had 5 responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree (Table 1).

**Statistical Analysis**

Answers were compiled according to frequency and analyzed using SAS (SAS/STAT, version 8, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC). A χ² analysis was performed to analyze relationships between questions, with results considered significantly different at $P < 0.05$.

**RESULTS**

More than half of the students stated that they would be willing to take the course online (Table 1) as opposed to the more formal classroom setting. Only 41% of the respondents used the online class to completely replace the face-to-face class, with 63% saying they used

### Table 1. Survey results (answers expressed in percentages), n = 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer(^1)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would be willing to take this course online</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I would be willing to pay an additional fee per credit hour to take POSC 429 online</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I used the online version of this course to replace attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I used the online version of this course because I missed something in lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I believe online courses are easier than typical lecture classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I found the class format helpful to my comprehension of subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would take another class in this format</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Slides are a valuable part of this course</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Slides used in this course are a great help in learning the material</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The course materials used in the class were of high quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The course Web site contributed to the quality of this class</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The course Web site was well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The course Web site was consistently updated and current</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The course Web site was visually appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)A = strongly agree; B = agree; C = undecided; D = disagree; E = strongly disagree.
the online class because they had missed something in
lecture (Table 1), indicating students might prefer to
have the online access as a supplement to the classroom
rather than a replacement. When we examined the re-
lationship between question 1 (willingness to take the
course online) and question 2 (willingness to pay an
extra fee) we discovered that even those willing to take
the course online were not willing to pay an extra fee
for the class (Table 2).

Forty percent of the students did not agree that on-
line classes are easier than typical lecture classes, but
an almost equal percentage (38%) was undecided about
the question. When looking at the relationship between
whether online classes were in general perceived as easi-
er (question 5) and willingness to take this specific
class online (question 1), those who were undecided
about the ease of online classes were willing to take this
course online (Table 3). However, those who strongly
disagreed that online classes were easier also strongly
disagreed that they would be willing to take this course
online (Table 3).

Almost half (47%) agreed that the format of the class
was helpful to understanding the subject matter, but
there was also a large segment (26%) that was neutral
on the concept. The relationship between question 6
(class format was helpful in understanding the subject
matter) and whether students would be willing to take
another class in this format (question 7) revealed that
the largest portion of the class agreed the format was
helpful and would be willing to take another class in
that format (Table 4).

Most students agreed that PowerPoint slides were a
valuable part of the course and that the slides were
helpful in learning the material. In addition, most re-
pondents agreed that course materials were of high
quality. Most respondents found the Web site to be
well organized, current, and visually appealing. The re-
lationship between questions 11 and 12 is presented in
Table 5. It can be seen that there was a high correla-
tion between agreement that the course Web site was
of high quality and agreement that the Web site was
well organized.

DISCUSSION

Although students expressed a willingness to take
courses online, they did not agree that they would pay
an extra fee for the online course versus taking a tra-
ditional class. Utah State University (2009) in their
spring 2009 distance education survey received com-
ments from students indicating that the extra fees for
the distance education courses were burdensome. Like-
wise, Braun (2008) found that only 20% of students
surveyed preferred a completely online course. Most of
the respondents in this study used the online version of
the class to supplement the classroom instruction and
not as a substitute for the classroom. Marcketti and
Yurchisin (2005) also found that students preferred the
hybrid learning model to both the online-only and face-
to-face-only courses. Most students found the Web site
to be well organized and a valuable resource. Pomales-
Garcia et al. (2009) found that attributes of online

Table 3. Two-way table for the relationship of question 5 (Q5, belief that online courses are easier
than lecture classes) and question 1 (Q1, willingness to take this course online), n = 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)A = strongly agree; B = agree; C = undecided; D = disagree; E = strongly disagree.

Table 4. Two-way table for the relationship of question 6 (Q6, found class format helpful) and ques-
tion 7 (Q7, willingness to take another class in this format), n = 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)A = strongly agree; B = agree; C = undecided; D = disagree; E = strongly disagree.
materials were ranked in order (most important first): clarity, organization, structure, simplicity, attractiveness, and excitement. According to Vencatesan (2006), poorly designed course materials are a chief factor in drop out from distance education courses.
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Table 5. Two-way table for the relationship of question 11 (Q11, the course Web site contributed to the quality of this class) and question 12 (Q12, the course Web site was well organized), n = 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1A = strongly agree; B = agree; C = undecided; D = disagree; E = strongly disagree.