| Author & Year Pub | Purpose/Research Question(s) | Methods | Sample | Study  Variables | Measures | Major Results | Limitations | LOE (JBI, 2013) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hart & Mor-gan, 2010 | Does lack of direct faculty visualization in online programs increase the occurrence of academic dishonesty?  How do faculty know that the student registered for the course is the one doing the work? | Quantitative/Mixed Methods: comparative descriptive study  Survey of self-reported academic integrity in online (asynchronous) and traditional classroom RN-BSN programs | Students enrolled in either an online or traditional/ classroom RN-BSN program at one private, SE US university in ADY 2008-09  n=100 in traditional classroom cohort  n=2048 in online cohort | IVs:  Program enrolled in  DV:  Cheating behaviors | McCabe Academic Integrity Survey  One open-ended question to explore why students chose an online or traditional RN-BSN program | **Response rates:**  Traditional cohort: 44% (n=44)  Online cohort: 16% (n=330)  Overall Low level of cheating, very high standards of AI both groups  **Online Students:** greater understanding/awareness of AI  **Traditional Students:** higher frequency of collaborative and independent cheating behaviors in younger students  Program Choice:  Online (n=288): flexibility & convenience  Traditional (n=28): lower cost, Face to face interaction with faculty & classmates | Sample from one program, one  Variable response rates  Relying upon self-reporting of cheating  Student fear of disciplinary action | 4b |
| Prenga-man & Joseph-son, 2010 | To evaluate the effectiveness of a competency-based community & public health nursing course for online RN-BSN students | Pre-post-test design | Online RN-BSN students enrolled in a community & public health nursing course | IV: public health nursing course  DV: post-test responses | Knowledge surveys | Based upon increase in related student knowledge community/ public-health nursing competencies can be successfully delivered using an online format | Validity & Reliability coefficients of surveys not identified  Brief research report | 2d |
| Rebar, 2010 | How do RN-to-BSN learners in an online program experience community? | Qualitative: Phenomenology, specific methodology not described | Convenience Sample  N=5 students online program in Ohio, USA  Age: (µ=29)  4 Caucasian 1Hispanic  All ADNs | N/A | Eight open-ended semi-structured interview questions | Two unified emerging themes drive how participants experience sense of community in online environment:   1. Timeliness of Facilitator responses/communication 2. Professionalism in facilitator communication (meaningful, detailed, moderate group work)   Self-Reliance for success (n=4); Sense of community essential part of success (n=1) | Lack of adherence to particular qualitative methodology  Learners knew researcher as professor | 4c |
| Cobb, 2011 | 1&2: What is the relationship of social presence to satisfaction and perceived learning in online nursing courses?  3. Are there differences in social presence, satisfaction and perceived learning related to student demographics or experience with online education? | Quantitative Descriptive, correlational  Multivariate regression analysis 🡺 % Satisfaction and Perceived Learning explained by Social Presence adjusting for demographics | N=128 Students in one RN-BSN program taking any web/text-based asynchronous, nursing courses with no face to face contact during one semester  Class size 7-15 students | IV:  Social Presence  Demograph-ics  DV:  Student Satisfaction | Social Presence & Student Satisfaction Scales\*  Scale\*  \*Subsets of GlobalEd  Question-naire  Demographics: Age, Gender, Ethnicity, primary language, years exp. as an RN; exp. with online education | **43% Response Rate**  **Correlation Analyses:**  Stronger relationships *between social presence* and *perceived learning, overall satisfaction* than with *instructor performance*  No sig. rel betwn demographics & Overall *Social Presence;* *Perceived Learning, & Overall Satisfaction*  **Predictive Model:**  *Social Presence* 🡺> variation in Overall *Satisfaction* (0.44) than in *Perceived Learning* (0.36)  *Comfort with Online and CMC* 🡺 greatest variation in Overall *Satisfaction* & *Perceived Learning* | Power analysis not performed  Single site study limits generalizabili-ty  Study explored fully online courses only, limiting application to hybrid courses | 3e |
| Cumm-ins, 2011 | What is the relationship between interpersonal interaction and course performance in online RN-BSN learners? | Quantitative: non-experimental correlational ex-post facto  Analysis of specific variables of interaction as they relate to final course percentage/grade  Multivariate regression 🡺 relationship of explanatory variables to a grade of ≤ C | N=236 learners enrolled in 15 sections of a required online junior/300 level course within a fully online RN-BSN program at a public northeastern US university from fall 2005 -spring 2010 semesters | IVs:  # of course discussion forums, posts by learners & faculty; Mean thread length  Interaction pattern level  Class size  DV:  Student grades by percentage | Correlation statistics run between each of the IVs and final course percentage earned by students | No statistically significant correlation between # of discussion forums OR mean highest *interaction pattern* level AND *final course percentage*  Statistically significant relationships:  Positive: between the *number of individual posts* and the *final individual course percentage* (p<.0001)  Negative: between mean *number of faculty posts* and mean *final course percentage* (p=0.037)  As *class size* increased, both the mean *course percentage* AND *individual* *course performance* decreased. | Single site study limits general-  izability  Homogeneous student population (90% white F)  Confounding variables: multiple teaching faculty, multi-faceted nature of interactions, actual level of engagement | 3e |
| David-son, et al. (2011) | To report on a three year HRSA grant project awarded to redesign an RN to BSN program with low retention and completion rates  To assure that RN-BSN students were achieving at the same level as those in the traditional BSN program following RN-BSN course/ program design | Mixed Methods  **Quantitative:**  pre-test/post-test same group; post-test different groups  **Qualitative/ Quantitative**: Entrance, Formative & Exit Surveys | N=56 RN to BSN students over 2 cohorts  Traditional/Pre-licensure nursing students at same university number unknown | IV:  Redesign of an RN to BSN program  Student Entrance Assessments  DV:  Program completion rate  Entrance and Exit Surveys  Student Exit Assessments | ATI Critical Thinking Test;  Measure of student retention;  Entrance, Formative & Exit Surveys with quan & qual components | *ATI Critical Thinking Test:*  RN to BSN statistically significant higher performance on inference at entrance and exit; exceeded performance of traditional BSN students nationwide  *Program completion rates*   * 98% for two cohorts * 24 grads from 2000-2006 vs. 52 over 3 years   *Entrance, Formative & Exit Surveys,* satisfaction with:  hybrid format; ability to work; time to completion; avail. support; acknowledgement of prior education/credits  *Likes/Dislikes:*  Dislike of group work; variable faculty expectations; more time commitment than expected; 6 hour in person sessions “too long”; OL learning rated higher; group work contrib. to learning; student mentoring program less important. | Single site study limits general-  izability  Use of tests designed for assessment of traditional BSN students for RN-BSN students  No evidence of psycho-metrical analysis of Student surveys | 2d |
| Hsu & Hsieh, 2011 | Examination of the influence of demographics, learning behaviors and self-reported learning performance on learning outcomes within a blended learning environment | Quantitative Descriptive  A priori power analysis 🡺 optimal sample size of 103  Final multiple linear regression to determine variables with statistically significant correlation with course scores | (N=99)Two of six classes of students enrolled in a ‘Professional Nursing Ethics’ course in the 2009 spring semester as part of a 2 year RN to BSN program at a public university in Taiwan | IVs:  Demograph-ics  Learning Behaviors: Online Dialogue, Time spent Online  Learning Performnce: Scores on the CAAS, CASES, BLSS and Metacognition Scales  DV:  Learning Outcome as the final ethical course scores | Student reports of learning using researcher- dev. scales  1. Case Analysis Attitude Scale (CAAS)  2. Case Analysis Self-evaluation Scales (CASES)  3. Blended Learning Satisfaction Scale (BLSS)  4. Metacog-nition Scale (MS) | N=99; 22-30y; mean work exp.10.6 mo  **Conclusions:**  **BLSS** 🡺*overall student satis.* with *blended learning environment* contributes to *course scores* through facilitation of *meta-cognitive* and *self-regulatory* development  **CAAS & MS**🡺signif. assoc.btwn *freq. of online dialogues*, *time spent OL*, *CAAS*, *MS* scores & *course scores*.  **Multiple linear regression model:**   * 3 variables (*freq OL dialogues,* *time spent OL &CAAS scores)* 🡺 signif independent predictors of *final course scores* * As *frequency of OL dialogues* incr. by 1 time, *course* *scores* incr. by 0.41 point * As *scores on the CAAS* incr. by 1 unit, *final course scores*  incr. by 0.14 point. | Single site study limits general-  izability  No awareness of participants baseline on the CAAS, CASES or the MS for comparison before/ after experience in blended learning environment (i.e. pre-test/ post-test) | 3e |
| John-son & Smith, 2011 | Not clearly stated  Study was designed to measure the student learning outcomes and satisfaction of a newly developed hybrid course dedicated to patient centered care and quality, in an RN-BS program at a northeastern US college | Mixed Methods  **Quantitative:**  Pre-test/Post-test survey on student perceived ability to meet learning outcomes (LOs)  Post-test only Survey of student satisfaction  **Qualitative:**  Pre-test/Post-test design  Simple, non-thematic analysis of one open-ended question on each of the 2 surveys | 14 RN-BS students employed as Full time RNs & enrolled in a 400 level hybrid course addressing patient centered care and quality | IV:  Newly designed hybrid course dedicated to patient centered care and quality  DVs:  Student assessment of perceived learning & satisfaction  Student grades earned in the course | Pre-assessment and post-assessment course Surveys addressing students’ perception of learning  Hybrid Postcourse Survey addressing student satisfaction  Student grades | **Quantitative:**  Post-test: *ability to meet LOs*  Response Rate: 98.2% (n=13)  Statistically significant positive difference pre/post (P<.05) with the exception of one item.  Post-test only: *student satisfaction*: Response Rate: 78.5% (n=11)  64% selected one of the 2 highest levels for overall satisfaction; highest score on item addressing the effectiveness of course activities to meet learning outcomes.  **Qualitative :**  Suggests broader learner perspective re: accreditation, benchmarking, quality measures and outcomes; additional evidence of student satisfaction  **Student course grades** range:  85-99 / 100 points | Threats to validity due to lack of tested instruments  Small, homogeneous sample at one college/ program limits general-  izability  Rigor limited to routine academic course evaluation methods  Student evaluation methods for grading (i.e. rubrics) not described. | 2d |
| Clark, et al., 2012, Part 1 | 1. To what extent do nursing students and faculty perceive incivility to be a problem in an Online Learning Environment (OLE)?  2. Are students or faculty more likely to engage in uncivil behavior?  3. What student and faculty behaviors are considered to be uncivil by nursing faculty and students in an OLE?  4. What is the perceived frequency of uncivil student and faculty behaviors in an OLE? | Quantitative descriptive  Researcher Developed Instrument: The Incivility in Online Learning Environment Survey (IOLE);  Content validity est. via expert review; prior pilot 🡺 Cronbach α = 0.987 for interitem reliability; factor analysis not performed | N=212 total nursing faculty and RN-BSN students in a comprehensive northwestern US university  Faculty n=20  Students n=192 | Student and faculty perceptions of:  1. uncivil behaviors and their frequency in the OLE  2. the greatest challenges in the OLE  Suggestions for pro-moting civility in the OLE  Effective prevention & intervene-tions to decr incivility & enhance the OLE | The Incivility in Online Learning Environ-ment Survey (IOLE) | **Response Rate:**  *Faculty:* 19 out of 20; 95%  *Students:* 152 out of 192; 79%  **RQ1:** Faculty & student perceptions similar except a **s**tatistically significant difference btwn viewing incivility as “no problem at all” *Faculty* (16.6%) vs. *Students* (40.2%)  **RQ2:** No significant differences btwn faculty & student responses:  18.6% Equally likely  29% Students more likely  <1% Faculty more likely  **RQ3 & RQ4:**  **Top 4 Uncivil/Frequent Student Behaviors:** name calling; verbal insults/rude comments; belittling comments to others about a faculty member; racial/ethnic, sexual or religious slurs;  **Top 4 Uncivil/ Frequent Faculty Behaviors:** belittling comments about a faculty member; name calling, verbal insults or rude comments; personal attacks or threatening comments | IOLE is a new instrument needing further psychometric testing  Convenience sample of students and faculty from one program limits general-izability  Lack of gender and ethnic diversity of respondents  Research questions = survey questions  Results reported as a frequency distribution of responses without factor analysis | 3e |
| Clark, et al., 2012, Cyber-bully- ing Part 2 | 1. What are the most challenging aspects of online learning as perceived by nursing faculty and students?  2. What are the advantages of online learning as perceived by nursing faculty and students?  3. What are the most effective ways to foster civility in the OLE? | Qualitative  Researcher Developed Instrument: The Incivility in Online Learning Environment Survey (IOLE), Qualitative component:  Thematic Analysis of verbatim comments using Textual content analysis, quantifying key words/phrases, categorized into themes.  Themes ranked ordered by times mentioned and in alignment with each research/ survey question | N=212 total nursing faculty and RN-BSN students in a comprehensive northwestern US university  Faculty n=20  Students n=192 |  | Open-ended questions from the Incivility in Online Learning Environ-ment Survey (IOLE) | Response rates reported to individual questions; aggregate data categorized by “themes” related to each RQ  **RQ1** (14/19 *Faculty*; 131/192 *Students*), 19 Themes, summary:  *Students*🡺 Top 4: excessive group work & lack of student participation in; lack of faculty clarity & objectivity re: assignments; self-discipline to stay focused & on task; lack of face to face;  *Faculty*🡺 Top 4: time consuming nature of reading, writing and responding to students postings & assignments; creating a sense of community & supportive T&L environment; lack of face to face to address student issues/concerns;  **RQ2** (14/19 Faculty; 131/192 Students) 6 Themes, summary: *Faculty* 🡺flexibility & convenience; self-paced learning; deeper connection with student learning. *Students*🡺 flexibility & convenience; self-paced learning  **RQ3:** (14/19 Faculty; 112/192 Students), Top 4 Themes,  *Faculty & Students*🡺 clearly defined course & behavioral expectations, norms & consequences for uncivil behavior; faculty role modeling of professionalism & civility; addressing incivility immediately & holding offenders accountable;  Conclusions/recommendations:   1. OL Course design for student success 2. Addressing Potential Barriers 3. Co-Creating Norms for Positive Learning Environ. | IOLE is a new instrument needing further psychometric testing  Convenience sample of students and faculty from one program limits general-izability  Lack of gender and ethnic diversity of respondents  Research questions =open ended survey questions  Analysis produced numerous detailed “themes” that were limited to categorization within each survey question | 4d |
| Gil-more & Lyons, 2012 | What is the impact of an 8 hour, comprehensive, face to face orientation upon student satisfac-tion and program attrition following transition from an on-ground to a fully online RN-BSN program? | Quantitative  Post-test only, different groups design | Group One: 102 RN-BSN students in 4 h orientation;  Group Two: 47 RN-BSN students in 8h orientation;  Group Three: 30 RN-BSN students in 8h orientation | IV:  1. A 4 hour, face to face orientation  2. An 8 hr, face to face orientation    DV:  Student Satisfaction,  Enrollment  & Attrition | Computer Technology Proficiency Assessment (CPTA)  Student attrition rate by course/ semester  Student satisfaction | **Group One:** 77.6% thoroughly satisfied with orientation; semester based attrition rate 🡺20 %  **Group Two:** 94.6% thoroughly satisfied with orientation; semester based attrition rate 🡺 2%  **Group Three:** 98.2% thoroughly satisfied with orientation; semester based attrition rate🡺 <1%;  Enrollment increase from 55🡺102  Data on CPTA not reported | No indication of significance of differences in student satisfaction and/or attrition  Little descript-tion of measure of student satisfaction/ instrument | 2d |
| Sikma & Pren-tice, 2012 | To apply best practices in blended learning to a hybrid elective course on Assessment of Older Adults in an RN to BSN program. | Mixed Methods  Descriptive  Report of Quantitative and Qualitative components of student evaluations of a newly designed hybrid course | Number of students as a subset of 200 students in a multi-site RN to BSN program in the northwestern US not provided | IV  Re-designed hybrid course in an RN to BSN program  DV  Student course evaluations | Quantitative and Qualitative components of Student course evaluations | High student ratings to include a strong score on a challenge/ engagement index.  Qualitative student feedback indicated:  1. increased appreciation of experiences of older adults  2. increased application of new assessment skills in practice  3. promotion and integration of enhanced assessment skills in clinical practice | Brief report lacked detail of instrumentation  Sample size/ Response rate not disclosed  Response rate not disclosed | 3e |
| Brahe, 2013 | 1. How can online course design promote the formation of informal communities (ICs)?  2. How do students use ICs in online RN-BSN degree programs? | Qualitative, descriptive case study design  Semi-structured, open-ended interview questions aligned with the research questions  Recorded telephone interviews  Data Analysis:  NVivo CAQDAS Manual Open Coding  Thematic Analysis through Axial Coding | N=9 determined once saturation was achieved  Students in fully online RN-BSN programs in different schools of nursing = *case* for this study  All female; 26-35 y (2); 36-45 (3); >45 (4) | NA | Responses to open ended questions  Exemplary Responses included in analysis as quotes aligned with themes | **RQ1 Central Themes:**  **Convenience:** of email, texting and facebook communication methods incorporated into courses  **Trust:**  In mode of communication; In one another  **RQ2 Central Themes:** human components not exclusive to OLE   1. Knowledge Sharing 2. Information 3. Social 4. Organizational   **Conclusions/Application:**   1. Vital role of instructional designer/faculty in promoting formation of ICs 2. Participation in ICs increased course satisfaction, learning and motivation for participants 3. Instructional Designers need to ensure the convenience of media r/t challenges/needs of students. 4. Figure out what works for the group and use it. 5. Instructors need to “model” use of tools 6. Connectiveness improves student satisfaction and learning outcomes | Use of starter codes/ themes as previously defined by the literature and communities of practice theory can pre-maturely categorize qualitative data vs. allowing the data to speak & form into its own themes | 4c |
| Lon-don, 2013 | Using the Community of Inquiry (COI) and Transactional Distance (TDD) theories as a framework, what effect does audio-text feedback versus text-only feedback have on:  1. the social, cognitive, and teaching presences  2. satisfaction and retention  AND  3. academic achievement  of students enrolled in an online RN-BSN program? | Quantitative: Quasi-experimental, post-test only  Nonprobability convenience sampling at week 12 of semester  Power analysis revealed power of 0.95, alpha of 0.05, medium effect size of 0.3🡺required sample of 134 to achieve 95% confidence level  Multiple regression analysis | N=202 Students enrolled in each of 4 courses in an RN-BSN program at a mideastern US university beginning in spring 2013 semester  Age ranges: 18-24; 25-34; 35-54; 55-64; ≥ 65 years  Control Group: 4 sections received text-only replies from faculty  Experimental Group: 4 sections received audio-text feedback from faculty | IVs:  instructor generated audio feedback  instructor generated text-only feedback  DV:  social, cognitive and teaching presences  student satisfaction, retention & academic performance | 1. 34 item COI survey (Garrison, 2000)  Dimensions: Teaching presence; Social presence; Cognitive presence;  Demograph-ic survey, previously pilot tested  3. Three items addressing course grade, intent to take more courses, perceived satisfaction, | **Response**  N=139 respondents 75%  **RQ1** multiple regression:  Neither text-only or audio-text feedback in online discussion boards were predictors of social or cognitive presence  Statistically significant negative correlation between *audio-text feedback* and *teaching presence*  **RQ2** multiple regression:  For every 1unit increase in *text-only feedback*, *student satisfaction* rose by 0.899  For every one unit increase in *audio-text feedback*, *student satisfaction* decreased by 0.355.  **RQ3** multiple regression:  Statistically significant negative effect for BOTH *text-only* and *audio-text feedback* in online discussion boards and *academic performance*  **Discussion** of results addressed the inappropriate selection of learning outcome variables on study outcomes🡺 the type of feedback was explored as opposed to the quality of feedback | Inappropriate variable selection limited conclusions  Explored use of feedback in discussion board only, vs. other course areas  Return rate could have been influenced by an established instructor- student relationship  Subject attrition  Single site study limits general-  izability | 2d |
| Mor-gan & Hart, 2013 | Evaluation of the effect of an Academic Integrity (AI) intervention in online program  Hypotheses:RN-BSN students in an online program that participate in a specific AI intervention will:  1. report less cheating  2. rank more forms of cheating as serious cheating  3. report higher levels of awareness and support of the program’s AI policies | Mixed Methods  Quantitative: Comparison group Quasi-experimental | Convenience sample of students newly admitted to an online RN to BSN program & entering 2 entry level courses  Random assignment to one of 2 groups:  N= 346  n=169 assigned to treatment group (TG)  n=177 control group (CG) | IVs: conveying of AI policies via:  CG: the usual manner  TG: through more intense faculty-led discussions at the beginning of the course AND reminders of AI during exams  DV: responses to AI survey/ tool at course completion | Donald McCabe Academic Integrity Survey with alterations addressing the RN-BSN population in collab. with McCabe  **Score Ranges** 24 (never having cheated) – 72 out of possible 96 | **Response Rate:**  CG: 27.8%; TG: 35%  **RQ 1&2:**  Acceptance of the Null HO   * no statistically significant difference btwn CG & TG in self-reported cheating OR perception of seriousness of forms of cheating presented. * Self-reported cheating very low for TG & CG; both reporting strong disapproval of their cheating by significant others   **RQ 3:**  Rejection of the Null HO:  TG reported statistically significant (p<.05) higher perceptions of AI Policies re:   * faculty and student support of * faculty understanding of * effectiveness of   Conclusion: RN-BSN students may exhibit higher levels of AI related to their socialization to nursing practice, consistent with earlier research. | Small convenience sample from one program  Instrument relies upon self-reporting of cheating  Student fear of disciplinary action | 2c |
| Price, 2013 | RQ: Is there a significant relationship between the six Distance Education Learning Environ-ments Survey (DELES) instructional delivery methods and online RN-BSN students’ satisfaction?  Six Null hypotheses addressed the lack of a significant relationship between each of the six DL instructional delivery methods and online RN-BSN student satisfaction | Quantitative: non-experi-mental, correla-tional, descriptive  Cohen’s statistical power analysis🡺 sample size of 141 to meet power  Convenience Sampling  Correlation analysis for each of the 6 DL instructional delivery methods (IVs) and online RN-BSN student satisfaction (DV) using PPMC | Population: All students enrolled in an online RN-BSN program  Sample: nursing students enrolled in a online RN-BSN program in a major the Midwest US university as of January 2013, N=6,733 | IVs:  6 DL Instructional Delivery methods:   * Instructor Support; * Student interaction & Collab-oration; * Personal Relevance; * Authentic Learning; * Active Learning; * Student Autonomy   DV:  Student Satisfaction | DELES 42 questions (Walker & Fraser, 2005)  Dimensions/Scales:  Six Scales on instructional Delivery methods  1 scale rep. student satisfaction  Demograph-ic survey, 4 questions | Response Rate: n= 1,161; (7 x recommended power)  All Null Hypotheses rejected:  Statistically significant positive relationships between the 6 instructional delivery methods and online RN-BSN student satisfaction (p<0.0001).  Cronbach’s Alpha:  Range for 7 scales = 0.757 - 0.938  Rank Ordered by strength of (+) relationship to student satisfaction and Cronbach’s Alpha (CA):   1. Active Learning r=0.25 (weak) CA=.757 (mod) 2. Student Interaction & Collab:   r = 0.31(mod) CA=.847 (mod)   1. Instructor Support r= .41 (mod) CA=.899 (mod) 2. Authentic Learning r=.42(mod) CA=.889 (mod) 3. Student Autonomy r=.43(mod) CA=.834 (mod) 4. **Personal Relevance r=0.50 (strong) CA=.91(strong)**   Simple Linear Regression Model:  For every 1 increase in personal relevance score there was a 0.564 increase in predicted student satisfaction | Sampling bias  Researcher is professor in program studied  Single site study limits general-  izability  DL methods perceptions pre-defined by instrument; actual student perceptions may vary  Timing of participant responses (early or later in survey availability) limit consistency of findings | 3e |
| David-son et al., 2014 | To compare *academic outcomes* of each of two RN-BSN programs offered and the Pre-licen-sure/Traditional BSN program at one southern US university:  To analyze the student experience through student reported factors that influence their enrollment and success  To examine the extent to which social support needs and availability might distinguish the student cohorts  To obtain student input for program improvement | Mixed Methods: Quantitative:  Calculation of graduation rates of online and hybrid RN to BSN programs  Same Group Pre-Test/Post-Test and Different Groups Pre-Test/Post-Test using *ATI Critical Thinking(CT) Assessment* completed by students in all three programs at program entrance and exit  Comparison of student groups on the entrance surveys using  Simple descriptive analysis of student responses on the *Entering Student Survey Packet* (Quantitative & Qualitative Items)  Comparison of student groups on *Exit Survey*  Descriptive anal of *Exiting Student Survey Packet* (Quan &Qual) | Three hybrid student cohorts (n=91at entrance, n=57 at exit)  Two online student cohorts (n=100 at entrance, n=93 at exit)  Traditional BSN Students | IVs:  1. Hybrid RN to BSN program  2. Online RN to BSN program  3. Pre-licen-sure/ Tradi-tional BSN Program  4. Social Support: (SSQSR)  5. Social Network Index (SNI)  6. Program Entrance Survey Dimensions  DVs:  1. Grad. Rates  2. Student Performance on *ATI Critical Thinking Test*  3. Exit Survey🡺 stdt satis.  4. ΔSocial Support: (SSQSR)  5. ΔSocial Network Index (SNI) | Graduation rates  ATI Critical Thinking Assessment  Social Support Question-naire (SSQSR) Short Form  Social Support Network Index (SNI)  Program specific entrance question-aire (how learned about program)  Program specific exit question-aire (faculty/ staff evalua-tions, pro-gram/ univ factors, etc.) | **Response Rates**: not reported  **Entrance Survey/ SSQSR/SNI:**  Hybrid(H) & online (O) students were *similar*  **Academic Outcomes:**  *ATI CT Assessment*: not reported  *Grad.Rates*: H: 92%; O: 88% Trad. 86%  **Exit Survey:** diff. betwn O & H student perceptions related to:   * Computer support (O >) * Relationships imp to success   (H >)   * Availability of OL resources   (O >)   * Rating of faculty VG/excel (H >) * Desire to *learn more about nursing* (O >) * mentoring pgm rejected by H   Lack of statistically significant differences btwn H & O student perceptions related to:   * *Program Quality: VG* or excel * *Reasons for Success:* program structure, length, schedule * *ability to complete school work on own schedule* rated highest, * *length of time to complete 🡺* second highest * *Social Support*: = satisfaction * Worked throughout. * Recog. Δ in nursing knowledge   **Importance to H students/exit:**   * knowing in-person class mtgs, * hybrid nature: face to face & OL * online social interaction less effective than face to face. | Research methods not described in accordance to generally accepted definitions  Mixed Lit review, program description, methods and results sections  Variables not named/ defined  Researcher developed instrument dimensions not described validity, reliability not provided  No specific report on SSQSR & SNI responses  Qualitative analysis not systematically approached  Lacks reports on some DVs  Statistical Significance not consistently reported | 2d |
| Lind-ley, 2014 | Do students who receive instructor Audiovideo (AV) with text-based feedback have different perceptions of teaching, social and cognitive presences than do those students who receive standard text-based only feedback? | Exploratory, quasi experimental repeated measures (pre- test/posttest) pilot\*  \*Study design changed to a descriptive posttest study with independent samples due to lack of matched pretest/posttest pairs  Random assignment of 50% of student groups to intervention  Posttest Community of Inquiry survey (COI) to both groups end of week 10  G\*3.1 Power analysis 🡺 target sample size n=180 (power 0.8, α 0.5)  Effect size unknown | Non-randomized convenience sample (n=240) of 540 RN-to-BSN students enrolled in the first course of a completely online program at one large state university in Texas, USA | IV:  AV Feedback (FB)  Participant Demograph-ics  Control Group (CG): (n=120) 🡺standard text-based student-instructor interaction weeks 3-10  Intervention Group (IG): (n=120) 🡺standard text-based student-instructor interaction weeks 3-10 plus inter-vention of AV FB weeks 3,4 & 7  DV:  Participant perceptions of teaching, social and cognitive presences | COI Survey administered via Qualtrics (2013)  Pretest: to both groups at week 2  Posttest: to both groups end of week 10  Demographics: Gender, race, ethnicity, yrs RN exp., social media use, online course exp., type of internet access | **Demographics Pretest Samples:**  No statistically significant differences between the Pretest CG and IG  **CG n=26/IG n=38**  **Demographics Posttest Samples:**  **CG n=25/IG n=36**  With the exception of years of RN experience no statistically significant differences    **Between Groups**  **Pretest:**  No statistically significant differences for *social, cognitive & teaching presence scores*  **Posttest:**  IG scored at a statistically significant higher level than CG for *teaching, social* and *cognitive presences*.  **Within Groups Analysis**\***:**  **IG:** positive changes on *teaching, social* & *cognitive presence* (8.3%) between pretest & posttest scores  **CG:** minimal positive change on *teaching presence*; Sl.negative changes for both *social* and *cognitive* presences between pretest & posttest scores  Conclusions:  Supportive of the COI Model  1. first exploratory study to utilize the entire COI instrument to test asynchronous AV FB in OLE  2. Participant demographics similar to national demographics of RN to BSN student population  3. Findings may be generalizable to RN to BSN students in online programs at other colleges | Data collection related to sub-ject’s PINs 🡺few matches btwn pre & posttests, 🡺change in study design from quasi-experimental to post-test study with independ. samples design  Lack of qualitative data: neither coaches or subjects per-ceptions of AV feedback were ascertained  Lack of resources, unfunded study con-strained ability to extend sample size due to re-liance on vol-unteers  Academic coaches varied between CGs and IGs  Student maturation, possible recall between pre & post tests | 2d |
| Mann, 2014 | What are historically black colleges universities (HBCU) nursing students’ preferred instructor caring behaviors in the online classroom? | Cross-sectional descriptive design | N=100  RN-BSN completion students enrolled in spring 2012, ≥ 18 yrs and had completed ≥ 2 online nursing courses  Public HBCU in SE US | Survey responses | 12 question survey  5 demo-graphic items | **Response Rate:** 48%  **Responses to Survey questions:**   * 89.5% completed ≥5 online courses * 100% believe an instructor can create a caring online learning environment * 67.5% believe that instructor organization, attention to detail and clarity evidence caring * Top 3 rated items r/t creating a caring online environment: * Prompt, detailed feedback on assignments; * attention to detail in organization and clarity * prompt response to students’ questions * Three items rated least important : * scheduling of weekly OL virtual office hours * use of real time OL sessions * Instructors expertise with technology | Single site study limits general-  izability  No data on validity and reliability related to survey/instru-ment  No correlations of survey re-sponses with demographics | 4b |