

Why are faculty unfavorably disposed to MOOCs? – a sharing of views by Chinese hospitality educators

Xin Zhang

School of Management

Zhejiang Gongshang University, Hangzhou College of Commerce

No. 66, South Huancheng Road, Tonglu, Hangzhou, P.R.China. 149, Jiaogong Road, Xihu District, Hangzhou, P.R. China

E-mail: zhangxin90683@mail.zjgsu.edu.cn

Mehmet Ali Koseoglu

College of Management

Metropolitan State University

1501 Hennepin Ave.

Minneapolis MN 55403-1897

E-mail: koseoglu.mehmetali@gmail.com

Brian King

School of Hotel and Tourism Management

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

17 Science Museum Road 842, TST East, Kowloon, Hong Kong

E-mail: brian.king@polyu.edu.hk

Omer Faruk Aladag

Faculty of Administrative Sciences

Abdullah Gul University

Kayseri/Turkey

E-mail: aladagomer@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explores the negative disposition of many hospitality higher education faculty towards MOOCs, a form of delivery which is increasingly prominent in current pedagogical discourse and which offers the potential for enriched student learning. This is particularly so because of the diversity of hospitality stakeholders and diversity of student learning needs. The researchers conducted an in-depth and qualitative exploration with 14 faculty members in mainland China. Combining the Diffusion of Innovation (DOI) approach and theory of motivation, the researchers formed groupings of resistance to MOOCs around five dimensions. These are: attributes and complexities, perceived incompatibility, unsuitability for trialing, and lack of observational capacity. The study addresses a knowledge gap by examining the perspectives of faculty members who have the potential to constrain the deployment of MOOCs. The authors propose the provision of encouragement for faculty members to facilitate the promotion of MOOCs as an innovative learning and teaching medium

Keywords: MOOCs, hospitality educators, resistance to innovation, motivations, Diffusion of Innovation theory, faculty members

Introduction

An increasing number of higher education institutions have harnessed rapidly developing network technologies to deploy innovative on-line Internet-based teaching through massive open online courses (MOOCs) (Deale & Lee, 2018; Murphy, Tracey, & Horton-Tognazzini, 2016). MOOCs offer students the potential to acquire knowledge through their mobile device or a computer, thereby overcoming issues of time, accessibility and money (Phan, McNeil, & Robin, 2016; Shapiro, Lee, Roth, Li, Çetinkaya-Rundel, & Canelas, 2017). Gaebel and Gaebel (2014) defined MOOCs as freely available on-line classes that have no barriers to entry or enrollment and offer a certification of completion option, without an academic credit requirement. MOOCs offer lifelong learners an alternative and positive learning style and environment (Ryan, Horton-Tognazzini, & Williams, 2016). Furthermore, many universities permit the substitution of MOOC credits for regular modules that are normally delivered face-to-face in class. The creation of MOOCs by higher education institutions for some or all of their degree programs or courses is accelerating discussion about the equivalent of on- and off-line qualifications (Xiao, Qiu, & Cheng, 2019). By late 2017, over 800 higher education institutions were offering around 94,000 MOOCs, serving 81 million registrations globally (Annaraud & Singh, 2017). One prominent provider is edX, established as a MOOC platform by Harvard University along with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 2012. EdX has more than 2,500 online courses which are offered from 140 institutions (edX, 2020).

MOOCs started developing in China somewhat later than elsewhere. For example, Peking University and Tsinghua University joined the edX platform and Hong Kong University joined Coursera in 2013. As well as sharing foreign curriculum resources, Tsinghua University proceeded to create its own Chinese “Xuetang Online” MOOC platform, based on the edX equivalent. Later, NetEase and Ai jointly established the so-called Chinese University MOOC which is now used by 685 participating universities across Mainland China. In the face of accelerating delivery, it is timely to explore the challenges that faculty members are encountering when dealing with MOOCs, given their role as front-line teachers (Annaraud, Singh, 2017). For University leaders there are various motives for developing MOOCs (Weinhardt & Sitzmann, 2019). These include a desire to enhance institutional reputation, recruit prospective students, become immersed within a professional community, develop business models to support future course developments, and to

attract donors (Annaraud & Singh, 2017).

In seeking to understand the views of faculty members about producing MOOCs, the hospitality and tourism discipline constitutes a suitable context for investigation (O'Mahony & Salmon, 2014). There is growing acknowledgment of the need for lifelong education to allow adaptation and survival in an industry which is experiencing digital disruption. With a variety of stakeholders in hospitality education - employers, academics, educational institutions, and learners – there is a need to accommodate an increasing diversity of student learning styles and to provide knowledge through multiple channels and in multiple formats (Ryan et al., 2016). So-called “microlearning” through MOOCs can provide a potentially viable option for the professional education of younger workers who need maintain currency with the latest trends in the sector (Goh & Lee, 2018). The medium of MOOCs can help accelerate the achievement of a balance between theoretical and practical concerns across the hospitality curriculum (Gross et al., 2017; Dredge et al., 2012). Despite the obvious potential, little empirical evidence has informed MOOCs in the hospitality and tourism context (Annaraud & Singh, 2017; Goh & King, 2019; Lee, Watson, & Watson, 2019; Murphy, Kalbaska, Williams, Ryan, Cantoni, & Horton-Tognazzini, 2014). Lin, Cantoni, McGreal, Kennepohl, and Blomgren (2018) have observed that MOOC practice in hospitality and tourism is relatively underdeveloped, leading to a lack of sector-specific studies (Ryan et al., 2016). The current authors are unaware of any previous investigations into resistance towards MOOCs amongst hospitality faculty members.

For investigations of technology adoption in educational contexts the Diffusion of Innovation (DOI) concept (first developed by Rogers, Simon, and Schuster (2003)) and been acknowledged as the most suitable theoretical framework (Sahin, 2006). Faculty members may be viewed as the gatekeepers for innovations that are subsequently diffused into educational settings. The provision of adequate training for faculty members is fundamental for ensuring integration into applicable learning environments (Haber & Mills, 2008; Steinke, 2012). Innovation theory offers a potential medium to understand both motivations and resistance and may also provide insights into diffusion over time (Rogers et al., 2003). The current researchers have focus on barriers and have deployed a combination of diffusion of innovation (DOI) theory and motivation theory as a framework to explore why a) hospitality faculty members dislike MOOCs and b) to investigate any factors that hinder implementation. The study contributes to theory by addressing the research gap about

faculty constraints to the use MOOCs as a medium for teaching. As a contribution to practice the authors suggest potential encouragements for faculty to use MOOCs as an innovative method.

Literature review

MOOCs in Hospitality and Tourism Education

It has been widely observed that MOOCs should be considered as a form of innovation in distance learning (Ryan et al., 2016). In discussing their impact on higher education, Rose and Martin (2012) described MOOCs as a disruptive innovation. As an alternative to restricted entry into degree programs, the deployment of on-line forums and the absence of entry requirements allows for unlimited participation in MOOCs and open access to on-line resources with the support of fellow learners. Some MOOC websites also inform candidates about how to acquire a certificate of completion (Ryan et al., 2016). The MOOC environment is suitable for lifelong learners, and accommodates a diversity of learning styles (Ryan et al., 2016). The MOOC “mania” or “tsunami” has been attributed to the capacity of this delivery style to provide an escape from geography, time, and human resource boundaries. It has been characterized as “redefining” higher education (Joseph & Nath, 2013; Xiao et al., 2019). MOOCs are undoubtedly making inroads into diverse academic disciplines and are likely to play a substantial part in both off-line and on-line learning modes (Annaraud & Singh, 2017; Marchiori & Cantoni, 2018). Traditional online learning may consist of asynchronous and synchronous experiences and involve expository instruction, active learning, and interactive learning (Means, Toyama, Murphy, Bakia, & Jones, 2009). The delivery of MOOC content typically involves using video lectures conducted by renowned subject experts from noted universities and deploying multiple-choice on-line quizzes (Deale, 2015).

MOOCs only reached hospitality and tourism higher education after they had already been embraced by other disciplines (Murphy, Kalbaska, Cantoni, Horton-Tognazzini, Ryan, & Williams, 2016). This fits with the is anticipation that technological developments will accelerate and become increasingly commonplace in hospitality (Murphy, Kalbaska, Horton-Tognazzini, & Cantoni, 2015). An increasing array of new training and educational delivery methods are forthcoming, including MOOC (Deale, 2015; Lin, Cantoni, & Murphy, 2018). However, it has been suggested that without the “rapid development of MOOCs in tourism higher education”, there may be a growing gap between “the demand and supply of human resources in the industry” (Xiao et al., 2019). Training provision has evidently struggled to keep up in the face of a rapid growth in

tourism demand and an associated need for a qualified and skilled workforce. This suggests that MOOCs may play an important role in future hospitality education, provided that those developing the medium take account of the motivations of students to pursue a degree in hospitality (Goh et al., 2017; Frawley et al., 2019).

Perceptions towards MOOCs amongst faculty members

Knowledge, perceptions, and skills may influence the motivations of faculty members to deploy on-line teaching tools (Mohamad, Salleh, & Salam, 2015). Faculty who possess knowledge or experience about distance learning pedagogies and delivery may be particularly well placed to appreciate the challenges associated with MOOCs (Carlson & Blumenstyk, 2012). However, some faculty may fear that employment opportunities may contract in the event that MOOCs become more commonplace in education (Annaraud & Singh, 2017). Such fears are likely to have been exacerbated through the progress of the COVID-19 pandemic with its incumbent job insecurities. Major impediments to applying on-line teaching include setting expectations, providing feedback, and interpersonal relationships (Davis, Gough, and Taylor (2019)). These authors concluded that setting expectations, providing feedback, and interpersonal relationships are the main barriers to the application of online delivery by teachers. An exploratory research note by Deale (2015), found that hospitality and tourism educators were unfamiliar with MOOCs and were at best lukewarm about their use. As will be reported later in this paper, respondents in the current study seemed comparatively unaware of the MOOC phenomenon.

The theory of diffusion of innovation

Faculty members are key gatekeepers for the diffusion of innovations into educational settings. A basic premise for change is adequate training for the faculty who will be responsible for incorporating the tools into learning environments (Haber & Mills, 2008; Steinke, 2012). Rogers et al. (2003) developed the DOI concept which is acknowledged as the most applicable theoretical framework to study the adoption of technologies in educational contexts (Sahin, 2006). In the diffusion of innovation (DOI) theory, certain characteristics of innovation determine the extent and speed of its diffusion. Table 1 shows that the rate of adoption is partially influenced by innovation related characteristics including relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, complexity, and observability.

Insert Table 1 about here

Faculty motivations for using MOOCs

An understanding of resistance and motivation is fundamental to the diffusion of innovation theory (Rogers et al., 2003). Motivational theory derives from how or why people are motivated and recognizes the existence of so-called resistance factors (Pinder, 1984). Gautreau (2011) listed seven motivational factors that influence the integration of on-line tools. These were: rate of pay, responsibility, achievement, advancement, administration and company policy, the work itself, and recognition. Schifter (2000) characterized motivators as personal motivation, previous technology training, scholarly pursuit, and reduced teaching loads. Various studies have illustrated the equivalent extrinsic and intrinsic factors for a consistent engagement by faculty in online teaching. The factors driving faculty to teach online include intrinsic rewards such as flexibility, challenge, and personal satisfaction (Betts, 1998). According to James, Steven, and Fairweather (2005) intrinsic motivations have the biggest influence on faculty involvement in online delivery. The most influential intrinsic factors are flexibility, personal satisfaction, and attracting more students . Though extrinsic factors play a role – notably stipends, potentially reduced workloads, and studying new technologies - it was found that intrinsic factors have a greater impact on the motivations of faculty members (Parker, 2003; Steinke, 2012).

With the increasing importance of MOOCs in contemporary higher education and rising hospitality and tourism employment (at least prior to Covid-19), the MOOCs medium can support lifelong learning. Hospitality and tourism higher education providers are starting to embrace MOOCs. If MOOCs are to become more widely accepted and then promoted, it is critical to understand the opposition that is shown by some faculty members. The rest of this study will respond to the following research questions:

1. Why are some hospitality and tourism faculty negatively disposed to MOOCs? And
2. What are the potential implications of such dispositions?

Methodology

Research design

The researchers adopt a constructivist paradigm to explore why hospitality faculty are uncomfortable about the use of MOOCs. This approach contends that differences in human attitudes and behaviors depend on the social context (Crotty, 1998). A qualitative research approach has been adopted in the current exploratory study. Such approaches allow for the interpretation of phenomena and where applicable the exploration of comprehensive views and perceptions (Heigham & Croker, 2009). The authors conducted semi-structured interviews to acquire a qualitative understanding of central themes in the lives of interviewees (Qu & Dumay, 2011). This approach offers the prospect of achieving greater depth of insight.

Data collection

The researchers have adopted a purposeful sampling approach because of their intended focus on faculty members who are familiar with MOOCs and thus capable of progressing to their development on a relevant platform. It is anticipated that the target audience may nevertheless have some reasons to dislike MOOCs and/or what they represent since they represent a substantial disruption to established delivery modes. Purposive sampling was deemed appropriate since it allows the identification of participants or angles that will help to understand the research problem (Creswell, 2018). The authors collected insights from the intended sample through interviewing and sorted the findings until the point of saturation, namely the emergence of no new content and perspectives. Interview guidelines were applied to ensure a consistent approach. Congruent with the prominent topics in the literature, the researchers assembled the following interview questions: (1) Have you heard of MOOCs? If yes, please proceed to the next question. (2) Are you capable of producing courses on a MOOC? (3) Have you experienced any negative feelings about MOOCs? (4) Where did you hear about MOOCs and can you describe in detail the process of knowing about them? (5) Could you explain in detail the reasons for your negative feelings about MOOCs? (6) Have you ever intended to produce a course on a MOOC, and subsequently abandoned your plan? Please provide a detailed description of this process.

The sample selection was based primarily on answers to the first three questions. The study sample is confined to those familiar with MOOCs and who are capable of proceeding to production, though have experienced some negative feelings. The final three questions are based on the study objectives, whereas the preceding questions provided a starting point for in-depth interviewing. The choice of wording was designed to assist the interviewers to collect a combination of basic

though rich and comprehensive data. The principal author acted as an interviewer to ensure the authenticity of the data. A neutral attitude was adopted throughout the interviewing, with objective questioning, and encouragement given to interviewees to share their full spectrum of opinions. The interviews were conducted in early May 2020 and extensive notes were taken. Data were checked carefully at the conclusion of the interviews to ensure that all designated questions had been answered. The interviewer also collected demographic information, including respondents' age, gender, and prior work experiences. Interviews took 40-45 minutes on average. Ultimately, a total of 14 valid samples were collected, with equal gender balance - seven of the interviewees were female (F) and seven were male (M). The respondents were drawn from 12 universities across mainland China, including in Zhejiang, Henan, Guangdong and Anhui Provinces and in Chengdu (Suchuan Province).

Data analysis

All of the interview responses were provided in Chinese and were subsequently translated and back translated between English and Chinese. The data were then coded by the first author and with two others who had familiarity with the study, with the review of progress concluding at the point of consensual agreement. Thematic analysis was used for the coding of transcripts. The authors followed Braun and Clark's six phases and analyzed the themes together manually (Braun & Clarke, 2006). They excluded any items that were irrelevant to the research objectives. Figure 1 presents the resistance dimensions that are embedded in the DOI model. The details are outlined in the following section.

Results and discussion

Table 2 presents the interviewee demographics based on the assembled data. The respondents ranged between age 20+ and 50+ and had work experience ranging between four and 27 years.

Insert Table 2 about here

The researchers assembled five dimensions of resistance to MOOCs on the basis of the DOI findings. These are respectively: perceived attributes and complexity, perceived incompatibility, trialability of MOOCs, and inability to observe.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Perceived attributes and complexity

During the course of interviewing, most respondents indicated that making MOOCs is complicated. Though they have the capability to engage in production, they were disinclined to proceed because of the complexity of the process. It was widely held that developing MOOCs takes considerable time compared with making face-to-face lectures, and may involve special dress requirements.

I felt it is very difficult. (F4)

It takes a lot of trouble to get a video camera and to produce a recording. I feel it is so complicated. You also have to choose the background and post-production. (F3)

MOOC lectures require a dress code, whereas I can wear whatever I want in my offline class. (F7, F4, F3, F2)

The older professors do not like to produce MOOCs. (M2)

The platform often has bugs and is difficult to operate. (M3. F1)

The technology could not meet the necessary requirements and had limitations. (M5)

Sense of incompatibility

Some interviewees dislike MOOCs because of perceived incompatibility. They feel that they do not offer an adequate replacement for most university subjects, especially in the case of more practically oriented units. Some interviewees consider MOOC assessment methods as poorly suited to certain courses. Many hospitality and tourism subjects have a more practical orientation, even at University level, thereby requiring different assessment.

MOOCs are an innovation, but they cannot substitute for face-to-face education. The transfer of knowledge should be extensive and not confined to theoretical conceptualization. In my opinion, MOOC is a popular teaching tool, but courses in MOOC platforms in China seem too theoretical. (M3)

MOOCs are over-reliant on multiple-choice questions for assessments and assignments. Their assessment method is basic, and ill-suited to some practical courses. (M2, F5)

For example, I used the Chinese MOOC this year. The assessment method was too simple, only multiple-choice questions. For the study of knowledge, the most important thing is the application, which requires use by students after graduation. Students may pass the exam, but they may be unable to use the knowledge after graduation. (M4)

A study by Xiao et al. (2019) highlighted the following differences compared with on-campus studies of hospitality management: “(1) the insufficient hurdle role of MOOC assessments to verify qualifications, (2) inadequacies in training and assessing higher-order practical competencies, and (3) the unfulfilled role of learners as co-creators and co-assessors”. As a supplement to these previously reported findings some interviewees in the current study feared that their jobs would be replaced by MOOCs. More intrinsic factors also elicited faculty resistance to MOOCs.

Some instructors will feel that it affects their workload. They fear that if students learn through MOOCs; then they will be unwilling to go to the offline class. There will be fewer offline classes. There will be conflicts in the interests of instructors. They are worried about being replaced by MOOCs. (F3, F7)

Un-trialability of MOOCs

During the interviews, most respondents attributed their dislike of MOOCs to barriers such as lack of time and experience. Others mentioned that they have little knowledge about MOOCs because they are not required. Some also noted a lack of financial backing and other assistance, equipment, training, and general support.

I have thought about it. But I did not subsequently apply for funding. My idea is to build on the application which was not approved. If my project is approved and I have funds, I will do it. If I have no funds, I will not do it. (F4)

I really want to do MOOC. The reason why I haven't done anything yet is that the school has not asked. There is no time to do it, I am so busy. (M1)

We hope the school will give us systematic training and help. Schools are required to provide instruments, with supporting facilities. (M6)

Our school is facing bankruptcy, and the college is unwilling to support or invest in us to make MOOCs. (F3, F6)

I have some doubts. I lack experience. I lack basic knowledge about MOOCs and have not received systematic training. (F1)

One interviewee mentioned that there are high barriers to entry and that not everyone can make MOOCs on the platform.

The requirements for Chinese MOOCs are very high. It is a requirement to pass the provincial assessment before uploading the project for construction. (F6)

Hsu (2016) found that efforts to promote the use of technology in hospitality education have a significant association with the adoption of in-class technologies by teachers. It has also been shown that teachers' behavioral intentions towards adoption relate significantly to the deployment of school budgets in innovative technology-based instruction.

Cannot be observed

The final dimension of faculty resistance to MOOCs is an inability to enjoy the fruits of innovation. Some interviewees mentioned that they do not want to be involved because there is no additional payment. Some mentioned that they could not get promoted. Also, most interviewees were concerned about the quality of online student interactions, leading to an accomplishment deficit.

Why should I make extra work for myself? The payment is not equal to my efforts (F2)

It is a waste of time. MOOCs cannot get you promoted. So, it makes no sense. (F1, F4, M3)

I can't feel that it is a real class, especially because of the lack of student interaction. (M3, M4, F2, F5, F7)

It is difficult to interact with students remotely; I cannot obtain a sense of accomplishment.

(F4)

Several interviewees mentioned the poor quality of MOOCs. One interviewee observed that students will prefer MOOCs coming from famous universities and that nobody wants to study those coming from lesser known institutions.

As far as I understand, on the platform of Chinese MOOC or edX, for schools like ours, there are very few students who are willing to join. Students are naturally willing to listen to the courses of famous universities instead of ordinary institutions. You put a lot of effort into making it, but no one listens. (F6)

The quality of MOOCs is not very good. (M3)

Rai, Sun, Cao, & Liu (2016) noted that MOOC success is largely attributable to the good reputation of offline universities and teachers (cited in Xiao et al., 2019).

Conclusion

This qualitative study has explored the in-depth thoughts of hospitality faculty members who are negatively disposed towards MOOCs. It has addressed the question of why some hospitality and tourism faculty are negatively disposed to MOOCs and the potential implications of such dispositions. Based on DOI, the findings may be classified into five causes of resistance to MOOCs. These are: perceived attributes and complexity, feel not compatibility, untrialability of MOOCs, and cannot be observed.

The ARCS Motivation model has been used previously to identify the factors affecting the motivation of lecturers to use online teaching methods (Mohamad, Salleh, and Salam (2015)). However, the previous authors proposed rather general factors from the user perspective, namely: knowledge, perceptions, and skills. The present study contributes to an emerging area by connecting educator motivations towards producing MOOCs, with the characteristics which determine the rate at which innovation is diffused (DOI). By analyzing themes emerging from the educator interviews, the authors classified ideas into factors that affect the rate of innovation diffusion, and proposed a systematic summary of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. There is a future opportunity to verify and further develop an extended thematic map by adopting a quantitative research approach with richer data, and also applying a similar topic in different settings. For example, future researchers can undertake quantitative testing of the influence of the

factors determining the degree of diffusion of innovation as a disruption. This research has generated some notable findings. For example, it has been shown that some educators are reluctant to record MOOCs because they feel that they must wear MOOC appropriate dress. Future researchers can explore whether this is unique to the education environment in Mainland China, or whether it applies in other countries and cultures. Finally, although the current authors have classified quality assurance in the thematic map as the Observability of MOOCs, quality assurance is a system that has the potential to ally educator concerns. Future researchers may consider the quality assurance system as a separate factor affecting the degree of innovation diffusion of MOOCs as a disruptive innovation.

This study contributes to higher education practice by encouraging institutional leaders to consider the various resistance factors when adjusting future MOOC development strategies, notably by providing interested faculty members with more targeted funding, assistance, support systems, training, payments, and promotion. As pressures for blended learning have accelerated through the Covid-19 pandemic, the urgency of encouraging educators to develop and delivery MOOCs is accelerating. Through the ongoing health crisis, educational institutions can benefit from flexible options such as MOOCs as a partial replacement and/or supplement to long established face-to-face teaching. This will require higher education institutions to engage in the production of MOOCs. Meanwhile, such institutions can revise the established focus of their performance appraisal systems on face-to-face teaching and academic research, to encompass online education such as MOOCs. Institutions could offer rewards to teachers who are willing to make MOOCs and engage in online teaching. Besides, higher education institutions need to support teachers with targeted funding. In the case of those that cannot record MOOC videos, they may defuse educator worries by outsourcing video recording to professional recording and editing companies. Institutions may also assist educators to learn about making MOOCs, particularly the older and less “tech-savvy”, or hire a professional team to help and guide educators in addressing issues.

The findings have highlighted some limits of MOOC platforms The authors have suggested a need to adjust the applicable platforms by improving user-friendliness, providing a diversity of assessment, applying quality assurance, extending opportunities to all, and promoting universities equally. Much of the success of MOOCs relates to the good reputation of universities and of their

instructors (Rai, Sun, Cao, & Liu, 2016). In the current environment, less famous universities and instructors may have fewer opportunities to become known by students on the MOOC platforms. The introduction of a quality assurance system may allow for the improved evaluation of MOOC quality, and may also encourage different universities and instructors to participate in the production of MOOCs. Quality assurance (QA) systems from established institutions could perhaps be “borrowed” to provide a mechanism for the measurement of MOOC quality specified for China (Xiao et al., 2019). According to Xiao et al. (2019), the MOOC platform may need to address challenges associated with the practical teaching requirements of hospitality and tourism education by cooperating with offline programs. The current study has also raised similar questions. Interviewees worried that students’ learning outputs could not be truly and effectively assessed using the single course assessment method provided by the platform. Platforms can overcome such worries by providing more assessment methods and/or adding plug-ins that assist teachers and students with real-time interactions.

Some limitations of the current study should be noted. Firstly, the sample size is small and cannot represent the whole population of hospitality and tourism faculty. Future researchers are encouraged to adopt a larger sample size with greater diversity of demographic backgrounds to improve the validity of the research design. Secondly, since the study targeted University faculty members in mainland China, the findings may not apply in other countries. Scholars with an interest in this topic are encouraged to design comparative studies or expand the study sites to test for prospective new findings. Thirdly, due to the qualitative nature of the research, subjectivity is a potential limitation. Future researchers might adopt a quantitative or mixed-method to provide empirical evidence in support of the verification or development of the perceptions map. Finally, the research team approached the investigation by narrowing down the range of respondents to those with a negative disposition. They acknowledge that an alternative approach would have been to “set the stage” by focusing on issues rather than barriers.

References

- Annaraud, K., & Singh, D. (2017). Perceptions of Hospitality Faculty and Students of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 29*(2), 82-90.
- Betts, K. S. (1998). An Institutional Overview: Factors Influencing Faculty Participation in Distance Education in Postsecondary Education in the United States: An Institutional Study. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 1*(3), 1-14.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.
- Carlson, S., & Blumenstyk, G. (2012). For whom is college being reinvented. *Chronicle of Higher Education, December 17, 2012*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fifth edition.. ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*: Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publications.
- Davis, N. L., Gough, M., & Taylor, L. L. (2019). Online teaching: advantages, obstacles and tools for getting it right. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 19*(3), 256-263.
- Deale, C. S. (2015). An Exploratory Study of Hospitality and Tourism Educators' Use and Perceptions of MOOCs. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 15*(2), 150-165.
- Deale, C. S., & Lee, S. H. (2018). Are They on the Same Wavelength? Industry Professionals' and Students' Perceptions of Online Graduate Degree Programs in Hospitality and Tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 30*(3), 154-166.
- Dredge, D., Benckendorff, P., Day, M., Gross, M., Walo, Weeks, P., & Whitelaw, P. (2012). The philosophic practitioner and the curriculum space. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(4), 2154-2176.
- edX. (2020). edX.org.
- Frawley, T., Goh, E., & Law, R. (2019). Quality assurance at hotel management tertiary institutions in Australia: An insight into factors behind domestic and international student satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 31*(1), 1-9.
- Gaebel, M., & Gaebel, M. (2014). MOOCs: Massive Open Online Courses. *European University Association*.
- Gautreau, C. (2011). Motivational Factors Affecting the Integration of a Learning Management System by Faculty. *Journal of Educators Online, 8*(1), 1-25. Goh, E., & King, B. (2019). Four decades (1980-2020) of hospitality and tourism higher education in Australia: Developments and future prospects. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 1-7*.
- Goh, E., & Lee, C. (2018). A workforce to be reckoned with: The emerging pivotal Generation Z hospitality workforce. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 73*, 20-28
- Goh, E., Nguyen, S., & Law, R. (2017). Marketing private hotel management schools in Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*
- Gross, M., Benckendorff, Mair, J., & Whitelaw, P. (2017). Hospitality higher education quality: Establishing standards in Australia. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*
- Haber, J., & Mills, M. (2008). Perceptions of Barriers Concerning Effective Online Teaching and Policies: Florida Community College Faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 32*(4-6), 266-283.
- Heigham, J. D., & Croker, R. A. D. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics : A*

- Practical Introduction*. Springer.
- Hsu, L. (2016). Diffusion of Innovation and Use of Technology in Hospitality Education: An Empirical Assessment with Multilevel Analyses of Learning Effectiveness. *Asia-Pacific Education Research*, 25(1), 135-145.
- James, Steven, & Fairweather. (2005). Beyond the Rhetoric: Trends in the Relative Value of Teaching and Research in Faculty Salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 401-422.
- Joseph, A. M., & Nath, B. A. (2013). *Integration of Massive Open Online Education (MOOC) System with in-Classroom Interaction and Assessment and Accreditation: An extensive report from a pilot study*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the international conference on e-learning, e-business, enterprise information systems, and e-Government (EEE).
- Lee, D., Watson, S. L., & Watson, W. R. (2019). Systematic literature review on self-regulated learning in massive open online courses. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(1), DOI: 10.14742/ajet.3749.
- Lin, J., Cantoni, L., McGreal, R., Kennepohl, D., & Blomgren, C. (2018). Decision, Implementation, and Confirmation: Experiences of Instructors behind Tourism and Hospitality MOOCs. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 19(1). DOI:10.19173/irrodl.v19i1.3402
- Lin, J., Cantoni, L., & Murphy, J. (2018). MOOCs in tourism and hospitality: a review. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 18(3), 217-235.
- Marchiori, E., & Cantoni, L. (2018). Applying the counseling-learning approach to a tourism-related massive open online course. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 18(1), 58-74.
- Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2009). Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies. Project Report. Centre for Learning Technology.
- Mohamad, S. N. M., Salleh, M. A. M., & Salam, S. (2015). Factors Affecting Lecturers Motivation in Using Online Teaching Tools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 1778-1784.
- Murphy, J., Kalbaska, N., Cantoni, L., Horton-Tognazzini, L., Ryan, P., & Williams, A. (2016). Massive open online courses (MOOCs) in tourism. In P. Benckendorff & A. Zehrer (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and learning in tourism* (pp. 154–172). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Murphy, J., Kalbaska, N., Horton-Tognazzini, L., & Cantoni, L. (2015). Online learning and MOOCs: A framework proposal. In I. Tussyadiah & A. Inversini (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2015*. Cham: Springer.
- Murphy, J., Kalbaska, N., Williams, A., Ryan, P., Cantoni, L., & Horton-Tognazzini, L. C. (2014). Massive open online courses: Strategies and research areas. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 26(1), 39–43. [Taylor & Francis Online](#).
- Murphy, J., Tracey, J. B., & Horton-Tognazzini, L. (2016). MOOC camp: A flipped classroom and blended learning model. In A. Inversini & R. Schegg (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2016* (pp. 653–665). Cham: Springer.
- O'Mahony, B., & Salmon, G. (2014). The role of massive open online courses (MOOCs) in the democratization of tourism and hospitality education. In D. Dredge, D. Airey, & M. J. Gross (Eds.), *Handbook of tourism and hospitality education* (pp. 130–142). London: Routledge.
- Parker, A. (2003). Motivation and Incentives for Distance Faculty. *Online Journal of Distance*

- Learning Administration*, 6(3).
- Phan, T., McNeil, S. G., & Robin, B. R. (2016). Students' patterns of engagement and course performance in a Massive Open Online Course. *Computers & Education*, 95, 36-44.
- Pinder, C. C. (1984). *Work Motivation: Theory, Issues and Applications*. Scott Foresman.
- Qu, S. Q., & Dumay, J. (2011). The qualitative research interview. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 8(3), 238-264.
- Rai, L., Sun, N., Cao, M., & Liu, F. (2016). *Comparision of Online and Offline Impact on MOOC Learning*. Paper presented at the Iserd-international Conference on Arts.
- Rogers, E. M., Simon, & Schuster. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations, 5th Edition*: Free Press.
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School*: Equinox Sheffield.
- Ryan, P., Horton-Tognazzini, L., & Williams, A. (2016). A Snapshot of MOOCs in Hospitality and Tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 28(2), 107-112.
- Sahin, I. (2006). Detailed review of rogers' diffusion of innovations theory and educational technology-related studies based on rogers' theory. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 5(2), 14-23.
- Schifter, C. C. (2000). Faculty participation in asynchronous learning networks: A case study of motivating and inhibiting factors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 4(1), 15-22.
- Shapiro, H. B., Lee, C. H., Roth, N. E. W., Li, K., Çetinkaya-Rundel, M., & Canelas, D. A. (2017). Understanding the massive open online course (MOOC) student experience: An examination of attitudes, motivations, and barriers. *Computers & Education*, 110, 35-50.
- Steinke, S. L. (2012). *Experiential learning to influence faculty resistance and motivation when developing science-with-lab online courses*. (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).
- Xiao, C., Qiu, H., & Cheng, S. M. (2019). Challenges and opportunities for effective assessments within a quality assurance framework for MOOCs. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 24, 1-16.
- Weinhardt, J. M., & Sitzmann, T. (2019). Revolutionizing training and education? Three questions regarding massive open online courses (MOOCs). *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(2), 218-225.

Table 1. Characteristics affecting individual adoption of innovation (adapted from Rogers et al. (2003))

Key Elements	Description	Rate of Adoption
Relative advantage	innovation has more advantages than the method it replaces.	Positively related
Compatibility	a degree of conformity with existing values, past experiences of potential recipients, and individual needs.	Positively related
Complexity	the ease with which an innovation is understood or used.	Negatively related
Trialability	the possibility that innovation can be tested under certain conditions.	Positively related
Observability	refers to the extent to which an individual can see the results of an innovation.	Positively related

Table 2. Interviewee Demographics

Interviewee	Gender	Age Range	Title	Area of Specialization	Years of Relevant Experience	Affiliation
M1	M	40+	Professor	Tourism planning and economics	27	Zhejiang Gongshang University
M2	M	50+	Professor	Tourism Economics	21	Zhejiang Gongshang University
M3	M	40+	Associate Professor	Hospitality Management	20	Zhengjiang Gongshang University
M4	M	40+	Associate Professor	Hospitality Management	10	Luoyang Normal University
M5	M	40+	Associate Professor	Hospitality Management	10	Zhejiang Yuexiu University of Foreign Languages
M6	M	40+	Associate Professor	Business Management	15	Zhe Jiang Gongshang University Hangzhou College of Commence
M7	M	30+	Lecturer	Tourism Management	7	Jinan University Shenzhen Campus
F1	F	30+	Lecturer	Hotel Management	4	Gingko College of Hospitality Management
F2	F	30+	Associate Professor	Business Management	10	Zhejiang Yuexiu University of Foreign Languages
F3	F	40+	Associate Professor	Tourism Management	16	Zhejiang Normal University
F4	F	30+	Lecturer	Tourism and Hospitality Management	7	Luoyang Normal University
F5	F	30+	Lecturer	Tourism Management	8	Zhejiang Gongshang University
F6	F	20+	Lecturer	Tourism Management	4	Bozhou University
F7	F	20+	Lecturer	Tourism Management	4	Zhengzhou Sias University

Figure 1. Faculty resistance dimensions to making MOOCs



