2024

An Examination of Differences in Course Satisfaction Between In Person and Remote Learning for PsyD Students

Alexandra Thrasher

An Examination of Differences in Course Satisfaction Between In Person and Remote Learning for PsyD Students

Alex Thrasher

Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program, LIU Post

Dissertation Chair: Eva Feindler, PhD

Committee Member: Linnea Mavrides, PsyD

Committee Member: Hilary Vidair, PhD

Table of Contents

Abstract

Many doctor of psychology (PsyD) students have chosen distance learning over in-person learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite distance education's novelty and the potential effect on student competency and satisfaction, little to no research to date explores PsyD students' experiences learning clinical concepts or seeing clients remotely during the pandemic. Previous research on online course satisfaction at the graduate level was conducted in 2020 and 2021, when pandemic-related stressors may have influenced results. Furthermore, research on online course satisfaction has yet to be conducted with PsyD students. Graduate students in PsyD programs may fall into the category of "non-traditional" students and have different needs than traditional students. In addition to taking classes, PsyD training incorporates clinical work that students participate in outside the classroom two to three days a week. Given these unique training demands, their satisfaction with online education may differ from that of other graduate-level students. This mixed-methods study included 34 participants in their third or fourth year of doctoral training who have participated in either the in-person or the virtual section of the professional development course at a private university in New York. By comparing satisfaction between the virtual and in-person sections, this study aimed to provide insight into whether doctor of psychology students are equally satisfied taking the supervision and consultation class online and in person. Furthermore, by gathering information through structured surveys, this study aimed to provide additional insights into the factors that may lead students to choose remote learning, their experiences as remote students in a course, and students' perceived benefits and drawbacks of online education. Ultimately, these findings will inform educational institutions and program directors about the viability of online learning and help enhance learning experiences for PsyD students by aligning program curriculums to student needs.

Results indicated no significant difference in satisfaction scores between the remote and in-person groups. However, satisfaction scores varied significantly between remote groups, with Professor 1's remote class having higher satisfaction scores than Professor 2's. Commute time for remote sections was significantly longer than for in-person sections. Four theoretical constructs emerged from the data in Pilot 2: Students opt for remote learning as a way to meet their basic needs and take care of themselves; instructor variables have significant impact on student satisfaction; class content affects students' decision to be remote; student social aspects and dynamics impacted uniquely based on individual students. Ultimately, these findings will inform educational institutions and program directors about the viability of online learning and help enhance learning experiences for PsyD students by aligning program curriculums to student needs.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Eva Feindler. Your mentorship and teaching over the past four years have meant the world to me. From the very beginning, you provided me with a solid foundation on which to build my clinical knowledge and skills. Your guidance and support have been instrumental in my growth, and I know I am a better student, person, and therapist because of you.

I also want to extend my heartfelt thanks to my amazing teachers and committee members, Dr. Linnea Mavrides and Dr. Hilary Vidair. Dr. Mavrides, your teaching pushes people to think beyond their normal perspectives and has forever stuck with me. I am so grateful you joined my committee and became a part of this project. To Dr. Hilary Vidair, thank you for your insightful guidance and support throughout this process. Your expertise and direction have been critical to my growth and to the completion of my dissertation.

To my amazing colleagues and friends, Melanie Sciaccio and Amneet Kaur, I could not have made it through without you both. Your late-night phone calls, hangouts, and shared laughter made this experience so much more bearable and enjoyable. Your friendship and support have meant the world to me. To my dear friend Jenna Ward, thank you for taking such a great interest in this project as a coder. Your intelligence and unique perspective have elevated this work, and I am so grateful for your contributions.

Finally, to my amazing family, thank you for your unwavering support and encouragement. You have always believed in me and my passions, pushing me to reach for my dreams and pursue graduate school. Your love and encouragement have gotten me here, and I am deeply thankful for you all.

History of the Doctor of Psychology Degree

In 1973, the American Psychological Association (APA) concluded that the knowledge and skills needed to be an effective practitioner of psychology differed from the skills needed in psychological research. As such, they recommended that the doctor of psychology (PsyD) degree be pursued by individuals looking to provide clinical services. Alternately, the doctor of philosophy (PhD) degree should be pursued by individuals interested in conducting research (Korman, 1976). PsyD programs typically follow a Practitioner-Scholar training model, where students pursue classroom learning of theories and clinical guidelines alongside hands-on clinical training and supervision. This requires that students matriculate through their studies while participating in clinical externship placements and one full-time clinical internship placement during their doctoral career (American Psychological Association, 2006). Many PsyD students navigated uncharted waters when they began their first clinical placements remotely in 2020 due to the pandemic. This may have required them to conduct therapy sessions and receive clinical supervision via telehealth platforms such as Zoom or Theranest.

PsyD Student Course Satisfaction Differences Between In-Person and Remote Learning

Historically, most doctor of psychology (PsyD) clinical training and education has been conducted face-to-face or in person. The American Psychological Association (APA) Commission on Accreditation currently does not accredit online-only psychology doctoral programs that utilize distance education as a substantial part of the instruction. Some accredited programs may offer online courses or other content via distance education in an adjunctive role, but online education cannot represent a "substantial nature of program content and certain classes (practicum) are not considered appropriate for this instructional method" (APA, 2015). As such, there has been little to no research conducted on distance education’s efficacy at the doctor of

psychology level. The U.S. Department of Education of Postsecondary Education Accreditation Division defines distance education as education that utilizes technology to deliver content to students who are not physically present with the instructor. It can be used to support interaction or learning synchronously or asynchronously. The internet, one-way or two-way transmissions, audioconferencing, or DVDs may be used (DOE, 2012).

However, despite APA's long-standing rules on distance education, COVID-19 forced the issue and pushed some doctoral programs fully online during the 2020 academic year. Since the pandemic began, some schools offered remote learning into 2022. Additionally, new laws and regulations surrounding telehealth, coupled with recent advancements in teleconferencing software, led to a completely changed landscape in how mental healthcare can be delivered to consumers. Research found that telemedicine was the preferred therapeutic environment for many consumers (Koonin et al., 2020; Fortune Business Insights, 2021). APA's COVID-19 Practitioner Survey (2021) found that 96% of psychologists surveyed continued to provide teletherapy as a part of their offerings (APA, 2021).

COVID-19 changed the educational landscape, the profession, and how psychologists deliver services to clients. As a result of distance education's novelty, especially at the PsyD level, more research needs to be conducted about its efficacy. Furthermore, it's largely unknown if students or faculty are satisfied with course instruction online. Despite course satisfaction's ties to performance, engagement, and success (Sahin & Shelley, 2008; Wickersham & McGee, 2008), no current literature could be found exploring PsyD students' satisfaction regarding distance education versus in-person learning. Information about doctoral clinical psychology student satisfaction with remote learning could help inform program directors in improving training or clinical course offerings.

A New Opportunity to Measure Course Satisfaction

A major limitation of online course satisfaction research is its outdated nature. Most studies were conducted largely before Software as a Service (SaaS) offerings became ubiquitous. For instance, such studies predate the introduction of modern, major online conferencing and learning platforms like Zoom in 2011 (Murphy Kelly, 2020) and Google Classroom in 2014 (Herold, 2020). Furthermore, many of these studies only closely follow the introduction of the ed-tech unicorn and first mover, Blackboard, in 1997 (Empson, 2012). Since their inception, these online learning and meeting platforms have only grown in market share. The Covid-19 pandemic accelerated their adoption into the fabric of our lives and our education. In 2020 at the height of the pandemic, Zoom was valued at $40 billion (Murphy Kelly, 2020), and the New York Times reports that more than 50% of the country's K-12 schools were using Google education products (Singer, 2017).

The outdated literature is significant because technological advancements may facilitate better teaching methods, learning outcomes, and student course satisfaction. Furthermore, expectations around what students can expect from technology and learning and conferencing platforms have also changed. To address this gap and account for the impact of modern online learning platforms, more research is needed to examine PsyD student satisfaction with online courses. However, while gauging an understanding of PsyD students' course satisfaction is important, measuring course satisfaction can be challenging.

Complexities in Online Learning Course Satisfaction

While grade point average or final grade has typically been the standard for measuring course effectiveness (Hao, 2016; Lu et al., 2003), course satisfaction is not as easy to measure despite its importance. The literature notes that student satisfaction is multidimensional and

includes many factors such as engagement, flexibility, workload, pedagogical skills of the instructor, and communication (Elshami et al., 2021). Furthermore, online learning satisfaction includes additional factors like technology support, access to technology, and comfortability.

Adding to the complexity, there is no one-size-fits-all regarding course satisfaction. The literature suggests that individual demographic factors, such as age, learning style, or personality, will affect individual factors that contribute to overall course satisfaction differently (Croxton, 2014). For instance, undergraduate students have been found to value interactions between peers more than graduate students. Rhode's 2009 mixed-methods study of 10 adult learners in a certification class reported that they valued the flexibility of the self-paced learning course over the student-to-student interactivity afforded by in-person learning. Whereas research on 304 online undergraduate and graduate students suggests undergraduate students prefer to work with their peers and collaborate (Walker & Kelly, 2007).

The median age of students graduating with doctoral psychology degrees was 31.3 years in 2022 (National Science Foundation, 2014), suggesting that many doctoral-level students may not be traditional learners throughout their doctoral careers. Kilgore and Rice (2003) define non-traditional students as students who are at least 25 years old and have taken on adult roles such as managing the care of family and/or children, full-time working responsibilities, or significant community involvement. These students are found to have different educational needs than traditional students, such as less interest in social campus life (Kilgore & Rice, 2003). Among more established students with families or students with disabilities, distance education may be preferred over richer peer-to-peer or peer-to-instructor interactions as it provides the necessary flexibility and ease that is needed during this developmental period (Renefro-Michel, O'Halloran, & Delaney, 2010).

Additionally, individual factors such as disability status and lower socioeconomic status may contribute to students valuing flexibility over other factors of course satisfaction. APA's (202) demographic study found that 76% of doctoral-level (PhD, PsyD & EdD) students identify as women. Considering the large number of female students pursuing doctoral-level psychology degrees, the age range of those pursuing the degree, and the long length of the programs, flexibility may be needed for students who are pregnant or with families.

Women who become pregnant during their long doctoral careers usually cannot qualify for benefits under the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA). FMLA qualifies women for 12 weeks of unpaid maternity leave (Kuperberg, 2009). While doctoral programs can offer a leave of absence, Doctoral students typically do not qualify for benefits under FMLA, given the nature of graduate school assistantships that universities typically offer. FMLA requires that an individual is employed for 24 hours per week on average to qualify. However, research assistantship jobs typically offered to doctoral students typically do not come close to meeting this standard (Springer et al., 2009). This leaves students negotiating with their programs for medical appointments, emergencies, post-partum recovery, and childcare issues. As such, women with dependents or who are pregnant may feel more satisfied in courses that offer flexible learning experiences. Despite these unique factors that vary from student to student, the literature points to specific factors that are most closely tied to student course satisfaction.

Factors Contributing to Online Course Satisfaction

Of those many variables tied to course satisfaction, factors related to the course instructor have emerged as being closely tied to course satisfaction ratings (McFarland & Hamilton, 2005; Bolliger & Martindale, 2004). Besides a student’s direct communication with their professor, the literature suggests that indirect instructor interactions, like students' perception of teacher and

peer interactions, also contributed to students' reports of overall satisfaction (McFarland & Hamilton, 2005). Adding to the literature on instructors and course satisfaction, Bolliger and Martindale (2004) found that the instructor of a course was most closely tied to course satisfaction at the graduate level. Utilizing a sample of 303 graduate students between the ages of 30 and 49 in the Southeastern United States, who completed at least one online course, researchers found that when evaluating key factors that affected student satisfaction, instructor variables most contributed to student satisfaction with online learning. Researchers developed the Online Course Satisfaction Survey (OCSS) to measure student satisfaction. The overall scale's reliability was .99, the Cronbach alpha coefficient for the instructor subscale was .98, and .83 for interactivity. Results suggested that the instructor was crucial in helping maintain student motivation and contributing to student learning (Bolliger & Martindale, 2004). Furthermore, results indicated that online students need opportunities to participate in discussions to feel engaged in the course.

Chuan Wei and Chou (2020) measured course satisfaction as a multidimensional construct comprising instructional style, learning contents and course structures, instructors and teaching assistants, discussion forums, examinations, and the overall course. Their research of 365 undergraduate students in Taiwan enrolled in asynchronous online courses found a positive relationship between perceptions of online learning and readiness (Chuan Wei & Chou, 2020). Surprisingly, a learner's perception of online learning did not affect performance or overall satisfaction. The authors suggest that while a student may have a positive view of online learning, perhaps because of the flexibility or accessibility, this may not significantly influence their actual satisfaction with each course (Chuan Wei & Chou, 2020). It is important to note that the aforementioned study only included undergraduate students who may have different needs

and priorities than non-traditional or graduate learners. As suggested earlier, undergraduate students value interactions with their peers more heavily than their graduate counterparts, so this study's results may differ for clinical psychology doctoral population.

Chuan Wei and Chou (2020) looked further into course satisfaction by examining how online learning perceptions and student readiness relate to course satisfaction and performance. They conceptualized student readiness as one's comfort with learning resources, degree of self-direction, and efficacy with technology. Chaun Wei and Chou (2020) also defined online learning perceptions as a "learners' recognition of the… features or benefits of online learning" (p. 50). Researchers have found that students' skillsets in online tools and their capacity for flexibility in communication and information sharing positively impact their course satisfaction (Sahin & Shelly, 2008; Stokes, 2003). Understanding students' capacity to access and utilize the technology should be considered when evaluating overall course satisfaction.

Course flexibility is another factor tied to student satisfaction. Flexibility may be crucial to non-traditional learners in matriculating through their programs. In a study by Bolliger and Hallupa (2012), 42 students enrolled in at least one-graduate-level online course completed a semi-structured interview about their satisfaction with the online environment. Questions in the interview focused on the course's flexibility, comfort with technology, and overall satisfaction. Results showed that doctoral students were satisfied with their online courses, and many shared that they would not have been able to graduate had it not been for the online learning capabilities afforded to them by their program. This research also supports previous literature that points to flexibility playing a role in education satisfaction (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2003).

Studies that have examined course outcomes suggest that outcomes for in-person and remote courses do not vary. In a study of traditional in-person learning environments compared

to students enrolled in distance graduate counselor education, no difference was found in learning outcomes (Thompson, 2000). Thompson's study focused on 242 counseling graduate students. There was no significant difference found between students that engaged in distance learning compared to in person learning in obtaining professional licensure or satisfaction with their degree (Thompson, 2000). Hendricker et al. (2017) found similar results in their survey of 63 school psychology program directors at the Masters, Specialist, and Doctoral levels. While some of the literature points to satisfaction with online learning, other studies indicate this is not always the case.

Dissatisfaction with Online Learning

Elshami et al. (2021), found that students at the University of Sharjah's Medical Health Sciences College in the UAE were less satisfied with online learning than traditional in-person learning. A cross-sectional study of 270 students and 81 faculty was conducted between April 2020 and May 2020. The University equipped professors with manuals and training workshops, launched 24/7 technical support, and offered synchronous and asynchronous classes using Blackboard and Microsoft Teams (Elshami et al., 2021). The researchers utilized a pre-validated questionnaire to measure course satisfaction. Based on Bolliger and Halupa's (2012) Online Course Satisfaction Survey, the researchers developed a students' satisfaction survey consisting of a 24-item questionnaire featuring subscales examining instructor, technology, course setup, interaction, outcomes, and overall satisfaction. Researchers also utilized an Online Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire that was developed by Bolliger and Wasilik (2009), which consisted of 28 items. Both questionnaires utilized a Likert scale, rating items from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Students and faculty in the study were enrolled in dental medicine (17.6%),

pharmacy (26.3%), health sciences (i.e., medical laboratory, nursing, physiotherapy, dietetics, medical imaging; 45.5%), and medicine (10.6%).

Sixty-eight percent of students surveyed were less satisfied with online learning, and forty-one percent would not recommend online learning. The factors contributing most to lower satisfaction scores were the increased time to download learning materials (35.2%) and the dissatisfaction with collaborative class activities (34.4%). Researchers then examined student responses to open-ended questions about course satisfaction. They found that technical difficulties and long time on screen contributed to the challenges that they faced with online learning.

Finally, about half (47.5%) of students reported that they were happy with the flexibility of online learning (Elshami et al., 2021). of Elshami et al. (2021), as with much of the online course satisfaction research, is that it was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. With the shift to online education happening abruptly, educators and students were unprepared, and there was more general stress due to the pandemic. Unlike Elshami et al. (2021) study, doctoral psychology students may have been more unprepared for this shift online as their clinical placements and supervision were moved online in addition to their coursework In addition to concerns over whether students are satisfied with online learning, some educators have questioned online learning's efficacy in training and in bolstering students' professional and clinical skills.

Criticisms of Online Courses at the Graduate Level

Shroeder's (2021) case study researching master's level school psychology students' preparation for a premaster's internship found that distance education might not promote the professional development of students, as it does not allow them ample time to engage with

colleagues and faculty. The master's program examined in the study featured online and in-person options for students. This suggests that if online courses make up a significant portion of a student's workload, students may miss a significant learning opportunity, especially younger students, who have yet to have the opportunity to develop these skills or build a professional community. Not feeling a sense of mastery over those professional skills or not feeling connected to the field, in general, may affect student satisfaction scores.

In clinical psychology doctoral training, this discussion on adequate professional development becomes more complicated as doctoral training involves integrating clinical training at off-site placements with in-classroom learning experiences (American Psychological Association, 2006). How well students can apply these skills learned remotely to in-person dynamics or vice versa adds to the complicated discussion around the efficacy of online doctoral training.

Hendricker et al. (2017) surveyed school psychology professors and program directors across master's and doctoral-level training programs and found that many professors felt ill-prepared for teaching online courses and had received minimal training in teaching online. Since instructor factors are crucial variables in course satisfaction, their lack of confidence or unfamiliarity with teaching online may affect overall student satisfaction. Also, while the research shows mixed reviews of online learning, Hendricker et al. (2017) found that the faculty in their research had a negative perception of online learning and viewed distance learning as inferior to traditional in-person learning. Program Directors surveyed cited that a lack of available technology infrastructure and university support were concerns in successfully administering online courses and may explain some of the faculty's negative views on online learning.

However, contrary to faculty perceptions, the study pointed out few adverse student outcomes for students engaged in distant learning, as measured by no change in Praxis scores, graduation rates, or employment rates. Despite programs not reporting changes in student outcomes, faculty dissatisfaction with online teaching may affect their excitement to teach the material, thus affecting student satisfaction scores. Furthermore, the study does not indicate what portion of a program's course load is made up of in-person or online courses. As such, online courses may not make up a significant portion of students' workload, and therefore, no change in overall student outcomes may be noticed.

Finally, graduate school can be a stressful experience (Committee on the College Student, 2000). Wang et al. (2020) sent an online survey to a cross-section of 2,031 undergraduate and graduate students at Texas A&M University. Participants completed two standardized self-report measures – the Patient Health Questionnaire -9 and the General Anxiety Disorder -7. Researchers found that students who reported that their stress and anxiety levels had increased during the pandemic shared that the maintenance of online classes contributed to their increased stress (Wang et al., 2020). Again, this study was conducted in 2020 when online classes were relatively newly adopted and followed the recency of a global pandemic which may have influenced findings. PsyD students, without the presence of a global pandemic, are under enormous pressure.

Unique Stressors of Doctoral Psychology Students

A recent study of 426 PhD psychology students and faculty at research-focused institutions found that students (70.2%) from this study reported working 50+ hours a week, and nearly a third reported they worked more than 60+ hours a week. In short, there is too much to do and not enough time for many doctoral-level psychologists in training who balance

coursework and clinical placements that are 16 hours a week. Nearly 60% of students in this sample reported they found it difficult to relax and felt "overcommitted." This may be because, in addition to a large amount of APA-mandated coursework, all advanced clinical psychology doctoral students are also managing several days of week at a clinical placement off-site.

Besides being under tremendous academic pressure, students may also struggle financially throughout their five years as full-time graduate students. The most recent data from the APA's 2009 doctorate employment survey found that the median debt level for PsyD graduates is $120,000 (Michalski et al. 2011). While this data is extremely outdated and we can expect these numbers have only gone up, it speaks to the enormous financial strain PsyD students take on to obtain their degrees.

Unfortunately, these factors may lead to poorer mental health outcomes for graduate students. Gee et al. (2022) found that more than half of the students in their study feel burned out/exhausted, while over one-third of students also report they rarely have time for self-care, family, and non-work activities. Consequently, PsyD students may opt for remote learning in order to cut down on commuting time, accommodate a work schedule, or save money. These may be ways doctoral psychology students may try to cut down on the numerous demands placed on them and improve their mental health. Unfortunately, the methodology and psychometric development of the survey utilized by Gee et al. (2022) was not adequately described by the authors, limiting the interpretation of the data. The NextGen Clinical Psychological Science Survey given to participants in the study contained 24 Likert scale questions rated from 1, not at all, to 5, extremely. There were also three open-ended questions and 2 yes/no/unsure questions.

Theoretical Framework

Interaction Equivalency Theorem and Course Satisfaction

Anderson's (2003) interaction equivalency theorem focuses on student-student, student-instructor, and student-content interactions. Anderson's (2003) theory asserts that when the quality of interactivity between one of these types of interactions is high, students will have a better learning experience. Furthermore, when interactivity from multiple types of interactions is higher quality, students are more likely to be satisfied with their course. The literature suggests that non-traditional students (e.g., students with dependents, low SES, and jobs) have different needs than traditional students (Kilgore & Rice, 2003). While online learning typically involves less student-student interaction, non-traditional students who take online courses may still be satisfied with their online course as long as their student-content interaction remains high. This may explain why low engagement between student-student and student-instructor may not affect satisfaction scores for students participating in online classes.

Student-instructor interactivity refers to the quality, prevalence, and timeline of professor communication (Anderson, 2003). Students with positive, meaningful interactions with their instructors will feel a sense of connectedness with the class and instructor. Finally, student-content interactivity refers to the material and design of the class. Students who find the content engaging and can interact with the material would be considered to have high interactivity with the content.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) proposed that human motivation is rooted in universal needs. He outlined these needs in a pyramid. The bottom of the pyramid consists of immediate physiological needs, then safety, then love (affection, and belonging), followed by esteem, and then finally self-actualization. Physiological needs consist of food, water, warmth,

and rest; whereas, safety needs related to security. Further up the ladder, the need for love includes belonging, intimate relationships and friends. Maslow's esteem needs consisted of person esteem (dignity, independence, mastery) and external esteem which relates to the desire for status or prestige. Finally, self-actualization referred to one's ability to achieve their full potential. Maslow believed that humans not only were driven by these different motivational needs, but also that these needs form a hierarchy where some of the needs will be prioritized first. Maslow first asserted that the need for self-actualization will only become a driving force after other needs are met. However, he later refined his theory (Maslow, 1987) to state that individual's place different emphasis on different needs depending on their individual differences or circumstances. He also would later assert that human behavior is motivated generally by multiple needs on the pyramid. His later theory was much more flexible and he would come to believe that to move up or down the original pyramid, needs must be more or less met rather than completely met as he previously thought (Maslow, 1987). A large study conducted across 123 countries found that Maslow's needs are associated with well-being across different cultures (Tay & Diener, 2011). Specifically, fulfilling basic needs most associated with life evaluation. Tay and Diener (2011) also found that negative emotions were most connected to esteem needs, basic respect and autonomy. Social and respect needs were found to be most associated with positive feelings.

Conclusion

The review of the literature suggests that course satisfaction is a multi-dimensional construct. Overwhelmingly, the quality of teaching and student engagement contribute strongly to student course satisfaction (McFarland & Hamilton, 2005; Sahin & Shelley, 2008; Chaun Wei & Chou, 2020). Many researchers studying online course satisfaction have also relied on

Bolliger and Hallupa's (2012) Online Course Satisfaction Questionnaire to measure online course satisfaction. Furthermore, some demographic factors of PsyD students like age and gender suggest that PsyD students may value the flexibility of online courses over traditional in-person courses leading to more online learning satisfaction compared to other populations.

The present study was focused on remote course satisfaction at the doctoral psychology level (PsyD). To date, there is no literature focused on measuring student satisfaction with distance education at the PsyD level. Additionally, the literature on remote learning satisfaction at the graduate level has largely taken place during the COVID-19 pandemic, which may have skewed results. During the COVID-19 pandemic, students may have experienced more stressors which may have affected students' overall course satisfaction. Furthermore, students and instructors may have taken or taught online classes for the first time as many campuses were shut down. Not having much time to adjust, instructors in studies conducted earlier in the pandemic may not have been able to deliver their course content as successfully through a new medium. Today, students are more familiar with online learning platforms, and President Joe Biden officially ended the COVID-19 pandemic on May 11, 2023 (Biden, 2023). The class in the aforementioned study concluded in April 2023.

As such, understanding students' satisfaction with online learning without the stressors of the pandemic may help program directors design curriculums that serve the best interests of students. Furthermore, understanding the unique factors that may lead students to choose online learning or the perceived benefits from the students' perspectives can help inform educators about how to enhance learning experiences for PsyD students by aligning program curriculums to meet student needs.

Researcher Bias

The lead researcher recognized two biases that she needed to be mindful of to maintain the integrity of the research and conclusions drawn. For one, the researcher chose to engage in virtual learning in her own PsyD program over in-person learning for several semesters. The researcher was likely to know many of the study participants personally, as her PsyD program was included in the research. The lead researcher received the quantitative data de-identified for anonymity by an IRB-trained research associate to maintain confidentiality and the integrity of the study. The lead researcher has also chosen committee members with mixed views on remote learning to provide a balanced perspective and control for bias. She also chose coders outside of the University and one coder who had not completed any online courses to try and correct for bias.

Study Purpose and Rationale

At the time this study was conducted, no research was found exploring clinical PsyD students' satisfaction with distance learning. Much of the literature was conducted with undergraduate students or near the pandemic, which may have skewed results. Furthermore, the studies that focused on graduate students didn't include a focus on clinical psychology doctoral students. Consequently, students' learning preferences at the PsyD level or the potential benefits of distance education at the PsyD level have not yet been explored. This relatively unexplored area of research is especially salient given the changing landscape of higher education and course satisfaction's ties with student outcomes.

The mixed-methods pilot studies compared PsyD students' course satisfaction with remote and in-person instruction. By comparing satisfaction between the virtual and in-person sections, this study aimed to provide insight into online course satisfaction at the Doctor of Psychology level. Furthermore, by gathering information through structured surveys, this study

aimed to provide additional insights into the factors that may lead students to choose remote learning and their experiences as remote students in a course. Ultimately, these findings will inform educational institutions and program directors about the benefits and drawbacks of online learning and help enhance learning experiences for PsyD students by aligning program curriculums to student needs. In pilot 1, researchers hypothesized that doctoral clinical psychology students would be equally as satisfied with in-person and remote learning for the consultation and supervision courses. In pilot 2, researchers aimed to gather more context into students ’satisfaction scores and their experience as remote students including reasons for choosing remote learning and the potential advantages and drawbacks of remote learning at the doctoral psychology level.

Methods

Participants

Pilot 1

An existing deidentified dataset from 34 graduate students out of a sample of 50 (those enrolled in both sections of the course) from a PsyD program in New York who completed the program's professional development seminar was utilized. Not every student who completed the course filled out the course satisfaction survey. Students were in their third or fourth year in the program. The course is an advanced course that students take towards the end or at the end of their doctoral training and includes content directly related to their clinical profession. The course is a pass-or-fail course, and all students who took the course passed the class. The third-year students had taken about 94 credits before taking the course and the fourth-year students had taken about 114 credits before taking the course.

Table 1 highlights all of the demographic information gathered on participants.

Table 1

Demographic Data

Year in Program

Year	N	%
Third	20	62.5
Fourth	13	34.4
Other	1	3.1

All Participants Time Commuting to Campus on Average

Category	N	%
Within 30 minutes	6	17.7
30-60 minutes	7	20.6
1 hour- 90 minutes	11	32.4
90 minutes – 2 hours	9	26.5
+2 hours	1	2.9

Remote Participants Time to Commute to Campus on Average

Category	N	%
Within 30 minutes	0	0
30-60 minutes	4	11.8
1 hour- 90 minutes	5	14.7
90 minutes – 2 hours	7	20.6
+2 hours	1	2.9

In Person Participants Time to Commute to Campus on Average

Category	N	%
Within 30 minutes	6	17.7
30-60 minutes	2	5.9
1 hour- 90 minutes	6	17.7

90 minutes – 2 hours	2	5.9

Age

Category	**N**	**%**
23 -25	13	38.2
26-28	13	38.2
29-40	5	14.7
No Response	3	8.8

Socio Economic Self Report

Category	**N**	**%**
Low	9	26.5
Medium	23	67.6
High	1	2.9
No Response	1	2.9

Paying Job Outside of School Responsibilities

Category	**N**	**%**
Yes	13	56.5
No	9	39.1
No Response	1	4.3

Previously Taken a Class Remotely

Category	**N**	**%**
Yes	22	95.7
No	1	4.3

Children or Dependents

Category	**N**	**%**
No	22	95.7
Yes	1	4.3

Note. Socio-economic status levels were not defined for participants and were up to the discretion of participants to interpret, define, and self-select.

Pilot 2

Out of the students who took the course, 26 students completed the remote sections of the course. As such, recruitment emails for the focus group interview were sent to all 26 remote participants in the remote section of the course by the PsyD administrative staff. Out of that sample, 6 remote students elected to participate in a one-hour focus group interview.

Course Content

For this study, the professional development seminar included a six-week supervision class and a six-week consultation class. These classes differed in the content and in the instructor's style. Furthermore, while students may have taken the supervision class remotely or in person, they were actively involved as supervisees at their clinical placements. As such, they were also engaging in supervision actively during the class, either remotely or in person. The consultation class did not experience the same real-world application of the material, as students were not placed in consultation clinical placements during the course.

The consultation class was instructor-led and taught by a novice professor with extensive experience in the consultation industry. The supervision class was taught by a tenured long-time professor who designed the class as an interactive, discussion-based class and had familiarity with the students as they had taught other classes with the students. The course structures break down as follows:

Supervision

Students at a private university in New York took a 6-week supervision course with professor 1 focused on teaching students about best practices in supervision, including, parallel processes, the supervisory alliance, ethical and legal responsibilities, and case management. This

class was very related to students' clinical work. Graduate students will be supervised throughout their graduate career and may engage in supervision in their career. On average, the course utilized a teacher-led presentation for 40% of the class and small group discussion via Zoom breakout rooms or small group in-person for 20% of the class, large group discussion for 20% of the class, and then mock supervision of their assigned supervisees for the remainder 20%.

Consultation

Students at a private university in New York also took a 6-week consultation course with professor 2 focused on learning consulting psychology. Less related to their day-to-day clinical work, this class offered students the opportunity to learn about a lucrative, and newer branch of psychology working within organizations. Executive search processes, assessment, coaching, and team building were discussed as a part of the course. The course structure was on average 70% instructor-led presentation and 30% discussion.

To encompass the many variables that influence course satisfaction, including the many instructor variables, this study will utilize two theoretical frameworks to frame the analysis and discussion of the data.

Design

This study utilized a mixed-methods quasi-experimental post-test-only control group design. Subjects pre-selected their groups when they registered for the course based on availability, preference, and accommodation. The course was made up of two separate six-week classes:

A supervision class with professor 1: Per the syllabus, the supervision class will teach students about best practices in supervision, including, parallel processes, the supervisory alliance, ethical and legal responsibilities, and case management.

A consultation class with professor 2: Per the syllabus, the consultation class focused on the newer branch of consulting psychology which works within organizations. Executive search, assessment, coaching, and team building were discussed as a part of the course.

Table 2 outlines the course progression with each professor and the dates of the classes.

Table 2

Schedule for remote and in-person students

Dates	Remote students	In-Person Students
1-26/2023-03/02/2023	Supervision class with Professor 1	Consultation class with Professor 2
03/16/2023-04/27/2023	Consultation class with Professor 2	Supervision class with Professor 1

Procedures

Pilot 1

50 students were enrolled for the professional development course in the Doctoral Clinical Psychology Program (PsyD program) at a private institution in New York. The PsyD program sent out optional course satisfaction surveys to all 50 students enrolled in the course at the completion of the consultation and then again at the end of the supervision components. Since not every student filled out the survey at the end of each section, or at all, 34 individual students out of the 50 students enrolled completed the survey either once or at the end of both the consultation and supervision course.

Sixteen students filled out the survey at the conclusion of both the supervision and consultation class and 18 students filled out the survey once at either the conclusion of the consultation class or the supervision class. The mean response rate for survey completion was

48%. Together, the dataset has 50 total data points. Tables 3, 4 and 5 show the breakdown of students who completed the survey by group and the corresponding response rate of the survey by each group.

Table 3

Survey Responses Breakdown

Group	Filled out survey 1x	Filled out survey 2x	Total
Remote: Professor 1	6	9	
Remote: Professor 2	5	*	
In person: Professor 1	5	7	
In person: Professor 2	5	*	
Total	**18**	**16**	**34**

**Note.* The total number of unique survey respondents was 34. This includes 18 students who filled out the survey once and 16 students who filled out the survey in both categories (once for professor 1 and once for professor 2).

Table 4

Final N Students in Supervision Class

Professor 1 Remote	Professor 1 In-person
N=15 of 26	N=12 of 24
57.69% response rate	50% response rate

Table 5

Final N Students in Consultation Class

Professor 2 Remote	Professor 2 In-person
N=11 of 26	N=12 of 24
45.83% response rate	50% response rate

Pilot 2

After receiving IRB approval, the PsyD administrative assistant invited all remote students who took the course (*N*=26) to participate in a remote focus group using the Zoom platform about their experience as a remote student in this course. Since students utilized Zoom as the remote learning platform, Zoom was selected to conduct the focus group as the group was already comfortable with accessing the platform and engaging in discussions utilizing the tool. Six students elected to participate in the survey by emailing the lead researcher. The lead researcher sent out meeting times in a doodle poll to coordinate a time and date that worked for all 6 participants to participate in the focus group. The one-hour focus group was conducted by a research assistant in the PsyD program who did not participate in the remote section of the PSY course and had undergone all IRB training. The research assistant transcribed the data and sent the anonymized data to the lead researcher.

The following are the questions that were given to the focus group:

1. What were some of the reasons you opted to take this class remotely?
2. Can you describe benefits and drawbacks of taking this class remotely?
3. Can you tell me from your perspective what would have improved your satisfaction with your remote class for either section?

4. Can you think of any other benefits or challenges that you have had with remote learning in general?

Measures

Demographic Form

The demographic form (Appendix A) included six demographic questions ranging from socioeconomic status to age and commuting distance to class. Information about age, distance from school, socioeconomic status, working status, experience with remote learning, and dependents was included.

Online Course Satisfaction Survey (OCSS) (Appendix B). Developed by Bolliger and Halupa (2012), the Online Course Satisfaction Survey (OCSS) is a self-report survey utilizing a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The OCSS is a 24-item questionnaire examining course satisfaction broken down by the following subscales: instructor, technology, course setup, action, outcomes, and overall satisfaction. The OCSS has good internal consistency (a = .91) and therefore is considered a reliable measure of student satisfaction.

The OCSS was based on research by Bolliger and Martindale (2004) who originally developed the OCSS as a 60-item questionnaire examining course satisfaction utilizing a five-point Likert scale. The original OCSS was tested on graduate students in the southeastern part of the United States and found to be a valid measure of student satisfaction. The OCSS shows strong construct validity and a high correlation with the Telecourse Evaluation Questionnaire (TEQ), a well-established measure developed by Biner (1993) (Bolliger & Martindale, 2004).

Since the OCSS was originally used to measure course satisfaction of a completely online course, the survey was modified from 24 items to 21 items to remove outdated or irrelevant

questions. For instance, "online courses offered flexible timing" was removed as course meeting times were set in advance, and students were expected to come for synchronous sessions regardless of whether they were remote or in-person. Furthermore, since researchers are interested in exploring differences in course satisfaction between in-person and remote sections, some questions had to be modified to make sense to participants in both sections. For instance, item 20, "My satisfaction encourages me to register in other available online courses, such as online summer courses," was modified to "My satisfaction encourages me to register in other available courses given in the same format (i.e., other remote classes or other in-person classes)." The total score from the adapted OCSS can range from 21 to 105 with higher scores indicating more satisfaction. Individual items are scored on a 5-point Likert type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Data Analysis

Pilot 1

Pilot one aimed to examine whether students were equally as satisfied with distance learning as with in-person learning. A Mann-Whitney *U* test (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 2008) was performed to examine OCSS data differences between PsyD students who took the course in person and those who completed the course remotely. Sample means of the in-person cohort and the remote cohort in the supervision class were compared, as were sample means of the in-person cohort and the remote cohort in the consultation class. The Mann Whitney *U* test can be used as an alternative to an independent samples *t-test* when the assumptions of the *t-test* cannot be met, such as with small sample sizes. Mann Whitney *U* test requires one scale or ordinal variable, one categorical variable, and three complete observations. (Intellectus Statistics, 2023).

Hypothesis: *Students are equally as satisfied, as measured by the OCSS, with distance and in-person learning.*

Support for the hypothesis was drawn from a Mann-Whitney *U* test between OCSS mean scores of PsyD students in the Professor 1 in-person (N = 12) cohort and the Professor 1 remote (N = 15) cohort. Additional support with data was also drawn from a Mann-Whitney *U* test between OCSS mean scores of PsyD students in the professor 2 in-person (N =12) cohort and the professor 2 remote (N=11) cohort.

Internal consistency

Cronbach's alpha (α) was calculated to assess the internal consistency of the OCSS. Alpha values above $\alpha > 0.70$ are considered acceptable, indicating good internal consistency. R software was used for this analysis.

Pilot 2

Data from the focus group was transcribed and coded utilizing the Auerbach and Silverstein method (2003). The Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) method utilizes grounded theory methodology developed from verbal responses from research participants which are then constructed into a hypothesis developed by coding verbal data. A team of two coders was recruited from outside of Long Island University, one with direct experience in remote learning in their higher education studies and another with no experience in remote learning in their higher education studies. The principal investigator was also included as a coder. Coders received training in the Auerbach and Silverstein method to ensure accurate and consistent data analysis. The coding team coded the transcript to establish relevant text, repeating ideas, and themes. Initially, each coder independently reviewed and coded the data to identify emerging themes. After the initial coding, the coding team met to discuss and compare codes. To reach

consensus at each step of the process, the coding team used the following procedure at each stage of coding:

- Initial Coding: Each coder independently reviewed the transcripts and coded.
- Code Comparison: The coding team met to compare initial coding, discussing any discrepancies and similarities.
- Code Refinement: Through discussion and debate, the coding team found consensus, merging similar codes and resolving discrepancies.
- Final Review: The final themes were reviewed and agreed upon by all coders to ensure reliability and validity of the findings.

Results

Pilot 1

The modified OCSS demonstrated good internal consistency, with an inter-item correlation of $\alpha = 0.953$. Table 6 summarizes the overall mean scores for professor 1 and professor 2 on the OCSS. Higher scores indicate higher satisfaction scores.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for the OCSS Subscales

	Indicator	Professor 1 M	Professor 2 M
Instructor	There was clear communication of class assignments	4.00	3.52
	Evaluation, test, and feedback were given on time	3.63	3.26
	*I felt a part of the class and belonged to the session	4.33	3.30
	I am satisfied with faculty accessibility and availability	4.26	3.42
Interaction	I am satisfied with the quality of interaction between me, the faculty and peers.	4.30	2.74
	I am satisfied with collaborative activities during class	4.15	3.30
	I can relate my level of understanding to other students'	4.30	3.65
	*I am comfortable with participating in class	4.19	3.70
Outcome	*I am satisfied with my performance in this course	4.22	3.74
	I will be satisfied with my final grade	4.04	3.87
	*I am able to apply what I learned in this course	4.22	3.2
Overall Satisfaction	Overall, I am satisfied with this course	4.15	2.91

Note. * Indicates item has been modified for the study

In terms of demographic variables, a two-tailed Mann-Whitney two-sample rank-sum test was conducted to examine whether there were significant differences in commute between the

InPerson versus Remote section. The result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test revealed significant differences based on an alpha value of α =05, U = 70, z = -2.65, p = .008. The mean rank for group InPerson was 13.12 minutes and the mean rank for group Remote was 21.88 minutes. This suggests that the distribution of commute for group InPerson was significantly different from the distribution of commute for the Remote category. The median for IP (Mdn = 60.00 minutes) was significantly lower than the median for R (Mdn = 90.00 minutes). Table 7 presents the of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.

Table 7

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test for Commute by Section

	InPerson		Remote				
Variable	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	*U*	*z*	*p*
Commute	13.12	17	21.88	17	70.00	-2.65	.008

A two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to examine if there were significant differences in self-reported socio-economic status between the remote group and the in-person group. The result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test was not significant based on an alpha value of α= .05, U = 169, z = -1.03, p = .303. The mean rank for group IP was 18.94 and the mean rank for group R was 16.06. This suggests that the distribution of SES_Ordinal for group InPerson (Mdn = 22.00) was not significantly different from the distribution of SES_Ordinal for the Remote (Mdn = 22.00) category. Table 8 presents the result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.

Table 8

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test for SES by Section

	InPerson		Remote				
Variable	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	*U*	*z*	*p*
SES Ordinal	18.94	17	16.06	17	169.00	-1.03	.303

For course satisfaction, the results of the Mann-Whitney *U* test between the professor 1 (supervision class) in-person and remote groups were not significantly different based on an alpha value of $\alpha = .05$, $U = 66$, $z = -1.27$, $p = .203$ (Intellectus Statistics, 2023). The mean score for group In Person – Professor 1 was 12.00 and the mean rank for group Remote – Professor 1 was 15.60. This suggests that the overall satisfaction scores for Inperson were not significantly different from the overall satisfaction scores for the Remote – Professor 1 section. Table 9 provides summary data for the Mann-Whitney *U* test output for professor 1 cohort data.

Table 9

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test for Overall Satisfaction

	In person professor 1		Remote professor 1				
Variable	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	U	*z*	*P*
Overall, I am satisfied with this course	12.0	*12*	15.60	*15*	66.00	-1.27	.203

Course Satisfaction

The results of the Mann-Whitney U test for course satisfaction between the professor 2 (consultation class) In-person and Remote groups was not significant based on an alpha value of

α =.05, *U* = 75.5, *z* = -0.62, *p* = .537. The mean score for group in person – professor 2 was 12.79 and the mean score for group Remote – professor 2 was 11.14. This suggests that the overall satisfaction scores for InPerson were not significantly different from the overall satisfaction scores for the Remote – Professor 2 (Intellectus Statistics, 2023). Table 10 indicates the summary data for the Mann-Whitney *U* test output for professor 2 cohort data.

Table 10

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test for Overall Satisfaction	In person professor 2		Remote professor 2				
Variable	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	*U*	*z*	*p*
Overall, I am satisfied with this course	12.79	12	11.14	11	75.50	-.062	.537

Course Satisfaction

Additional, analysis of overall satisfaction data between professor 1 Remote and professor 2 Remote yielded significant results. The result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney *U* test was significant based on an alpha value of α =.05, *U* = 14, *z* = -2.47, *p* = .014. The mean score for group Remote – professor 2 was 6.56 and the mean sore for group Remote – professor 1 was 12.44. This suggests that the distribution of satisfaction scores for group Remote – professor 2 was significantly different from the distribution of overall satisfaction scores for the Remote – professor 1 category. The median for Remote – professor 2 was significantly lower than the median for Remote – professor 1 Table 11 presents the results of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.

Table 11

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test for Overall Course Satisfaction Remote Section

	Remote professor 2		Remote professor 1				
Variable	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	*U*	*z*	*p*
Overall, I am satisfied with this course	6.56	9	12.44	9	14.00	-2.47	.014

Because the instructor variables have been most closely tied to course satisfaction, additional analysis of the instructor subscales from the OCSS revealed significant differences between professor 2 and professor 1 for the Remote sections. The remote sections were selected to be analyzed to compliment analysis completed in pilot 2 about remote experiences of students. The result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test was significant based on an alpha value of $\alpha = .05$, $U = 38$, $z = -2.44$, $p = .015$. The mean rank for group Remote - Professor 2 was 9.45 and the mean rank for group Remote - Professor 1was 16.47. This suggests that the distribution of I felt a part of the class and belonged to the session for group Remote - Professor 2 was significantly different from the distribution of I felt a part of the class and belonged to the session for group Remote - Professor 1category. The median for Remote - Professor 2 (Mdn = 3.00) was significantly lower than the median for Remote - Professor 1 (Mdn = 4.00). Table 12 presents the result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.

Table 12

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test - I felt a part of the class and belonged to the session

Variable	Remote – Professor 2		Remote – Professor 1				
	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	*U*	*z*	*p*
I felt a part of the class and belonged to the session	9.45	11	16.47	15	38.00	-2.44	.015

The result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test was significant based on an alpha value of α = .05, U = 26.5, z = -3.04, p = .002. The mean rank for group Remote – Professor 2 was 8.41 and the mean rank for group Remote – Professor 1 was 17.23. This suggests that the distribution of I am satisfied with faculty accessibility and availability for group Remote – Professor 2 was significantly different from the distribution of I am satisfied with faculty accessibility and availability for the Remote – Professor 1 category. The median for Remote – Professor 2 (Mdn = 3.00) was significantly lower than the median for Remote – Professor 1 (Mdn = 5.00). Table 13 presents the result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.

Table 13

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test - I am satisfied with faculty accessibility and availability

Variable	Remote – Professor 2		Remote – Professor 1				
	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	*U*	*z*	*p*
I am satisfied with faculty accessibility and availability	8.41	11	17.23	15	26.50	-3.04	.002

Table 14

Two-Tailed Mann-Whitney Test for Overall Course Satisfaction In-Person Section

Variable	In Person – Professor 1		In person – Professor 2				
	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	*n*	*U*	*z*	*p*
Overall I am satisfied with this course	15.67	12	9.33	12	110.00	-2.30	.021

The result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test was significant based on an alpha value of .05, U = 110, z = -2.30, p = .021. The mean rank for group In Person – Professor 1 was 15.67 and the mean rank for group In person – Professor 2 was 9.33. This suggests that the distribution of Overall I am satisfied with this course for group In Person – Professor 1 was significantly different from the distribution of Overall I am satisfied with this course for the In person – Professor 2 category. The median for In Person – Professor 1 (Mdn = 4.00) was significantly larger than the median for In person – Professor 2 (Mdn = 3.00). Table 14 presents the result of the two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test.

Pilot 2: Focus Group Results

From Relevant Text to Repeating Ideas

Presented in table 15 are 24 repeating ideas derived from the relevant text of remote students participating in the focus group. A repeating idea is defined as a category that groups together quotes from two or more participants who use similar or the same words or phrases to express a similar idea. Relevant text that couldn't be grouped together as a repeating idea were categorized under "orphan text."

From Themes to Theoretical Constructs

Following the coding methodology outlined in Auerbauch and Silverstein (2003), repeating ideas are categorized into themes. Themes are categories of repeating ideas that are similar in basic idea or a repeating concept. Themes are then organized into theoretical constructs which represent more abstract ideas from the subjective experience of participants.

In the table below, theoretical constructs are capitalized, themes are bolded, and repeating ideas are presented in regular typeface.

Table 15
Results: Theoretical Constructs, Themes, and Repeating Ideas

Theoretical constructs, themes, and repeating ideas	%
I. STUDENTS OPT FOR REMOTE LEARNING AS A WAY TO MEET THEIR BASIC NEEDS AND TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES	
A. Reasons for being remote: Allows for healthier students/reducing stress	83%
1. Choosing remote because of COVID	
2. Remote lets me be a better student and take care of myself better.	
3. Getting more sleep	
B. Choosing remote allows students to save time and money	67%
4. Having more time	
5. Financial benefits of remote learning	
C. Reasons for being remote: Students opting for convenience over in-person learning	100%
6. Choosing remote because of convenience	
7. Choosing remote because of commute	

II. INSTRUCTOR VARIABLES HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION	
D. Stigma against remote learning hurts student satisfaction	67%
8. Instructor attitudes towards remote learning	
9. Instructor making negative remarks to students about being remote	
E. [Negative] attitude of the professor is a big influence on course satisfaction	67%
10. Instructor variables affect satisfaction	
11. Instructor making students feel uncomfortable	
12. Hearing about the professor before taking the course	
F. Instructor's mastery of teaching and the materials contribute largely to course satisfaction	50%
13. Instructors' class organization and preparedness to teach	
14. Instructors' mastery of the material and class satisfaction	
G. Remote teaching/ learning introduces technological challenges that aren't present with that of traditional in-person learning	100%
15. Professor tech savviness affecting remote learning satisfaction	
16. Challenges screens on/off	
17. Hybrid learning leaves students unhappy	
III. CLASS CONTENT AFFECTS STUDENTS' DECISION TO BE REMOTE	
H. Class format[context/purpose] is a common driver of whether students deem a course "worthy" of taking in person	100%
18. Learning feels the same as virtual or remote	
19. Factors students consider/prefer for remote learning	
20. Weighing cost/benefit of in-person vs remote option	
IV. STUDENT SOCIAL ASPECTS AND DYNAMICS IMPACTED UNIQUELY BASED ON INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	
I. Remote learning can lead to a more disconnected social experience	50%
21. Social aspects affecting the school experience but not course satisfaction	
22. Negative social experiences remotely	
J. Remote learning forces students to become more creative and intentional with their social/in-person interactions	50%
23. Positive social experiences remotely	
24. Mixed feelings about remote social aspects	

Note. *N*=6

Theoretical Narrative

The data analysis resulted in four theoretical constructs: STUDENTS OPT FOR REMOTE LEARNING AS A WAY TO MEET THEIR BASIC NEEDS AND TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES; INSTRUCTOR VARIABLES HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION; CLASS CONTENT AFFECTS STUDENTS DECISION TO BE REMOTE; STUDENT SOCIAL ASPECTS AND DYNAMICS IMPACTED UNIQUELY

BASED ON INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS. The narratives below support each construct listed. Theoretical constructs are capitalized, themes bolded, and repeating ideas are presented in italics.

When students reflected on why they chose remote learning, the perceived benefits and drawbacks of remote learning, and their satisfaction with their remote course, the conversation focused on their most recent course they took remotely, as well as their graduate experience where they took courses either in person or remotely. Here is the story of how it happened.

STUDENTS OPT FOR REMOTE LEARNING AS A WAY TO MEET THEIR BASIC NEEDS AND TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES

Overwhelmingly, students felt that remote learning helped them live a more balanced, healthier, and happier life (**reasons for being remote: allows for healthier students/reducing stress**). When asked why students elected to choose remote, most mentioned the COVID-19 pandemic and their desire to maintain their health and safety (*choosing remote because of COVID*). Remote learning helped students show up as more engaged and focused students because they had more time back in their day.

> "To be able to balance more in my life, so when it was actually time for class, I felt like I could give more as far as listening and engagement because I feel like I have more time and energy to do so (P5, pg 6)" (*remote lets me be a better student and take care of myself better*).

Students also felt that being remote gave them more time to take care of themselves, especially around sleep, "If I have to commute for a 9:20 class, then I'd have to probably be up around 6:30 and I don't have to do that when we were virtual. I objectively get more rest (P1, pg 6)" (*Getting more sleep*).

In addition to better rest and having more balance, which allows for more effective students, students choose remote learning over in-person learning to save resources (**choosing remote allows students to save time and money**). Especially for students who don't live close to campus, remote learning gave them time back in their day that they could spend doing other things (*having more time)*. The remote aspect also helped students save money, which relieved students of tremendous stress.

> "Financially it's a huge benefit to be remote in terms of like, no matter where anyone's coming from, but gas prices were going up last year. So, you got to save on gas….if you don't have to pay rent and you can live somewhere or at home, you could save money, and that's a huge weight off your shoulders as graduate students with loans (P4, pg 12)" (*financial benefits of remote learning*).

Students unanimously felt that convenience was a major driver in their wanting to be remote as they saw that to be a benefit to their overall well-being (**reasons for being remote: students opting for convenience over in-person learning**). Students mentioned that the convenience piece was related to commute and efficiency. "There is a big difference between being able to get up at 8:30 or even 9:15 if you really wanted to and just take a class and then go back to your business (P2, pg 3)" (*Choosing remote because of convenience*). In addition to having sometimes long commutes to campus for class, students are also being pulled in many directions and have competing priorities that make eliminating the need for commuting to different locations and saving time on commuting very helpful.

> "We are being pulled in a lot of different directions – you're commuting for externship some days, and then there's a lab or other stuff going on. So, when there are certain things

> you can opt to do from home, that is useful (P6, pg 3)" (*Choosing remote because of commute*).

INSTRUCTOR VARIABLES HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION

During the conversation, focus group participants discussed how the instructor contributed to their satisfaction with the course and the stigma they felt as remote learners (**stigma against remote learning hurts student satisfaction**). Reflecting on the two classes they took with two different instructors, students felt that the instructors' negative attitudes towards remote learning and hence them as remote learners made them uncomfortable and hurt their ability to take in information and learn from their instructor. "Perhaps their distaste toward virtual just further emanated the distaste is us and led to a lack of engagement (P3, pg 5)." "I think she had a very negative opinion about all of us before getting to know us simply because we wanted to take this class virtually (P4, pg 7)" *(Instructor's attitudes towards remote learning*). Students described negative and unprofessional remarks that hurt their satisfaction. "I just think there's a level of professionalism that hindered the remote experience that had nothing to do with the remote experience...I don't think she was able to hold respect for me and my peers (P3, pg 10)."

> "The closest thing I think to a con [about being remote] is just like, both professors offered it [remote learning] semi-begrudgingly and it was much stronger with one professor than the other, you know the level of vitriol around it. It was either subtly suggested or not subtly suggested that this wasn't their ideal domain of teaching. And you

had to kind of sit with that and take that in as part of the room (P2, pg 6)" (*Instructor making negative remarks to students about being remote*).

In addition to stigma, the students discussed how the professors' overall attitude affected their experience of remote learning. (**[Negative] attitude of the professor is a big influence on course satisfaction**). Students discussed how one professor's emotionality affected them,

> "it would have been better if the professor was more even keeled than she was. We were aware going into the second part of the semester of the ill will that had been cultivated, and I think that leaked into our own experience (P2, pg 9)" (*instructor variables affect satisfaction*).

More specifically, when a professor's attitude made students feel uncomfortable it negatively affected students and their experience with the course.

> "I remember the feeling that I had in the class, which was like, I'm a little afraid to ruffle any feathers or I am afraid to say the wrong thing because I don't know how this professor is going to respond and then take it out on me and my classmates…it made me feel less free in the class, like free to learn, free to listen, and free to just be myself" (P5, pg 7)" (*instructor making students feel uncomfortable*).

It was not just the students' unique experience of the professor that affected their course satisfaction, students shared that they had been briefed about the bad experience students had previously with a professor which affected their attitudes toward the class before taking it themselves (*hearing about the professor before taking the course*).

> "Having the first session with the good professor and then all the other people who were with the other professor at the time were like, oh my gosh! And it was not getting rave reviews. It definitely dampened the experience" (P1, pg 8).

COURSE SATISFACTION DIFFERENCES

Remote learning presented challenges that learners had to manage from their professor's ability to navigate the technology and the challenges with their peers' computer videos being on or off. (**remote teaching/learning introduces technological challenges that aren't present with that of traditional in-person learning**). Most significantly, students mentioned a professor's ability to navigate the technology as impacting their learning experience (*professor's tech savviness affecting remote learning satisfaction*). "The main drawback to me is what I said before with the Wi-Fi issues or professors who were not too familiar with technology that wasted class time on technical issues" (P1, pg 13). Beyond instructor variables, for students, their classmates turning their video camera on during class made a difference in terms of their engagement in class (*challenges screens on/off*).

> "I think when they were mostly on [computer video] or all on it was easier to capture everyone's attention and to know that people were engaged. When screens are off, you don't really know if someone is in the room or if they are completely there…there's definitely a disconnect when the screens are off" (P3, pg 5).

In addition to their classmates having their cameras off, students did not enjoy when some of their classmates were in-person and some were online (*hybrid learning leaves students unhappy*). Students had previously engaged in hybrid learning in other classes they took during their doctoral education, and spoke about its ineffectiveness. "We did not do the blended thing well, and I wasn't going to be what I considered as a sucker in that situation" (p2, pg 10). "… that hybrid model isn't so conducive to learning. If I had to rank them, that's probably the worst option…it was the worst of both worlds" (P6, pg 11).

CLASS CONTENT AFFECTS STUDENTS' DECISION TO BE REMOTE

When parsing out why students opted for remote learning over in-person learning students broke down what they deemed a class "worthy" of taking in person (**class format [context/purpose] is a common driver of whether students deem a course "worthy" of taking in person**). In breaking down what some of those factors were students discussed that they could learn equally as well in either setting. For professors that use lectures and PowerPoint slides, learning felt similar to participants whether they were remote or in-person (*learning feels the same virtual or remote*). "We could still see the PowerPoint, and we could still hear the professor. So, we're still able to learn in that way as long as the professor knows how to do those things." (P4, pg 5). Some students are more independent learners and therefore like remote learning because it saves time commuting, giving them time to review material outside of the class (*factors students consider/prefer for remote learning*).

> "I personally kind of learn best at my own pace reading things myself—like going over it myself. Whether I'm remote or in-person my learning quality is going to be the same. Therefore, I might as well save myself time, money, and stress of commuting and driving through traffic and figuring out how to plan my day around that" (P5, pg 2).

When students shared how they decided to take the class remotely, they shared that they weighed the costs and benefits of taking the class in-person versus virtually before making their choice (*weighing cost/benefit of in-person vs remote option*).

> "I don't know that it's an exact science, but I think some things that would contribute would be, let's say, like, is there going to be a vibrant class discussion? I find those things to be better in person than online. That wasn't the case for this course. Or like, is the

professor going to be maybe doing any sort of interactive thing that would be better in person that just wasn't the case for this" (P6, pg 3).

STUDENT SOCIAL ASPECTS AND DYNAMICS IMPACTED UNIQUELY BASED ON INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

Students reflected on how remote learning affects their experience of their social connectedness in graduate school (**remote learning can lead to a more disconnected social experience**). An important distinction participants made was that the remote social aspects mostly affected their experience in graduate school more holistically than their satisfaction with the course (*social aspects affecting the school experience but not course satisfaction*). "I think for me, the real con is just not having that in-person social connection and feeling part of a community beyond a computer screen" (P5, pg 6). "I'm seeing peers checking in via the remote world which feels disconnected from that school experience. But I don't think that affects like the learning necessarily or the course content" (P6, pg 5). More specifically, some students valued in-person interactions with their cohort and felt the loss of those interactions more with remote learning (*negative social experiences remotely*). "I think a difficult thing for me when it came to remote learning, and I think I personally got really preoccupied because I actually do like going in-person for things and I enjoy the interactions and all that" (P2, pg 10).

Finally, some focus group participants were able to find ways to connect with their peers even if it wasn't at optimal at times (**remote learning forces students to become more creative and intentional with their social/in-person interactions**). For some, they were able to create positive social experiences with their peers despite being virtual (*positive social experiences remotely)*.

> "When we were virtual, the group work was some of the best thinking tanks that I've been a part of. There were definitely times of being just distracted or exhausted, but for me, getting in a breakout room and virtually getting the task done and then having some side conversation was a much easier, lighter experience than my professor in person telling me to get into group work and feeling like a deer in headlights—I didn't come in person to like—we're in person, we're here to learn, let's just not break away for 20 minutes. What are we doing here? So perhaps I appreciate the group work actually more in the breakout rooms" (P3, pg 11& 12).

For others, their preferences for social interactions conflicted with their preference for learning remotely which gave them more time. As such, they felt some conflict about their experience socially (*mixed feelings about remote social aspects*).

> "I kind of go back and forth with this. We all did start virtual, so I feel like my connections that I made with a lot of people were through WhatsApp and texting and Zoom. So, I feel like I really established my friendships very early on. When it came to being in-person, it was great that I could see one person, but I don't feel so bad because you could rely on FaceTime or texting, too. Even on the days of being virtual, I missed seeing some people during breaks or like getting food after class, but the majority of the time, I didn't always feel that way and sometimes felt glad that I was at home and could do my own thing and see my friends another time" (P4, pg 12).

Table 16 describes the same repeating ideas in table 15, and also includes relevant text examples.

Table 16

Theoretical Constructs and Supporting Data

Theoretical Construct #1: STUDENTS OPT FOR REMOTE LEARNING AS A WAY TO MEET THEIR BASIC NEEDS AND TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES		
Theme #1: reasons for being remote – remote allows for healthier students/reducing stress		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**
Idea #1: Choosing remote because of covid **(4 Participants)**	"Some reasons were first, the COVID-19 pandemic was still happening. So, for safety reasons" (P4, pg 2)	"Definitely health concerns around COVID-19" (P5, pg 2)
Idea #3: remote let me be a better student and take care of myself better **(3 Participants)**	"I think the benefits are for me to be able to balance more in my life, so when it was actually time for class, I felt like I could give more as far as listening and engagement because I feel like I have more time and energy to do so." (P5, pg 6).	"So that was a big pro for me, just being able to sort of take care of the things I need to whether that's other homework, other school things, other jobs, whatever it is. And then I can really just connect in the way I need to when it's actual class time. So that's a big pro." (P5, pg 6)
Idea #4: getting more sleep **(2 participants)**	"the big benefit for me is just not having to commute. So, I got to experience waking up at a reasonable hour. I think of that as being the primary pro about it." (P2, pg 6)	"….getting a little bit of extra sleep. If I had to commute for a 9:20 class, then I'd have to probably be up around 6:30 and I do not have to do that when we were virtual. I objectively got more rest." (P1, pg 6).
Theme #2: Choosing remote allows students to save time and money		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**

Idea #2: Having more time **(2 participants)**	"I also live quite far from campus, so it gives me time." (P1, pg 4)	"I think we've gone with the benefits of having no commute and being able to dial in and dial out, to have that sort of transactional approach with classes was great and gave me some other time for things." (P2, pg 10)
Idea #18: Financial benefits of remote learning **(3 participants)**	"I think this was not really touched upon, but the financial part of what we've been discussing we haven't really tapped into. I think financially it's a huge benefit to be remote in terms of like, no matter where anyone's coming from, but gas prices were going up a lot last year. So, you got to save on gas if you could do the entire year remote. If you don't have to pay rent and can live somewhere or at home, you could save money and that's a huge weight off your shoulders as graduate students with loans. (P4, pg 12).	"the convenience part and financial part is very real." (P1, pg 13).
Theme #3: Reasons for being remote: students opting for convenience over in-person learning		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**

Idea #5: Choosing remote because of commute **(2 Participants)**	"not really having to commute was very convenient" (P4, pg 2)	"My main reason is the convenience of the commute especially this year when we are pulled in a lot of different directions—you're commuting for externship some days, and then there's a lab or other stuff going on. So, when there are certain things you can opt to do from home, that is useful." (P6, pg 3)
Idea #6: Choosing remote because of convenience **(5 participants)**	"Some benefits again are like the convenience aspect of it" (P4, pg 4)	"convenience or proximity to campus for me as well." (P3, pg 4)
THEORETICAL CONSTRUCT #2: INSTRUCTOR VARIABLES HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION		
Theme #4: Stigma against remote learning hurts student satisfaction		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**
Idea #10: Instructor attitudes towards remote learning **(4 Participants)**	"I think she had a very negative opinion about all of us before getting to know us simply because we wanted to take this class virtually." (P4, pg 7)	"…In this particular course, one professor was much more engaged and willing to have conversations in a virtual format, whereas the other professor was begrudgingly engaged in our conversations, and it was kind of like an inability to lead by example." (P3, pg 5).

Idea 11: Instructor making negative remarks to students about being remote **(3 participants)**	"I just think there's a level of professionalism that really hindered the remote experience that had nothing to do with the remote experience. I mean, we can also talk about the content of the course, but like, my dissatisfaction with the remote section of the [redacted] class came from a place of not liking her as a professor. I don't think she was able to hold respect for me and my peers to have a long-term discussion. I think she had great information to share at points but unfortunately was often hindered by something completely out of left field that entered the space." (P3, pg 10).	"I don't know if they are word for word, but they are approximately what was said in the classroom. One was "I don't think you understand how difficult it is to teach with divided attention. I can't wait for all of you to have the opportunity to teach like this." And the other one was "I will not be teaching this again. It's too hard to stare at 20 blank squares. This has been an experience for me that I do not choose to duplicate." But I think that tone came through even before she said those things." (P6, pg 7)
Theme #5: [Negative] attitude of the professor is a big influence on course satisfaction		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**

Idea #8: Instructor making students feel uncomfortable **(2 participants)**	"I also experienced that disparity where I don't have anything to add about the better section. There was no technology issues. There were no behavioral outbursts. There was nothing of concern for me in that section. But in the other section, there was a lot of technical difficulties and speaking to us in a way probably due to her frustration. Maybe if she had that support in managing online teaching, there would have been less of that negative way of speaking to us and it would have overall increased my satisfaction of the course." (P5, pg 8)	"it's more of like a protective nature of us, but I felt that some of my peers would like to try to help her facilitate a better experience for us. Like, we were interested in the content that she had to share but not the way that she chose to share it, and the challenges she was having, we were equally feeling challenged by trying to learn. We made suggestions like a PowerPoint or diving into specific topics, and she was really like not into engaging in that format. We, as students, tried to have better conversations and learning experiences. And that just wasn't either of those." (P3, pg 7 & 8).
Idea #9: Instructor variables affect satisfaction **(2 Participants)**	"It would have been better if the professor was more even-keeled than she was. It's hard to figure out where one started and the other starts but like, ill will was cultivated early on. And we're aware going into the second part of the semester of the ill will that had been cultivated, and I think that leaked into our own experience." (P2, pg 9)	"It might have helped if it was taught by the same professor the whole time. I think the professor's attitude is an important part of that." (P1, pg 8)

Idea #24: Hearing about the professor before taking the course **(3 participants)**	"Having the first session with the good professor and then all the other people who were with the other professor at the time were like, oh my gosh! And it was not getting rave reviews. It definitely dampened the experience." (P1, pg 8)	"I think my experience with the [redacted] professor was most affected by what I had heard coming into her section and feeling that she was still rehashing some fallout with us that she had in the earlier in-person section. I can only speak for myself, but some of the things that were said in the first section that I heard from my peers were extremely unsettling and unsettling enough where like, professionally, I could not maintain respect for her in the room." (P3, pg 10)
Theme #6: Instructor's mastery of teaching and the materials contribute largely to course satisfaction		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**
Repeating idea #12: Instructors' class organization and preparedness to teach (**3 participants)**	"I think it's much less about the remote format. My suggestions for improvement of either course would be more about the course structure … but not about the Zoom so much." (P6, pg 10)	"[I was satisfied with the class because] There was a clear organized method to teach us that material with a PowerPoint. There were a lot of engaging conversations, and there was still going out into breakout rooms to talk to my fellow classmates about the content. Maybe here and there were a couple of technical difficulties, but nothing that took more than like two minutes of class time." (P4, pg 8 & 9)

Idea #13: Instructors' mastery of the material and class satisfaction **(2 participants)**	My suggestions for improvement would be more about….the course content that's presented, like the class discussions and how they're run, but not about the Zoom so much." (P6, pg 10)	" Like, I feel like from week one to the end of the term, I still cannot tell you what consulting was. I don't think that's a 100% reflection of me rather than just the material provided to us and the way that the material was explained to us, or a complete disconnect of the information she was trying to teach us and what we were receiving."(P4, pg 9)
Theme 7: Remote teaching/learning introduces technological challenges that aren't present with that of traditional in-person learning		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**
Idea #7: Professor tech savviness affecting remote learning satisfaction **(3 participants)**	"I think if there was consistency in the professors being trained in using the electronics, it would have been a lot better at least for one of the sections." (P5, pg 8)	"The main drawback to me is what I said before with the Wi-Fi issues or professors who weren't too familiar with technology that wasted class time on technical issues." (P1, pg 13)
Idea #14: Challenges screens on/off **(2 participants)**	"I could also add a drawback is screens with people who didn't have their screen on. That's a huge drawback for continuing the conversation or discussion. There was not a set rule all the time of whether screens should be on or off." (P3, pg 5)	"It could have been a better class as well if there wasn't the collective disengagement or if it didn't happen the way it did. Toward the end of the semester, there were a lot of no shows and a lot of blank screens, and it just got her more agitated. There is a difference between a lack of structure with a person riffing, and a lack of structure and a person riffing while pissed off." (P2, pg 9)

Idea #23: Hybrid learning leaves students unhappy **(3 Participants)**	"The blended was like, it was sort of like nobody came home happy. It would either be something where the people in the room couldn't hear the people online or the people online couldn't hear the people in the room. And so there was a lot of like people repeating back and forth and operating as a medium. And the utility that people would normally experience being in-person just wasn't there. So, you may as well have taken the classes remotely. You could have gone into another room and taken the class and would have gotten as much as if you were in person." (P2, pg 11)	"Being super honest, it was also feeling bad when I heard someone's experience about how poor hybrid was and knowing that like, oh crap, I was on the remote end of it and somehow negatively impacted other people's experiences. So that's just like my own stuff as far as negativity." (P5, pg 12).
Theoretical construct #3: CLASS CONTENT AFFECTS STUDENTS' DECISION TO BE REMOTE		
Theme #8: Class format[/context/purpose] is a common driver of whether students deem a course "worthy" of taking in person		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**
Idea #15: Learning feels the same as virtual or remote **(3 participants)**	"I personally kind of learn best at my own pace reading things myself—like going over it myself. So, I feel like whether I'm remote or in-person my learning quality is going to be the same. Therefore, I might as well save myself time, money, and stress of commuting and driving through traffic and figuring out how to plan my day around that." (P5, pg 2)	"I don't find it more difficult to learn whether I'm in-person or virtual. I can get distracted in either setting, or I can focus in either setting. So, that part to me is also a benefit because I don't feel like anything is lost (P1, pg 13).

Idea #16: Factors students consider/prefer for remote learning **(2 participants)**	"I guess I might add and it was echoed previously by some other members, but this idea, perhaps the format of the class being web-seminar based and more of a discussion, I felt more inclined to engage. Taking the remote option can maximize my priorities." (P3, pg 4)	"As a remote learner, I find it made me more independent with figuring stuff out and makes me really have to be attuned to the class because there I am in a world of distractions. So, I have to work harder to pay attention, and that has had a really beneficial impact on me. Like now, I'm actually focused and doing the stuff I need to do. I'm doing the work. And if I don't understand something, then there is that social component of reaching out to someone even if it looks a bit different". (P5, pg 12)
Idea #17: Weighing cost/benefit of in-person vs remote option **(3 participants)**	"[in regards to what would have made the class worthy enough to be in person for] I don't know that it's an exact science, but I think some things that would contribute would be, let's say, like, is there going to be a vibrant class discussion? I find those things to be better in person than online. That wasn't the case for this course. Or like, is the professor going to be maybe doing any sort of interactive thing that would be better in person that just wasn't the case for this." (P6, pg 3)	"I also agree that as far as this class, there isn't much lost being virtual versus in person. I think there are some classes like assessment kind of classes where you need like things in front of you, or you're practicing those things where it might be different. But this class was definitely not the case." (P1, Pg 4).
Theoretical construct #4: STUDENT SOCIAL ASPECTS AND DYNAMICS IMPACTED UNIQUELY BASED ON INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS		
Theme #9: Remote learning can lead to a more disconnected social experience		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**

Idea #19: Social aspects affecting the school experience but not course satisfaction **(2 participants)**	"The drawback I think mainly is the social aspects which is less about the course itself and more about the graduate school experience." (P6, pg 5)	"I think for me, the real con is just not having that in-person social connection and feeling part of a community beyond a computer screen. Other than that, I can't think of any." (P5, pg 6)
Idea #21: Negative social experiences remotely **(2 participants)**	"I think a difficult thing for me when it came to remote learning, and I think I personally got really pre-occupied because I actually do like going in-person for things and I enjoy the interactions and all that." (P2, pg 10)	"In general, I've had very little negativity with remote learning. I will say the major negative piece would be the social aspect. And that's a big thing. I'm quite a relational person and like having people and being around people. So that was something I totally missed out on which was a big negative of remote learning. And for sure, I will not have gotten that sort of relational experience that my peers who were more in-person got, and that's a big trade-off. That kind of suck." (P5, pg 12)"
Theme 10: Remote learning forces students to become more creative and intentional with their social/in-person interactions		
Repeating Ideas	**Relevant Text Example**	**Relevant Text Example**

Idea #20: Positive social experiences remotely **(2 participants)**	In terms of social interactions, we're still able to go into breakout rooms which is really good to still have that social interaction with their classmates." (P4, pg 4)	"I think some of the benefits are like pure convenience and also, when we were virtual, the group work was some of the best thinking tanks that I've been a part of. There were definitely times of being just distracted or exhausted, but for me, getting in a breakout room and virtually getting the task done and then having some side conversation was a much easier, lighter experience than my professor in person telling me to get into group work and feeling like a deer in headlights—I didn't come in person to like—we're in person, we're here to learn, let's just not break away for 20 minutes. What are we doing here? So perhaps I appreciate the group work actually more in the breakout rooms." (P3, pg 11& 12)

Idea #22: Mixed feelings about remote social aspects **(2 participants)**	"...and I guess on the negative social aspect that P5 was talking about, I kind of go back and forth with this. We all did start virtual, so I feel like my connections that I made with a lot of people were through WhatsApp and texting and Zoom. So, I feel like I really established my friendships very early on. When it came to being in-person, it was great that I could see one person, but I don't feel so bad because you could rely on FaceTime or texting, too. Even on the days of being virtual, I missed seeing some people during breaks or like getting food after class, but the majority of the time, I didn't always feel that way and sometimes felt glad that I was at home and could do my own thing and see my friends another time." (P4, pg 12)	"I also agree with P4 that I made a lot of connections in the first year when we were remote that definitely blossomed when we were in person but nonetheless, we're still here. "(P1, pg 13)

Discussion

Pilot 1

The objective of this study was to evaluate whether graduate PsyD students are equally as satisfied with in-person learning as with distance learning. We hypothesized that doctoral clinical psychology students would be equally as satisfied with in-person and distance learning for the consultation and supervision courses. The data provided quantitative support that students are equally satisfied with in-person and distance learning. Given the remote section of the course reported significantly longer commute times than the in-person segment of the course, it is possible that students self-selected remote learning as way to better meet their most basic needs (i.e., sleep, safety, food). This may suggest that students are looking to save time and money by selecting remote learning and may speak to the themes in pilot 2 that highlight wellbeing as a factor students consider when opting for remote learning. These results also align with Anderson's (2003) interaction equivalency which would predict that as long as student-content interaction remains strong, students will still be satisfied with their online course even if the student-student and student-teacher interaction remains low due to distance education. Furthermore Bolliger and Martindale (2004) found that in traditional education settings, curriculum and instructor as well as quality of relationship with faculty contribute to student satisfaction. The literature points to instructor performance as the strongest indicator of course satisfaction (Bolliger & Martindale, 2004). Further analysis revealed that instructor satisfaction was significantly lower for professor 2 when compared to professor 1 using the instructor subscales in the OCSS. This may explain differences in course satisfaction scores between professor 1’s course and professor 2’s course.

Pilot 2

This study explored the experiences of remote PsyD students to understand the perceived advantages and disadvantages of remote learning, identify ways to improve the remote experience and uncover the motivations for choosing remote learning. The narratives collected from participants revealed experiences that align with existing literature and new perspectives that provide fresh insights into the remote learning environment. By analyzing these experiences through the lenses of Anderson's (2003) interaction equivalency theorem and Maslow's (1987) hierarchy of needs, this discussion aims to offer a nuanced understanding of the factors that influence student satisfaction and engagement in remote learning in the doctoral psychology education setting.

Anderson's (2003) interaction equivalency theory relates learning and positive learning experiences with interactivity in the classroom. As long as one of three types of interaction is high (student-instructor, student-student, and student-content) students can still have a good learning experience even if the quality of interactions between others is lower. However, Anderson asserts that these interactions influence each other. Meaning a low-quality student-instructor interactivity may influence the student-content interaction as students may become disengaged. This theorem is relevant to this study to help assess where interactions within a remote context may be lacking compared to in-person instruction and help provide context for positive learning experiences remotely.

Maslow's (1987) hierarchy of needs asserts that all individuals have needs: physiological, safety, love and belonging, esteem, and self-actualization. These needs can provide insights into students' learning preferences and behaviors in the classroom as motivation to meet these needs.

Utilizing these theoretical lenses to ground the data, the findings in this study have significant overlap with other literature on student satisfaction and remote learning. Most notably, this study aligns closely with the literature pointing to the significance of the course instructor on student satisfaction (McFarland & Hamilton, 2005; Bolliger & Martindale, 2004). The literature emphasizes that student's perception of teacher and peer interactions in addition to a student's direct communication with their professor contribute to satisfaction scores (McFarland & Hamilton, 2005; Bolliger & Martindale, 2004). Bolliger and Martindale's (2004) Online Course Satisfaction Survey (OCSS), with $\alpha = .98$ coefficient rating for the instructor subscale, underscores the importance of this variable.

This is consistent with the findings of this study within the theme [negative] attitude of the professor is a big influence on course satisfaction where participants shared how negative remarks and behaviors from their instructor decreased satisfaction with the course. For instance, one participant shared,

> "I remember the feeling that I had in the class, which was like, I'm a little afraid to ruffle any feathers or I'm afraid to say the wrong thing because I don't know how this professor is going to respond and then take it out on me and my classmates. I can't remember a specific instance like P3, but I just remember my feeling of thinking of what I wanted to say and how to say it, and it made me feel less free in the class, like free to learn, free to listen, and free to just be myself," (P5, pg 7).

Another participant shared,

> "I think my experience with the [redacted] professor was most affected by what I had heard coming into her section and feeling that she was still rehashing some fallout with us that she had in the earlier in-person section. I can only speak for myself, but some of

> the things that were said in the first section that I heard from my peers were extremely unsettling and unsettling enough where like, professionally, I could not maintain respect for her in the room" (P3, pg 10). These narratives speak more deeply to the importance of instructor communication and how it can impact not only course satisfaction, but it may affect a student's ability to learn.

This narrative aligns with Anderson's (2003) interaction equivalency theorem, which suggests that high-quality student-instructor interactions are crucial for positive learning experiences. When these interactions are poor, they can negatively impact students' engagement with the course content. Furthermore, Maslow's (1987) hierarchy of needs adds to the importance of instructor communication in the classroom. Maslow's (1987) hierarchy of needs highlights an individual's need for esteem. This encompasses feeling like an individual has basic respect and autonomy. This study suggests that students who don't feel basic respect in the classroom from their professor may in turn disengaged from the material and the course. Specifically, Participant 5's narrative speaks to this idea saying that they felt less able to learn.

In addition to the importance of instructor communication, this study supports literature tying student satisfaction with engagement in class discussions and with the content (Sahin & Shelley, 2008; Wickersham & McGee, 2008). Anderson's (2003) interaction equivalency theory asserts that high-quality interactions between student to student, student to instructor, and student to content will lead to a better learning experience. Data from this study found that when students struggled to engage with their instructor, it hindered engagement in class and with the material. One participant shared,

> "I mean, we can also talk about the content of the course, but like, my dissatisfaction with the remote section of the [redacted] class came from a place of not liking her as a

> professor. I don't think she was able to hold respect for me and my peers to have a long-term discussion. I think she had great information to share at points but unfortunately was often hindered by something completely out of left field that entered the space." (P3, pg 10).

This experience demonstrates how negative student-instructor interactions may limit an instructor's efficacy in the classroom as students become unable to connect with the material. Within the context of Anderson's (2003) theory, a negative interaction within one dimension (i.e., student to instructor) can hinder a student's experience of another dimension, (i.e., student to content). This was certainly true of the data which suggests that feeling respected by the instructor and connected with their instructor, affected students' ability to attend to the content. Interestingly, the focus group provided evidence that large-scale disengagement continued in one section of the course where students were having trouble connecting with the professor,

> "It could have been a better class as well if there wasn't the collective disengagement or if it didn't happen the way it did. Toward the end of the semester, there were a lot of no-shows and a lot of blank screens, and it just got her more agitated" (P2, pg 9).

One of the divergences in this study from the literature that online learning increased student stress both for undergraduate and graduate students (Wang et al., 2020). Conversely, the participants in this study pointed to the numerous wellness benefits of remote learning as reasons for self-selecting online learning. Not only did participants overwhelmingly speak to the balance and wellness benefits they realized through remote learning, but also how these wellness benefits translated as helping them attend better as students. Participant 5 shared,

> "I think the benefits are for me to be able to balance more in my life, so when it was actually time for class, I felt like I could give more as far as listening and engagement because I feel like I have more time and energy to do so" (P5, pg 6).

Some of the reasons that the data from this study may have been markedly different than Wang et al. (2020) is that the data in this study was conducted further after the pandemic, that students had some autonomy to self-select remote learning, and that students in their final years of PsyD programs may be categorized as non-traditional learners. The literature on non-traditional learners and graduate students suggests these learners may have different needs that affect their course satisfaction (Croxton, 2014). For PsyD students later in their graduate training, having more time back in their day, not having to commute, attending to health concerns, saving money, and more sleep may be preferential, and thus why they may opt for remote learning when given the choice.

Participants shared,

> "…to recap, I think remote learning is hugely helpful for adults balancing a lot of stuff, who have health concerns, and aren't 20 years old and can live at their parent's house and not have to pay rent. I think when we get to a certain age, it's really helpful to have that option" (P5, pg 12).

Participant 4 shared,

> "I think this was not really touched upon, but the financial part of what we've been discussing we haven't really tapped into. I think financially it's a huge benefit to be remote in terms of like, no matter where anyone's coming from, but gas prices were going up a lot last year. So, you got to save on gas if you could do the entire year remote.

If you don't have to pay rent and can live somewhere or at home, you could save money and that's a huge weight off your shoulders as graduate students with loans" (P4, pg 12). "I objectively get more rest," Participant 1 shared when discussing the benefits of remote learning.

These experiences not only contradict Wang et al. (2020) but speak to the wellness benefits graduate psychology students may experience as remote learners. The literature on wellness for students suggest that wellness helps to support neural function and learning in students (Colino et al., 2020). Overall, this current data suggests that for PsyD students, online learning may help students meet their basic needs more effectively and lead to better learning outcomes.

In addition to this study's overlap with the literature, experiences shared in this study also highlighted new perspectives on online learning that warrant discussion. For one, one of the unique insights from this study is the feeling of stigmatization that remote learners reported. The literature review did not reveal students discussing feeling stigmatized as a remote learner by their instructors or peers. One study of master's and doctoral school psychology programs found that instructors felt a lack of familiarity and confidence with online teaching, preferred in-person teaching, and had an overall negative perspective of online learning (Hendricker et al., 2017). This study built on this research by highlighting how faculty's negative perspective of online learning would translate to students, in some very personal ways.

This study revealed that students may feel stigmatized as remote learners by professors and potentially by their peers in a hybrid setting. Although the course examined was not hybrid, students discussed their overall satisfaction with remote learning during the focus group, having previously engaged in hybrid learning during their graduate careers. Participant 2 shared,

> "And then for me, the closest thing I think to a con is just like, both professors offered it [remote] semi-begrudgingly and it was much stronger with one professor than the other, you know, the level of vitriol around it. It was either being subtly suggested or not subtly suggested that this wasn't their ideal domain of teaching. And you had to kind of sit with that and take that in as part of the room" (P2, pg 6).

Another shared, "I think she had a very negative opinion about all of us before getting to know us simply because we wanted to take this class virtually" (P4, pg 7). Participant 3 stated,

> "I remember a nasty, like curtness and rudeness that was felt virtually. It virtually was pretty radiant in the room, whereas the other professor was more like, this is where we're at now and let's get through it together even if it was perhaps still begrudgingly, but it was more of a shoulder shrug from that professor. The other professor was just nastier about it" (P3, pg 7).

These accounts suggest that one of the major hurdles in online learning at the doctoral psychology level is not student preferences, needs, or access to technology, but rather faculty discontentment with remote teaching. This stigmatization creates significant obstacles for students in connecting with their instructors and course material. Furthermore, research conducted on adult learners suggests that unmet lower-level needs in the classroom (physiological, safety, and esteem) could hinder a student's ability to attend to their self-actualization needs (Shi & Lin, 2020). For remote students, not feeling respected by their professors (esteem needs) or safe in the classroom (safety needs) due to perceived hostility can impede their ability to engage with the material fully. The negative impacts of stigmatization in the classroom are vast and well-documented. Stigmatization in the classroom can lead to bullying, alienation, and negative behavioral intentions (Salinger, 2020). Furthermore, students

experiencing stigma are at risk for long-term adverse effects, from lower self-esteem to an impact on their overall well-being (Salinger, 2020).

Another significant perspective brought to light by the experiences reported in this study is the complexities in social dynamics among peers in a hybrid setting. Hybrid learning was not directly a part of this study but emerged as an important participant experience. Overall, participants in this study reported a negative experience with the hybrid learning model in which some students are in-person, and some students are remote. Participant 6 shared,

> "It came to the point at school where the remote option was only offered to certain people. Then it got complicated because that hybrid model isn't so conducive to learning. If I had to rank them, that's probably the worst option. It would become sort of a necessity though where like certain people needed to be in person and certain people were not, so then it was the worst of both worlds" (P6, pg 11).

Participant 2 shared,

> "The blended was like, it was sort of like nobody came home happy. It would either be something where the people in the room couldn't hear the people online or the people online couldn't hear the people in the room. And so there was a lot of like people repeating back and forth and operating as a medium. And the utility that people would normally experience being in person just wasn't there. So, you may as well have taken the classes remotely. You could have gone into another room and taken the class and would have gotten as much as if you were in person" (P2, pg 11).

Adding to this complexity Participant 2 stated,

> "I think that showed up last year on the first day of classes. I saw that like 50% of our cohort just like wasn't there and wasn't going to be there, and I was like, Okay, f**k this

like there's no way I'm going to be one-half of the people that chooses to come into a blended learning environment. We did not do the blended thing well, and I wasn't going to be what I considered as a sucker in that situation" (P2, pg 10).

This frustration with hybrid may speak to unmet esteem needs (Maslow, 1987) for some students in the classroom. If a student ultimately feels they are getting the short end of the stick compared to their peers, their sense of esteem may be undermined leading to disengagement. Students discussed not being able to hear other students in the classroom during discussions or not being able to hear their professors. This suggests that student-student and student-instructor interaction may be limited in the hybrid model. As such, this affects a student's ability to attend to the content and results in a poor learning experience overall. Teaching via a hybrid model may add further complexities to teaching as professors must manage two classrooms, one in the room and one virtually. This may affect a professor's self-efficacy and lead to a disconnected experience. Future research could focus specifically on experiences of professors with virtual, hybrid and in person teaching environments.

Finally, across graduate clinical professional programs, the importance of socialization and belonging are well documented as important constructs in the development of students (Levett-Jones et al., 2007; Gardner, 2010). The lack of socialization is a well-documented criticism of online education at the doctoral level. Literature critiquing graduate-level online learning suggests it may hinder professional development as students can't interface and collaborate with peers and mentors as easily (Shroeder, 2021; Elshami et al., 2021). However, this pilot study provides an updated view of belongingness in a new digital age where students access their social connections more than ever before from devices and may change our

perception of how students think of belonging post-COVID-19. Overall, this study found that participants had a mixed view on feelings of belonging and socialization from the remote world. For some students, their experience suggests they have their love and belonging needs more-or-less satisfied with remote learning because they were able to cultivate peer relationships remotely through other online avenues outside of the classroom. Additionally, for some students, they may feel motivated to fill their lower-level needs (physiological) by opting for remote learning over in-person learning and then focusing on fulfilling their social needs later. As one participant discussed, they were able to build relationships virtually in a meaningful way which may have reduced their need to establish connections within an in-person learning perspective, instead, opting to see their friends from school outside of the classroom. One participant shared,

> "...I kind of go back and forth with this. We all did start virtual, so I feel like my connections that I made with a lot of people were through WhatsApp, and texting, and Zoom. So, I feel like I really established my friendships very early on. When it came to being in-person, it was great that I could see one person, but I don't feel so bad because you could rely on FaceTime or texting, too. Even on the days of being virtual, I missed seeing some people during breaks or like getting food after class, but the majority of the time, I didn't always feel that way and sometimes felt glad that I was at home and could do my own thing and see my friends another time" (P4, pg 12).

Some of the experiences shared in the study indicate that in-person interaction is still important for students; however, the flexibility of remote learning combined with student's ability to access their peers more easily online support the idea that remote learning may still allow students to build satisfactory relationships and develop a sense of belonging. Furthermore,

given the advancements in online collaboration tools, some students even reported enjoying online collaboration more than in-person group work.

One student shared,

> "When we were virtual, the group work was some of the best thinking tanks that I've been a part of. There were definitely times of being just distracted or exhausted, but for me, getting in a breakout room and virtually getting the task done and then having some side conversation was a much easier, lighter experience than my professor in person telling me to get into group work and feeling like a deer in headlights—I didn't come in person to like—we're in person, we're here to learn, let's just not break away for 20 minutes. What are we doing here? So perhaps I appreciate the group work actually more in the breakout rooms" (P3, pg 11& 12).

Whereas another experience indicated the lack of in-person social interaction did not affect their satisfaction with a course but rather their feeling of belonging in graduate school as a whole. "The drawback I think mainly is the social aspects which is less about the course itself and more about the graduate school experience" (P6, pg 5).

This study aligns well with the current literature surrounding the influences of course satisfaction for students. As aligned with the literature, this pilot study supports that the instructor has the biggest influence on course satisfaction. Creating an atmosphere and trust and safety within the classroom and providing a structured learning environment were important aspects for a positive learning experience. As this post-COVID world shifts with new technological advancements, program directors should reassess the changing needs and challenges of students, especially within the remote paradigm. This study suggests that remote learning may positively influence student well-being by helping them meet their most basic

needs. However, there is a disconnect between student preferences and faculty preferences for online learning which may hamstring its efficacy and harm students through stigmatization. Finally, this study sheds light on the limitations of the hybrid model, which leaves both in-person and virtual students unhappy.

Limitations

While this study adds to the limited body of research on PsyD student's experiences with remote learning, there are strong limitations to consider. One of the biggest limitations was the small sample size in both pilot one (N = 34) and pilot two (N = 6) which affected the data analyses that could be done and thus the researcher could not correct for the lack of random assignment in pilot one. An increase in the sample size in pilot one could have allowed for parametric tests increasing the generalizability of the data used. In pilot two, a larger sample size (N= 6) would have helped to conduct several focus group interviews to provide a more well-rounded view of remote learning experiences at the doctoral level. This may have provided a theoretical narrative that included a larger experience or included views that would have modified the overall findings.

Furthermore, this study focused on two cohorts of students from the same private institution. This introduced a few limitations. For one, the participants knew one another from class which may have affected what they were willing to share. More sensitive topics like finances, personal circumstances, or health factors, may have been avoided due to familiarity. Moreover, despite the transcripts being deidentified before being sent to the lead researcher, participants were aware that the lead researcher was someone they knew. As a result, this may have also affected the experiences that they were willing to share and may have dissuaded individuals from participating in the focus group. Secondly, including students from differing

institutions may have brought a more varied and well-rounded view of remote learning at the doctoral level as different intuitions may have had differing policies or bias surrounding remote learning. For instance, the repeating idea of bias may not have been relevant for participants at other institutions, and it may have been apparent this was a micro experience at one institution rather than a collective experience of remote learners at the doctoral level. Drawing a sample from various schools would provide a more diverse sample that could speak to a larger experience PsyD students had with remote learning at the doctoral level.

Furthermore, the OCSS had to be modified for the purpose of this study and may have affected the efficacy of the self-report. Additionally, one professor in this study had experience teaching the course and also extensive teaching experience, whereas the other professor in this study was teaching their course for the first time. Comparing professors with similar experience level may have added to the efficacy of this study and the experiences shared in pilot two. Also, one professor had familiarity with students and had taught these students in other classes which may have biased results. Finally, one of the professors in the study was a principle investigator in the study.

Future Research

The findings in both pilot studies provide a springboard for future research to explore the experiences and satisfaction PsyD students have with remote learning. Foremost, future research should be conducted about PsyD students' experiences remotely beyond a single institution to assess the generalizability of these findings. Furthermore, research from the point of view of the in-person segment would help provide rich contrast in which to compare against the experiences of the remote learners. Based on the theoretical constructs identified in Pilot 2, the following hypotheses are proposed for future research.

Hypothesis 1: PsyD students opting for remote learning will report significantly higher levels of satisfaction in meeting their basic needs and self-care compared to those opting for in-person learning.

Most students cited wellness reasons for self-selecting remote classes. Future research should test if and what aspects of wellness improved for remote PsyD students. This may help programs consider student needs and welfare when designing curriculum and structure, especially since wellness impacts student performance.

Hypothesis 2: The quality of instructor and positive instructor engagement will be positively correlated with student satisfaction among PsyD students in both in-person and remote environments.

The findings in these studies point to instructor variables being closely tied to student satisfaction in both the in-person and remote segments. Students reported professors' overall negative attitudes, professors being unprepared, and stigma for being remote learners as instructor aspects that negatively affected their satisfaction with the course. Furthermore, as this study revealed a stigma remote participants felt from their professors, future research may want to focus on professor experiences as a remote instructor. This pilot indicates that professors may not be properly supported in the online platforms they are being asked to utilize and may have strong preferences against teaching in this format. Given their experience in the field and in training future psychologists, their perspectives for or against this format of education is an important perspective that requires consideration.

Hypothesis 3: Class format and content (i.e., assessment courses vs lecture-style courses) have a significant impact on a student’s decision to prefer remote learning when a choice is present.

Participants preferred remote learning in lecture-style courses, discussing time saved on commuting without compromising learning. Conversely, they preferred in-person learning for assessment courses to acquire necessary hands-on skills. Investigating adaptable class formats for remote delivery could provide PsyD students with flexibility without compromising educational quality. Research across various PsyD programs will enhance understanding of these preferences.

Hypothesis 4: The unique dynamics of individual PsyD students will significantly impact their satisfaction with remote learning, showing variability based on personal circumstances and social needs.

Future research should explore these dynamics and how they may change across a student's matriculation through the program. Having a better understanding of individual student needs may help programs design curriculum that enhances student satisfaction and outcomes.

Conclusion

This study aimed to understand students' satisfaction with distance learning as the existing literature conducted focused mostly on undergraduate students or in close proximity to the pandemic which may have skewed results about its efficacy. Using a quantitative design, this pilot study first sought to understand if students were satisfied with remote learning compared to in-person learning. The results of this study indicate that students reported no difference in satisfaction between the remote group and the in-person group. However, consistent with prior literature, overall satisfaction scores varied based on instructor satisfaction. This pilot study further emphasizes the importance of quality teaching on student satisfaction. Program Directors may want to consider additional methods of evaluating professors and helping struggling professors improve their efficacy in the classroom.

Pilot 2, a qualitative study, sought to understand more specifically remote students' experiences in their doctoral program and in the PDS (Supervision and Consultation) course from pilot 1. Students shared most overwhelmingly that remote learning helped them find more balance and wellness in their life. Students also shared that finding more wellness in their lives through remote learning helped them be a better learner in the classroom. Given the importance of the work of psychologists and adverse effects of burnout in the health professions (McCormack et al., 2018), programs may want to restructure courses and their programs to emphasize for more student wellness not only to improve the health of students but to optimize for learning as well. This small pilot study stands out as the only research to examine remote experiences and satisfaction of students at the Doctoral Psychology level and is unique in that it was conducted post-pandemic. A larger study inclusive of more PsyD programs should be conducted to access the generalizability of these results.

References

American Psychological Association. (2006). *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology* (G&P). Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/policies/guiding-principles.pdf

American Psychological Association. (2015). *Online education: Graduate programs.* https://www.apa.org/education-career/grad/online-programs

American Psychological Association. (2021). *APA-accredited programs*. American Psychological Association. Retrieved April 16, 2022, from https://apps.apa.org/accredsearch/?_ga=2.22457720.294852357.1650134529-105381035.1634147665

American Psychological Association. (2021). *Demand for mental health treatment continues to increase, says psychologists.* Retrieved July 22, 2022, from https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2021/10/mental-health-treatment-demand

American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Enticing new faces to the field*. Monitor on Psychology. Retrieved April 13, 2022, from https://www.apa.org/monitor/2020/01/cover-trends-new-faces

Anderson, T. (2003). Getting the mix right again: An updated and theoretical rationale for interaction. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 4*(2). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/149/230 Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52,* 1-26. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis. New York: New York University Press.

Biden, J. R. (2023, February 10). *Notice on the continuation of the national emergency concerning the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (covid-19) pandemic*. The White House. https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/02/10/notice-on-the-continuation-of-the-national-emergency-concerning-the-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-pandemic-3

Biner, P.M. (1993). The development of an instrument to measure student attitudes toward televised courses. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 7*(1), 62-73.

Bolliger, D. U., Wasilik, O. (2003). The design and field test of a Web-based training program for future school administrators in a northwest Florida school district. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 1*(3), 1–12. Retrieved from http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/

Bolliger, D. U., & Martindale, T. (2004). Key Factors for Determining Student Satisfaction in Online Courses. *International Journal on E-Learnin*g, *3*(1), 61-67. Norfolk, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved May 16, 2023, from https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/2226/.

Bolliger, D. U., & Halupa, C. (2012). Student perceptions of satisfaction and anxiety in an online doctoral program. *Distance Education, 33*(1), 81–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2012.667961

Chow, W. S., & Shi, S. (2014). Investigating students' satisfaction and continuance intention toward e-learning: An extension of the expectation-confirmation model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *141*, 1145–1149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.193

Cianci, R. and Gambrel, P. (2003). Maslow's hierarchy of needs: Does it apply in a collectivist culture. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship, 8*(2), pp. 143–161.

Colino, F. L., Williams, C. C., Hassall, C. D., Binsted, G., & Krigolson, O. E. (2020). The impact of Wellness on Neural Learning Systems. *Neuroscience Letters, 714,* 134537. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2019.134537

Committee on the College Student, Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. (2000). *Helping students adapt to graduate school: Making the grade*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Croxton, R., (2014). The role of interactivity in student satisfaction and persistence in online learning. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 10*(2). chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://jolt.merlot.org/vol10no2/croxton_0614.pdf

Elshami, W., Taha, M. H., Abuzaid, M., Saravanan, C., Al Kawas, S., &; Abdalla, M. E. (2021). Satisfaction with online learning in the new normal: Perspective of students and faculty at Medical and Health Sciences Colleges. *Medical Education Online, 26(*1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2021.1920090

Empson, R. (2012, October 19). Blackboard: With Both Co-founders Now Gone. It's the End of An Era For The Education Software Giant. *TechCrunch.* Retrieved March 8, 2023, from https://techcrunch.com/2012/10/18/with-both-co-founders-now-gone-its-the-end-of-an-era-for-education-software-giant-blackboard/.

Fortune Business Insights (2020). https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2020/05/14/2033299/0/en/Telehealth-Market-2020-Size-Share-Growth-Trends-Market-to-Reach-266-8-Billion-by-2026.html. Accessed: July 22, 2022.

Gardner, Susan, K. (2022). Faculty perspectives on doctoral student socialization in five disciplines. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 5*, 39-53. https://doi.org/10.28945/1310

Gee, D. G., DeYoung, K. A., McLaughlin, K. A., Tillman, R. M., Barch, D., Forbes, E. E., Krueger, R., Strauman, T. J., Weierich, M. R., & Shackman, A. J. (2022). Training the next generation of clinical psychological scientists: A data-driven call to action. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *18*(43). https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xq538

Hao, Y. (2016). Middle school students' flipped learning readiness in foreign language classrooms: Exploring its relationship with personal characteristics and individual circumstances. *Computers in Human Behavior,* pp *59*, 295–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.031

Hendricker, Elise & Saeki, Elina & Viola, S. (2017). Trends and perceptions of distance learning in school psychology. *Trainers' Forum: Journal of the Trainers of School Psychologists, 34*. 36-68.

Herold, B. (2020, December 17). How Google Classroom is Changing Teaching: Q&A With Researcher Carlo Perrotta. *EducationWeek.* Retrieved March 8, 2023, from https://www.edweek.org/technology/how-google-classroom-is-changing-teaching-q-a-with-researcher-carlo-perotta/2020/12

Hofstede, G. (1984). The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review, 9* (3); pp. 389–398.

Huei-Chuan Wei & Chien Chou (2020). Online learning performance and satisfaction: Do perceptions and readiness matter?, Distance Education, 41:1, 48-69, DOI:10.1080/01587919.2020.1724768

Intellectus Statistics [Online computer software]. (2023). Intellectus Statistics. https://analyze.intellectusstatistics.com/

Kerr, E., & Wood, S. (2023, September 22). A look at 20 years of tuition costs at National Universities. U.S. News & World Report. https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/paying-for-college/articles/see-20-years-of-tuition-growth-at-national-universities

Kilgore, D., & Rice, P. J. (2003). Meeting the Special Needs of Adult Students. *New Directions for Student Services, 102,* 3–98.

Koonin, L. M., Hoots, B., Tsang, C. A., Leroy, Z., Farris, K., Jolly, T., Antall, P., McCabe, B., Zelis, C., Tong, I., & Harris, A. M. (2020). Trends in the Use of Telehealth During the Emergence of the COVID-19 Pandemic - United States, January-March 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report, 69*(43), 1595–1599. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6943a3

Korman, M. (Ed.). (1976). *Levels and patterns of professional training in psychology.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10047-000

Kuperberg, A. (2009). Motherhood and graduate education: 1970–2000. *Population Research and Policy Review, 28*, 473–504. doi:10.1007/s11113-008-9108-3

Levett-Jones, T., Lathlean, J., Maguire, J., & McMillan, M. (2007). Belongingness: A critique of the concept and implications for nursing education. *Nurse Education Today, 27*(3), 210–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2006.05.001

Lu, J., Yu, C. S., & Liu, C. (2003). Learning style, learning patterns, and learning performance in a WebCT-based MIS course. *Information & Management, 40*(6), 497–507. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0378-7206(02)00064-2

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370-96.

Maslow, A. H. (1987). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.). Delhi, India: Pearson Education.

McFarland, D., & Hamilton, D. (2005). Factors affecting student performance and satisfaction: Online versus traditional course delivery. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 46*(2), 25–32. https:// doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2006.11645880

McCormack, H. M., MacIntyre, T. E., O'Shea, D., Herring, M. P., & Campbell, M. J. (2018). The Prevalence and Cause(s) of Burnout Among Applied Psychologists: A Systematic Review. Frontiers in psychology, 9, 1897. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01897

Michalski, D., Kohout, J., Wicherski, M., & Hart, B. (2011, May). *Doctoral employment report.* American Psychological Association. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/workforce/publications/09-doc-empl/report.pdf

Milheim, Karen, L. (2003). Toward a better experience: Examining student needs in the online classroom through Maslow's hierarchy of needs model. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 8*(2), 159-172.

Murphy Kelly, S. (2020, March 27). Zoom's massive 'overnight success' actually took nine years. *CNN Business.* Retrieved March 8, 2023, from https://www.cnn.com/2020/03/27/tech/zoom-app-coronavirus/index.html.

National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (1994–2014). Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities. Arlington, VA. Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/statistics/2016/nsf16300/archives.cfm.

Patel, Z. S., Tarlow, N., & Tawfik, S. H. (2021). Assessment supervision during COVID-19 and beyond: Trainee perspectives on the supervision of teleassessment. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 15*(4), 276–283. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000342

Renfro-Michel, E. L., O'Halloran, K. C., & Delaney, M. E. (2010). Using technology to enhance adult learning in the counselor education classroom. *Adultspan Journal*, pp. *9*, 14–25. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0029.2010.tb00068.x

Rhode, J. F. (2009). Interaction equivalency in self-paced online learning environments: An exploration of learner preferences. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *10*(1). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/603/1178

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (2008). Nonparametric procedures. In *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis* (pp. 403–405). chapter, McGraw-Hill.

Sahin, I., & Shelley, M. (2008). Considering students' perceptions: The distance education student satisfaction model. *Educational Technology and Society*, *11*(3), 216–223. Retrieved from http://www.ifets.info

Salinger, Rachel (2020) Empirically Based Practices to Address Disability Stigma in the Classroom, *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, *36*:3, 324-345, DOI: 10.1080/15377903.2020.1749203

Schroeder, M. (2021). Preparation for a premaster's internship in a blended school psychology program: A case study. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *15*(1), 54–61. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000296

Sells, J., Tan, A., Brogan, J., Dahlen, U., & Stupart, Y. (2012). Preparing international counselor educators through online distance learning. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *34*(1), 39-54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-011-9126-4

Shin, Yuewei., & Lin, Xi. (2021). A test of Maslow's hierarchy of needs concept by a correlational model among adult learners. *American Association for Adult and Continuing Education.*

Singer, N. (2017, May 13). How Google Took Over the Classroom. *New York Times*. Retrieved on March 8, 2023 from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/13/technology/google-education-chromebooks-schools.html

Snow, W. H., Lamar, M. R., Hinkle, J. S., & Speciale, M. (2018). Current practices in online counselor education. *Professional Counselor, 8*(2), 131-145. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1193678

Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2010, April). *Digest of education statistics, 2009* (NCES Publication No. 2010-013). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010013

Springer, K. W., Parker, B. K., & Leviten-Reid, C. (2009). Making space for graduate student parents:Practice and politics. *Journal of Family Issues, 30*, 435–457. doi:10.1177/0192513X08329293

Stokes, S. P. (2003, November 5–7). Temperament, learning styles, and demographic predictors of college student satisfaction in a digital learning environment. In J. Petry, L. Allen, & E. Welch (Eds.), Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association.

Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 354–365. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023779

Thompson, P.A. (2000). *A follow-up study comparing the outcomes of the residential and distance learning counselor education graduates of an eastern university*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sarasota). https://www.learntechlib.org/p/123832/

U.S. Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education Accreditation Division. (2012). *Guidelines for Preparing/Reviewing Petitions and Compliance Reports*. Retrieved from https://www.asccc.org/sites/ default/files/USDE%20_agency-guidelines.pdf

Walker, C. E., & Kelly, E. (2007). Online instruction: Student satisfaction, kudos, and pet peeves. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 8*(4), 309-319.

Wang, X., Hegde, S., Son, C., Keller, B., Smith, A., & Sasangohar, F. (2020). Investigating mental health of US college students during the COVID-19 pandemic: Cross-sectional Survey Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22*(9). https://doi.org/10.2196/22817

Wickersham, L. E., & McGee, P. (2008). Perceptions of satisfaction and deeper learning in an online course. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 9,* 73–83.

Appendix A

Questionnaires

Demographic Questionnaire:

1. Year in program?
2. Age?
3. How far on average do you (or would you have to) drive to class?
4. How would you describe your socio-economic status?
5. Do you have a paying job outside of your full-time student responsibilities?
6. Have you taken classes remotely in the past?
7. Do you have any children or dependents?

Semi-structured questions:

1. What factors led you to take this class online or in person?
2. What benefits have you realized (if any) from learning either in person or virtually?
3. What would have improved your overall learning experience?

Appendix B

Structured questionnaire:

1. There was clear communication of class assignments

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

2. Evaluation, test and feedback were given on time

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

3: I felt a part of the class and belonged to the session

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

4. I am satisfied with faculty accessibility and availability

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

5. I am satisfied with the in-class discussions

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

6. Technology for the class (in the classroom and outside of the classroom) was appropriate (e.g., blackboard, classroom computer, internet connection).

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

7. I am satisfied with the in-class technology (i.e. classroom computers, zoom, blackboard…etc.).

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

8. I am satisfied with the self-directed responsibilities assigned to me

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

9. I enjoyed class activities

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

10. I am satisfied with the interaction between me, the professor, and peers

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

11. I am satisfied with collaborative activities during class

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

12. I can relate my level of understanding to other students

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

13. I am comfortable with participating in class

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

14. I am satisfied with my performance in this course

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

15. I will be satisfied with my final grade

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

16. I am able to apply what I learned in this online course

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

17. I will recommend this learning experience to others

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

18. I am more satisfied with the format this class was given in compared to the other section (i.e. more satisfied with the in person format compared to the virtual formats or vice versa).

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

19. Overall, I am satisfied with this course

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

Appendix C: Consent Form

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Study Title: PsyD Student Experiences Utilizing Distance Education

Faculty Investigator: Dr. Eva Feindler, PhD, Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program (PsyD), eva.feindler@liu.edu, LIU Post, 720 Northern Blvd Life Sciences 149-11 Brookville, NY 11548, 516-299-3212

Student Investigator: Alexandra Thrasher, Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program (PsyD), alexandra.thrasher@my.liu.edu, 443 904 1036

You are being asked to join a research study. Participation in this study is voluntary. Even if you decide to join now, you can change your mind later.

1. Why is this research being done?

This research is being done to examine Clinical PsyD students 'satisfaction with remote learning compared to traditional in-person learning in terms of its potential efficacy, benefits, and drawbacks. This quantitative study will include at least 20 participants in either their third or fourth year of doctoral training who have participated in either the in-person or the virtual section of a professional development course at private university in New York to examine any differences in course satisfaction between the virtual and in-person section. Participants will complete a structured survey about their learning experience.

People who have completed a professional development seminar (PDS) course at a private university in New York may join.

2. What will happen if you join this study?

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to do the following things:

- Complete a brief demographic survey about your age and socio-economic status (about 3 mins)

- Complete a brief survey (about 10-20 mins) about your experience learning in the PDS course.
- Participate in a focus group (about 45mins) about your remote learning experience in the PDS course.
- All information will be gathered remotely and will not require the participant to travel.

In total, participation in the study will take approximately 35-90 minutes.

4. What are the risks or discomforts of the study?

The risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life. You may get tired or bored when we are asking you questions or you are completing questionnaires. You do not have to answer any question you do not want to answer.

Although your IP Address will not be stored in the survey results, there is always the possibility of tampering from an outside source when using the Internet for collecting information. While the confidentiality of your responses will be protected once the data is downloaded from the Internet, there is always the possibility of hacking or other security breaches that could threaten the confidentiality of your responses.

There is the risk that information about you may become known to people outside this study. Identifiers are removed, and the information will not be used or distributed for future research studies.

5. Are there any benefits to being in the study?

This study may benefit society if the results lead to a better understanding of increasing diversity in the field of mental healthcare through the use on online learning or improving the learning experience of doctoral psychology students.

6. What are your options if you do not want to be in the study?

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You choose whether to participate. If you decide not to participate, there are no penalties, and you will not lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled. Furthermore, if you do not join, your employment/education at Long Island University will not be affected.

7. Will it cost you anything to be in this study?

No

8. Will you be paid if you join this study?

No.

9. Can you leave the study early?

- You can agree to be in the study now and change your mind later, without any penalty or loss of benefits.
- If you wish to stop, please tell us right away.

- If you want to withdraw from the study, please email Alexandra.thrasher@my.liu.edu
- Leaving this study early will not affect your employment/education.

10. How will the confidentiality of your biospecimens and/or data be protected?

Any study records that identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including members of the Long Island University Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records.

11. What other things should you know about this research study?

What is the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and how does it protect you?
This study has been reviewed by an Institutional Review Board (IRB), a group of people that reviews human research studies. The IRB can help you if you have questions about your rights as a research participant or if you have other questions, concerns or complaints about this research study. You may contact the IRB at 516-299-3591 or lacey.sischo@liu.edu.

What should you do if you have questions about the study?
Contact the student investigator Alexandra Thrasher at 443 904 1036 or ***Alexandra.thrasher@my.liu.edu*** or the faculty investigator Dr. Eva Feindler, at 516-299-3212 or ***eva.feindler@liu.edu***. If you wish, you may contact the principal investigator by letter. The address is on page one of this consent form. You can also contact the department chair, Dr. Mark Sirkin at (516) 299-2406 or ***Mark.Sirkin@LIU.edu***. If you cannot reach the investigators or wish to talk to someone else, call the IRB office at 516-299-3591.
You can ask questions about this research study now or at any time during the study.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please call the Institutional Review Board at Long Island University at (516) 299-3591.

12. What does your signature on this consent form mean?

Your signature on this form means that: You understand the information given to you in this form, you accept the provisions in the form, and you agree to join the study. You will not give up any legal rights by signing this consent form.

WE WILL GIVE YOU A COPY OF THIS SIGNED AND DATED CONSENT FORM

Signature of Participant (Print Name)
Date/Time

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent (Print Name)
Date/Time

By marking the "Agree to Participate" box below, you are indicating that you have fully read the above text and have had the opportunity to print the consent form (or ask for a printed copy) and ask questions about the purposes and procedures of this study. If you choose not to participate, please choose the "Decline to Participate" box below.

☐ I agree to participate
☐ I decline to participate
_____ Date