

MEETING THE NEEDS OF DISTANCE LEARNERS of M ED PROGRAM: Bangladesh Open University Perspective

Amirul ISLAM
Associate Professor (Mathematics),
School of Education, Bangladesh Open University
BANGLADESH

Sakiba FERDOWSI
Assistant Professor (Education),
School of Education, Bangladesh Open University
BANGLADESH

ABSTRACT

This study draws on the experience of a cohort of 22 students from 09 tutorial centers enrolled in a Master of Education (M Ed) distance learning program administered by the Bangladesh Open University (BOU). It's purpose is to locate the aims and philosophies of distance learning within the experiences of actual distance learners in order to see if learners' needs were being met by the program and to obtain a fuller understanding of core aspects of distance education.

The study found that students were, on the whole, satisfied with the course materials, the choice of modules, assignment feedback, and length of time given to complete the assignments, but significant problems surfaced regarding issues of student support, and access to and provision of resource materials. Arguably, these are issues intrinsic to the successful provision of distance learning courses, and the results both concord with aspects of the research literature (Burge & Howard, 1990; Chen, 1997; Hyland, 2001; Morgan, 1995; Robinson, 1995; Simpson, 2000; Tait, 2000) and raise some interesting questions regarding the provision of distance education and its ability to meet the needs of learners.

Keywords: Distance Education; distance learners; needs of distance learners; students' satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

The study was intended to assess the experiences of actual distance learners and to see if students' needs were being met by the program. The results of the study will be presented and discussed in relation to the aims and philosophies that underpin distance education, the strengths and weaknesses of distance education, and the needs of distance learners as they relate to the key issues of course materials and learning support.

REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH LITERATURE

What Is Distance Education?

Before a fuller discussion of distance education can be undertaken, it is necessary first to clarify the terms *open learning* and *distance learning*. In the field of non-traditional, post-school education, open learning and distance learning are terms which are often used interchangeably, and the literature abounds with overlapping terminology and conflicting viewpoints. Some propose that there is no distinction between the two (Rumble, 1989), and that "distance learning is a sub-category of open learning" (Lewis & Spencer, 1986, p. 17); others that "Open learning is not synonymous with distance education" (Foks, 1987, p. 74), a view echoed by Garrison (1990), who states that, "Open learning systems are not equivalent to...distance education" (p. 119).

It appears that there are significant differences between the two terms, although much modern usage blurs the distinction. *Distance learning* refers mainly to a mode of delivery (independent learning at a distance through the means of self-study texts and non-contiguous communication), while *open learning* includes the notions of both openness and flexibility (whereby students have personal autonomy over their studies and where access restrictions and privileges have been removed) and distance (as in independence from the teacher).

Keegan (1990, p. 44) identifies five main elements of distance education: the separation of teacher and learner; the influence of an educational organization; the use of technical media (usually print) to unite the teacher and learner and to carry educational content; the provision of two-way communication so that the student may benefit from or even initiate dialogue; and the possibility of occasional meetings for both didactic and socialization purposes. Keegan's formulation is a useful one (and one which appears to have been generally accepted by researchers, although one criticized by Garrison, 1990, as being too narrow), and is considered a suitable one for this paper since the distance learning program under study included these five elements.

The Strengths and Weaknesses of Distance Education

Distance learning, like any kind of learning, can serve different ends, but distance learning appears mainly to serve those who cannot or do not want to make use of classroom teaching. Demanding professional commitments and family responsibilities of many adults often make attending a conventional, full-time, face-to-face course with fixed timetables a rather unrealistic proposition, and the reasons why adults choose distance education are primarily "the convenience, flexibility and adaptability of this mode of education to suit individual students' needs" (Holmberg, 1989, p. 24). All learning requires a degree of motivation, self-discipline, and independence on behalf of the learner, but these aspects are arguably more pertinent in the case of distance learning, where the student is largely self-directed and unsupervised, and expected to be more autonomous. Threlkeld and Brzoska (1994) state that "maturity, high motivation levels, and self-discipline have been shown to be necessary characteristics of successful, satisfied students" (p. 53). One of the main foci of this study is what factors contribute to this notion of "successful, satisfied students." Distance study is self-study, but the student is not alone. As Holmberg (1989) describes it, "A kind of conversation in the form of two-way traffic occurs through the written or otherwise mediated interaction between the students and the tutors and others belonging to the supporting institution" (p. 27).

Holmberg goes on to state that, "conversation is brought about by the presentation of the study matter if this is characterized by a personal approach and causes the students to discuss the contents with themselves" (p. 27). Such a development can be brought about by a readable style of presentation. The issue of course materials is directly relevant to the current study, and the dialogic approach to materials will be examined in more detail later in the paper.

Kirkup and Jones (1996) believe that the success of distance learning courses "cannot be assumed" (p. 277). Sharp cut-off dates for tutor-marked assignments, rigidity of learning content and materials, and inflexible learning structures are all common in distance education systems (Keegan, 1990), and are factors which clearly will not meet the needs of all learners. Kirkup and Jones (1996) summarize the most significant weaknesses of distance education as (a) its inability to offer dialogue in the way that conventional face-to-face education does; (b) the inflexibility of its content and study method; and (c) the isolation and individualization of the student.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF DISTANCE LEARNERS: Student Satisfaction

Garrison (1990) states that, "the majority of distance education is concerned with meeting the educational needs of adults" (p. 103), and Holmberg (1986) that "distance teaching will support student motivation, promote learning pleasure and effectiveness if offered in a way to make the study relevant to the individual learner and his/her needs" (p. 123).

Defining and categorizing adult learners' needs is, though, a difficult task. Distance education offers students an opportunity to "study and learn in a peer-free environment, when and if they prefer it" (Verduin & Clark, 1991, p. 27), while also providing support during the learning experience in terms of guidance, planning, and feedback that is necessary for continued student motivation and completion of the course.

A review of the literature demonstrates that while there is no significant difference in achievement levels between distant and traditional learners, there is "considerable variance in student attitudes and satisfaction levels" (Johnstone, 1991, cited in Threlkeld & Brzoska, 1994, p. 49). Student satisfaction in distance education has been examined by a number of researchers (Beare, 1989; Hilgenberg & Tolone, 2000; Jones, 1992; McCleary & Egan, 1989). One of the most common problems of many distance learning courses is the limitation of dialogue between teachers and learners, and amongst learners themselves. As Kirkup and Jones (1996) state, "Students need dialogue with their teachers and with other students in order to consolidate and check on their own learning" (p. 278). Chen (1997) supports this view, finding student-instructor dialogue an important factor in distance learning. Furthermore, dialogue allows students to assess their learning and develop a sense of community with other students (a measure that can counter the effects of isolation often experienced by distance learners), and also allows the institution to assess its teaching objectives and see if they are being fulfilled.

Threlkeld and Brzoska (1994) maintain that there is little empirical evidence to show mediated instruction suffers in comparison to face-to-face instruction, stating that "the instructional medium doesn't appear to make any important difference in student achievement, attitudes and retention" (p. 42).

They conclude that the media itself is not as important to instruction as other variables, such as learner characteristics, motivation, and instructional alternatives. It is these variables, they suggest, that are more pertinent to the process of learning and teaching at a distance, and thus to the ability of distance education to meet the needs of learners.

The need for face-to-face meetings is undoubtedly important to the distance learner, although it is perhaps more a matter of the degree of interactivity than whether or not any interactivity takes place. As Stone (1990, cited in Threlkeld & Brzoska, 1994, p. 47) argues in his assessment of interactivity in distance learning, adult learners may actually perform better in situations where they control not only where but when learning occurs, and concludes that as long as students have some form of interaction with tutors, then high quality learning can still occur.

One way to counterbalance the absence of dialogue in distance learning is to institute sufficient student support services. Tait (1995) categorizes student support as advice/counseling, tutoring (individually or in groups), the learning of study skills, peer group support, feedback concerning assessment and progress, language support and administrative problem-solving, where the aim is to support students' individual learning whether alone or in groups. Student support is a key issue in the provision of distance education, and three services appear repeatedly in the literature: timely student feedback, on-site support, and access to library materials. The response of tutors and "turn-around time" for comments and grading is cited again and again as being a critical component of student support, with students who receive timely feedback on assignments responding more positively to the course than those who have to wait for feedback (Delbecq & Scates, 1989). The support provided by on-site facilitators has also been consistently cited as crucial to the effectiveness of a distance education program (McCleary & Egan, 1989; Murphy & Yum, 1998; Threlkeld, 1992; Threlkeld & Brzoska, 1994). Burge and Howard (1990), too, in their questionnaire study of audio-conferencing in Canadian graduate education, found that the effective utilization of local tutors (or on-site facilitators) increases student satisfaction with courses.

Finally, access to library materials is a key component of distance education. For many learners, access to library resources may well be limited. This creates obvious problems for the distance learner. An evaluation of learner support conducted by Dillon, Gunawardena, and Parker (1992; cited in Threlkeld & Brzoska, 1994, p. 57) noted that "Library resources are very important to distance students as the majority of them indicated that success in the course required access to library materials." The issue of student support has received renewed interest recently, with Tait (2000) and Simpson (2000) both exploring this aspect of distance learning in some detail.

In considering student support services, any institution that offers courses through distance learning must address the question of who their learners are and what their needs are. The institution must then determine how those needs can be met with regard to constraints of costs, technologies, and geography. It appears that media such as correspondence, face-to-face, telephone, and electronic communications provide a variety of means which differ widely in their effectiveness (for individuals and groups) and in ways that appear to be only partially understood (Tait, 1995), while Lewis (1995) states that the tutor is "the main source of support for the student beyond the course materials" (p. 245).

Clearly, then, the course materials and the tutors are of significant import in distance education, and resources that contribute greatly to meeting the needs of learners.

In reference to the program conducted by the BOU, it is possible to identify five areas of support provision: local tutors who provided assignment feedback and arranged study groups and individual meetings; the facility to communicate with the course tutors via e-mail or cell phone; feedback from the tutors; audio-video lectures through Bangladesh Betar and Bangladesh Television; and access to a library of relevant texts located at the Regional Resource Centers of BOU.

This would appear to be a comprehensive support structure, but any structure needs to be implemented and monitored efficiently if it is to achieve its aims.

METHOD

Introduction

The research study was undertaken in an attempt to identify some of the key issues in distance education with specific reference to a group of distance learners enrolled on a two-year M Ed distance learning program delivered by the BOU, and to see how far their individual needs were being met by the course.

Background to the Course

The Master of Education by Distance Learning offered by the university was designed as an opportunity for teachers to study at home for a post-graduate qualification. The four main features of the course were that it could be completed in at least two years; it followed a modular structure which allowed course members to progress at their own pace; assignments were related to the work of course members; and access to the research expertise of the members of university staff was provided.

The Questionnaire

The self-completion questionnaire (see [Appendix](#) for a copy of the one used in this survey) was selected as the most appropriate tool for two reasons:

- because it is an effective small-scale research tool, and
- because "the knowledge needed is controlled by the questions, therefore it affords a good deal of precision and clarity" (McDonough & McDonough, 1997, p. 171).

As Cohen and Manion (1998) state, "surveys gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of existing conditions or determining the relationships which exist between specific events" (p. 83). In addition, given the size of the study and number of people involved, a questionnaire was particularly appropriate for collecting data in a relatively quick and inexpensive manner (Bell, 1999, p. 126). Furthermore, because they are anonymous, questionnaires encourage respondents to be honest, and Seliger and Shohamy (2000) believe that they provide data which are more "uniform" and "accurate" than that obtained by other methods (p. 172). In an effort to maximize the response rate, the questionnaire was designed to be deliberately short (eight questions) and to have the majority of questions (questions 1-6) be of the scaled type (utilizing a four-point Likert-like scale).

Only two of the questions were open-ended questions (Q7 and Q8), because, while I didn't want respondents to feel pressured into writing too much, more individual points of view and more detailed information than could be elicited in the closed questions were required.

The use of the fixed-alternative format gave the respondents specific and limited alternative responses from which to select the one closest to their own viewpoint. These kind of questions are easier for respondents to answer than open-ended types, and the standardization of alternative responses allows for comparability of answers, which in turn facilitates the coding, tabulating and interpreting of data.

It has been argued that there is a tendency for respondents to show "indecisiveness" when answering questionnaires (Rust & Golombok, 1992, p. 154), and avoid either agreement or disagreement with scaled questions by opting for the middle (neutral/no opinion) category. To combat such a propensity, it was decided not to include a middle category as a means of ensuring relevant levels of agreement and disagreement.

This follows Walonick's (1997) finding that questions which exclude the middle option produce a greater volume of accurate data.

To this end, the questions were designed -- as far as possible -- to minimize any potential irritation that respondents might feel (through the omission of a middle category) with items they deemed unanswerable. A review of the literature indicated that student satisfaction with a distance learning course revolves around issues of course materials and student support (in terms of feedback, on-site support and access to library materials). The survey questions thus focused mainly on these two areas.

A pilot study involving six people showed that the questionnaire contained no confusing or ambiguous questions, and there was thus no need to alter or amend the questions or the format of the questionnaire. The pilot group were drawn from the tutors of different tutorial centers, and were selected because of their familiarity with issues related to distance learning program.

Fieldwork

The sample of students was drawn from 09 different tutorial centers of M Ed program of BOU, and included both male and female students of different semesters. Questionnaires were distributed among the students in different tutorial centers directly by the authors or an e-mail. When we visited and distributed questionnaires in different tutorial centers, at the same time we gathered e-mail addresses of the students. In order to counter any potential reservations and to provide a guarantee of confidentiality, respondents were given the opportunity of returning the questionnaire either by fax to authors directly or an e-mail.

Processing the Data

In processing the questionnaire data, and following Cohen and Manion (1994, p. 101), the returned self-completion questionnaires were checked for completeness, accuracy, and uniformity. It was discovered that each respondent had answered every question and, furthermore, that all questions were answered accurately (in the sense that appropriate answers had been given to the questions). Respondents also interpreted the instructions and questions uniformly.

Response Rate

The response rate was calculated by comparing the number of questionnaires analyzed with the number distributed to students.

Table: 1
Summary of Questionnaire Response Rate

Number of questionnaires distributed	54
Number of questionnaires returned	22
Response rate	41%

In order to maximize the response level, a reminder e-mail was sent to those students who did not respond the first time, and included the same questionnaire and a follow-up covering letter emphasizing the importance of the survey and the value of the respondents' participation. The reminder had the effect of increasing the response rate by just three (to 14). Because of this rather disappointing response rate, a third and final attempt to gather data from the cohort lead to a further 12 students being sent the questionnaire by e-mail, which resulted in eight more students responding.

It remains, however, that the overall response rate of 41% was a little disappointing. There are, perhaps, a number of reasons for the low response rate.

Since the questionnaire asked students to rate their satisfaction with the university's distance learning program, some may have been reluctant, for whatever reason, to explicitly voice their opinions and/or criticisms (despite their anonymity being assured). A counter view to this, however, is that since the questionnaire focused on issues directly related to students' learning (an endeavor that they are investing time, effort, and money in), it might not have been unreasonable to expect that more people would have been willing to respond.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table: 2 shows a breakdown of student responses regarding questions 1-6 (the scaled questions). Since questions 7 and 8 were open-ended questions, the results cannot be similarly quantified, though common themes were identified through a qualitative analysis.

Table: 2
Student Responses to Questions 1-6 of the Survey Questionnaire

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q1	2	18	1	1
Q2	7	13	1	1
Q3	1	12	6	1
Q4	4	14	3	1
Q5	0	8	11	3
Q6	0	4	17	1

Course Materials

Q1. How Satisfied Are You With The Course Materials Provided On The Program?

Most respondents (91%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with the course materials, while just 9% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

In a follow-up comment with regard to the course materials, one respondent stated that "material mentioned in the modules is often difficult to obtain and not supplied as reading material." Others stated that "I think more textbooks should have been given to us" and "resource books in the RRC library were not enough." It is worth noting that, in the absence of a tutor, the role of learning materials is of great importance.

Holmberg (1986) states that the provision of extra materials in the form of a specially prepared reader is advisable "when students have inadequate library facilities or when only a few selected texts are relevant" (p. 47).

This is a point that relates to the frustration felt by some respondents who do not have access to an adequate library, one of whom reported that "looking for resources for supporting my ideas was very difficult as I had a problem accessing the other local university or college libraries,". Other comments relating to the course materials included "the materials are written in an accessible and personal style" and a few respondents welcomed the "time-outs" that have been built into the materials allow for a degree of dialogic exchange, interaction, and engagement with the text. By attempting to involve the learner emotionally, the materials encouraged a degree of self-reflection on the part of the learner and thus satisfied Morgan's (1995) concern that distance learning texts "encourage reflection in learning" (p. 59).

Choice of Modules

Q2. How Satisfied Are You With The Choice Of Modules Available On The Program?

Respondents were fairly unanimous in this respect, with most (91%) being either satisfied or very satisfied with the choice, and only 9% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Comments on the choice of modules ranged from "the topics are directly relevant to me" to "the modules I've encountered so far have been thought-provoking and appealing."

Assignment Feedback

Q3. How Satisfied Are You With The Feedback

You Have Received From Tutors For Your Assignments?

This question was not applicable to two respondents since they had yet to receive feedback for their first assignment. Of the remaining respondents, almost two thirds (65%) were satisfied or very satisfied, with 35% being either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Comments relating to the latter included, "I was unimpressed with the feedback, which I felt was misleading from a local tutor about a problematic assignment, followed by some very negative and unhelpful comments." Hyland (2001, p. 233) states that in the distance learning context, "feedback plays a crucial role in opening and maintaining a dialogue between tutors and students and also serves an important function in motivating and encouraging students." Holmberg (1983) avers that empirical studies have shown that "quick handling with proper tutor comments on students' papers has proved essential for students' success" (p. 322), and others (Egan, Sebastian, & Welch, 1991; Threlkeld & Brzoska, 1994) that timely feedback regarding assignments is a critical component of learner support.

Assignment Completion Time

Q4. How Satisfied Are You With The Length Of Time You Are Given To Complete Your Assignments?

The majority of respondents (82%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with assignment completion times, while 18% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Two respondents stated that they would like more flexibility in this respect, it seems reasonable to have cut-off dates for assignments. Deadlines can also be a motivating factor, and one student stated that "sufficient flexibility has been built into the course by the provision of assignment extensions and the option to defer if necessary."

Student Support

Q5. How Satisfied Are You With The Range Of Support Provided On The Program (I.E., In Terms Of Local Tutors, RRC's)?

This was the aspect of distance learning that I most wished to focus on, so questions 5, 6, and 7 related to the provision and management of student support services.

In relation to question 5, nearly two thirds of respondents (64%) were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the range of support provided on the program in terms of the local tutors, while 36% were satisfied or very satisfied. From the follow-up comments in questions 7 and 8, it was possible to identify a number of specific concerns, namely, that while students welcomed the provision of local tutors, many found the quality of the support they provided to be lacking.

Comments included "the quality of their input and advice varies, some are helpful while others are rather passionless and directionless," "I am rather dissatisfied with the aspect of the local tutors provided," "local tutors could be more helpful," and "the local tutors provide little support; this term we haven't even been informed yet about our tutors -- if there are any this term!" One respondent reported a bad experience with the first local tutor and decided not to seek tutor assistance for subsequent modules.

In general, the usefulness of the local tutors was found to be highly variable, with one tutor in particular being identified by several respondents as being extremely unfocused and largely unhelpful. One student comment in this regard was that "My first tutor provided meaningless feedback and several of my fellow students felt the same way," while another stated that "I was very unhappy with my first tutor. She tried to dissuade me from pursuing the assignment topic, stating that she wasn't familiar with the subject area."

One respondent stated that during face-to-face meetings I received a lot of in-depth information, but three respondents would like them to be longer than they were and to include more lectures.

This might then prevent, in the words of one respondent, the feeling that "I could have got more if there had been more time the lecturers seemed to be too pressured and tired to give what I, personally, would have liked." Chen (1997) discovered that a significant factor in student satisfaction with distance learning is student-instructor dialogue. And Holmberg (1986), with regard to face-to-face sessions in distance education, found that "they are useful as opportunities to consult subject specialists ... and to exchange views with tutors and fellow-students," and thus help to stimulate and motivate students' learning (p. 53).

A few respondents mentioned the support provided by the RRC, variously stating that "the RRC staffs have always been prepared to do that little extra to help out," "the RRC staffs are well-organized and helpful," and "the people at the RRC were very supportive and always responded to my questions or request immediately."

On the other hand, another respondent stated that "contact between BOU main campus and the RRC are minimal," and another that "local tutors are often contacted late after the face-to-face session ... which cuts down on the time available to discuss assignments," while another complained about "the speed of communication between the students and the School of Education of BOU." These last three comments would, however, appear to reflect more on the course organizers at the BOU rather than on the staff at the RRC (although there may well be mitigating circumstances for any breakdown in communication between the university main campus and the RRC -- the sudden illness of a key member of the university staff, for example).

Q6. How Satisfied Are You With The Level Of Support Provided On The Program (I.E., Is It Enough)?

In relation to question 6, respondents were almost unanimous in stating their dissatisfaction with the level of support provided on the program, with 82% being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, and just 18% satisfied. The level of support provided was deemed to be insufficient, and follow-up comments on this issue (given in response to Q7) ranged from "more support will be much better" and "There is only little support," to "I can't say we are well 'looked after' and cared for" and "No-one checks to see if you're getting on OK." If the on-site support provided by the university program is characterized as consisting of the local tutors and the staff at the RRC, then these are revealing comments since, in their overview of research into distance education, Threlkeld and Brzoska (1994) state that the support provided by the on-site facilitators is "critical to the effectiveness of a distance education program" (p. 55).

Q7. What Aspects Of The Support Provided On The Program Do You Like Or Dislike?

In relation to question 7, the ability to contact the university teachers directly and the willingness of university teachers to communicate by e-mail was given by eight respondents as an aspect of the course they liked (although one respondent disliked "the way support dwindles because of low intake numbers"). The way the course is organized was liked by five respondents, as was "the broad base it gives students to choose their own path through each module." In addition, the fact that students were given the opportunity to negotiate alternative assignment titles if they felt the ones available did not accommodate them was an aspect that was welcomed by one respondent. This (along with the opportunity to extend assignment deadlines and/or defer for a certain period if necessary) provided a level of flexibility that a number of respondents appreciated.

Suggestions for Improving the Course

Q8. What Areas, If Any, Of The Program Could Be Improved?

An analysis of responses to this question highlighted a number of common concerns, with 12 respondents criticizing the limited number and type of books provided by the university and located in the RRC library (one respondent finding it "incomprehensible"). This factor was clearly a concern for those students who did not have access to a university library or similar resource for reference books, articles and journals.

As discussed before, comments relating to the issue of student support were also given in response to this question. In tandem with the range of support provided on the program, the issue of the level of student support seems to be one that is failing to meet the needs of many students. As stated earlier, this is an area that would appear to be worth looking into in more detail.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It seems that students were, on the whole, satisfied with the course materials, the choice of modules, assignment feedback, and length of time given to complete assignments. In these areas, it seems fair to say that most students' needs were being largely met.

An area of significant concern, however, was that of student support. Although this is an issue that inherently involves a high degree of subjectivity, this would appear to be an area worthy of further investigation since it relates directly to students' needs, and it would appear that students' needs are not being met in this aspect. Furthermore, as Robinson (1995) states in her review of research literature regarding learner support, "multiple interacting factors (personal, environmental and course variables) are at work in determining learner success," although some "institutional interventions can assist if appropriately targeted" (p. 222).

Many people clearly appreciated the provision of local tutors, but there were questions about the quality of the assistance they provided in practice. As a way of more effectively utilizing this valuable resource, it would be worthwhile for the course organizers and administrators to implement closer screening and monitoring of local tutors.

The issue of access to library materials is often cited by researchers as a key component in distance education (Cavanagh, 1994; Dillon et al, 1992; Tait, 2000).

This is germane to the current program, and since a number of students do not have access to reference material (and have expressed frustration at not being able to access the material they need to complete their work), it would appear to be worth looking into ways of providing students with the ability to access key resource material, either by establishing a relationship for this purpose with a local university or college or by providing access to an on-line data bank. Appleton (1994) goes so far as to state that "academic institutions ... have a responsibility to provide off-campus students with resources and facilities equivalent to their on-campus peers" (p. 79).

Since the Internet has rapidly become a source of daily communications, education via the Internet is now more widely used. Many educational institutions actively use the Internet to deliver completely on-line programs.

In America, for example, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 1999, cited in Lim, 2001) reports that "58% of two-year and four-year postsecondary education institutions offering distance education in the 1997-98 academic year used asynchronous Internet instruction (e.g., e-mail, list serves, and Web-based courses). Of these, 82% planned to start using or to increase their use of asynchronous Internet instruction as a primary mode of delivery in the next three years" (p. 41).

The UKeU (2003) online list of UK universities offering full Web-based courses is constantly growing, too. Given this international trend of last decade, the BOU offering the current M Ed program might usefully consider a similar course of action as a way of counteracting student frustration over lack of access to resource materials. In the meantime, at the very least, equipping the library at the RRC with more resource material would be a welcome stopgap.

As a number of respondents were unhappy with certain administrative aspects of the course (in terms of arrangement of local tutors, feedback on assignments, and communication between the university main campus and the RRC), it seems that administrative procedures could be better co-ordinated to allow for quicker and more efficient communication between the students and the university main campus, and the university and the RRC.

Such a view concords with both Holmberg (1989, p. 106), who found that speeding up communication and instituting quick response and turn-around times helps to reduce the frustration felt by students, and Snowden and Daniel (1988), who state that "distance education systems, because of the inherent complexity and interdependence of their parts require 'tighter' management than conventional educational institutions" (p. 339). This belief is echoed by Rumble (1992, cited in Schlosser & Anderson, 1994), who states that the key to successful management of distance education lies in planning, organization, leadership and control (p. 31).

The issue of the tutors' individual concern for students was mentioned by a number of respondents as an area that could be improved, with one stating that the sending of "a bimonthly or quarterly email" to individual students might be a good idea -- "a personal one, with reference to your own time plan, modules, progress." Another respondent stated, "we seem to have been left on our own a bit, whereas the university might have thought to enquire about how things were/are going for us, as, I think, most of us are new to this level of study." This relates to Rogers' (1989) claim that isolation, anxiety, and failure to control the pace of work are particular problems with learners "who have not undertaken a substantial piece of learning for some time" (p. 148). The respondents' comments are, therefore, important considerations, and more personal support and concern for individual students' welfare would help offset the sense of isolation that distance learners often feel (Holmberg, 1989, p. 95) and contribute to learners' motivation, interest, and satisfaction (Willen, 1981, p. 113).

Although there is a school of thought in distance education that holds to treating the students as "potentially independent people to whom it is left not only to decide, but expressly to state, if and to what extent they want support or advice" (Holmberg, 1986, p. 70), it would seem that the views of those students who were investigated on the current program take the opposite view, which posits interference on the part of the institution to prevent failure and promote success as a social responsibility of the institution.

The communication element is rightly considered a cornerstone in distance education and, as Robinson (1995) concludes in her survey of learner support research, "learner-institution contact, such as regular contact with support staff, appears to have a positive effect on learner performance and persistence rates" (p. 222).

Limitations of the Study

There are a number of limitations to the study. Firstly, the sample consisted of a fairly small group (which in turn had a fairly low response rate of 41%, although possible reasons for this are given in the response rate section of the paper). Secondly, the students in the cohort were all at different stages of their studies, with some at the beginning and others nearing the end. The varying levels of experience with the course may, therefore, influence both the needs and levels of satisfaction of individual students. Finally, given the nature of the questionnaire -- an attempt to gauge the level of satisfaction of distance learners -- it should be noted that "satisfaction" is a rather elusive concept because it is a state of mind, and one, therefore, for which no relative measures between individuals exist.

Furthermore, since a person's needs will also vary from individual to individual, it is hard to objectively quantify and qualify whether all peoples' needs are being met. In terms of the level of support as it pertains to meeting learners' needs, for example, a highly motivated and self-confident learner who is comfortable working on their own could quite feasibly require less support than one who is less motivated and self-confident and not particularly comfortable working by himself/herself.

For the purposes of this study, a useful definition of satisfaction was that given by Lawler (1973, cited in Poppleton, 1988), who states that satisfaction "is determined by the difference between all those things that a person feels he *should* receive and all the things that he actually *does* receive" (p. 8).

CONCLUSION

It is clearly extremely challenging for any process of education, let alone one carried out at a distance, to meet the needs of all learners. In her review of the literature in distance learning, Speth (1991) states that there is no typical distance learning student -- a view echoed by Charp (1997) -- but rather that tremendous variability and individual differences exist in the consumer population. In general terms, then, such variability and individuality will make meeting all learners' needs an extraordinarily difficult task. It seems fair to say that anyone embarking on a course of distant-learning study at the "career education" level would have some awareness of the demands that such study would place upon them in terms of motivation, self-discipline, and time management. In choosing a distance learning course, potential students would analyze their needs and relate them to the types of courses available. It is only when immersed in the actual course of study, however, that certain problems might become apparent. How far responsibility for these problems lies with the student or with the distance learning institution will vary from individual to individual and from institution to institution, and, as such, it is hard to identify in general terms whether the fault is the result of any fundamental flaws in the notion of distance education, or whether it lies with the student or with the organizing institution. Accordingly, the complicated interplay of a multitude of factors makes the successful provision of distance education a very formidable one.

The results of the survey highlighted a number of areas in which students felt let down by the course, especially in terms of learning support, and access to and provision of resource materials. The study highlighted the need for competent student support services, access to reference materials, and efficient administrative procedures in order to better fulfill learners' needs.

While in no way intended to be conclusive, it is hoped that the results of the survey have indicated some areas in which further research would be useful, and pinpointed areas which the university might like to evaluate in the light of the findings.

As the research literature appears to support the view that there is no significant difference between face-to-face and non-contiguous instruction, successful distance learning comes from factors related to learners, support, course design, motivation, and need. Distance education, as it is provided by the BOU, is meeting the needs of some learners, but this is clearly not the case for all students. In light of this, the student support services and problem-solving capabilities of the organizing institution are seen to be crucial to satisfying the needs of distance learners.

BIODATA and CONTACT ADDRESSES of the AUTHORS

Amirul ISLAM is an Associate Professor in Mathematics at the School of Education of Bangladesh Open University. He has been working as a Teacher Educator at a Distance for the last 11 years. He did his Master of Education major in Educational Leadership and Management from De La Salle University-Manila, Philippines. He is coordinating the Mathematics courses for the B Ed & C Ed programs. He is conducting the research in different aspects of Teacher Education through Distance Learning. He has research interest on Learning Assessment & Evaluation, Mathematics Teacher Education, Secondary Education in Bangladesh, Mathematics Education, Educational Leadership & Management, Open & Distance Education (ODE), ICT in ODE, ICT in Mathematics Education. His other major research publications are "Unsteady MHD flow due to a rotating disc with Hall current", "Teleconferencing in Distance Education – A Technical Prescription for Interactive Learning" & "Technology Based Tutoring in Distance Education – an Approach for Tutors and Learners of Teacher Training Program" in the Journal of Teacher Education, School of Education, Bangladesh Open University in different volumes. He has written several books jointly with other writers like 'Mathematics', 'Mathematics Teaching' & 'Learning, Evaluation and Reflective Practice' that are published by the Bangladesh Open University. He has also written another research book named as 'Motivational Strategy for Distance Education Teachers' that are published from LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Germany, January 2013.

Amirul ISLAM

Associate Professor (Mathematics)

School of Education Bangladesh Open University, Gazipur-1705, BANGLADESH

Tel & Fax: 88-02-9291107 (off.)

Cell: 88-01912-236942

Email: amir_math_bou@yahoo.com



Sakiba FERDOWSI is an Assistant Professor in Education at the School of Education of Bangladesh Open University. She has been working as a Teacher Educator at a Distance for the last about 10 years. She is coordinating the Education related courses for the M Ed, B Ed & C Ed programs. She is conducting the research in different aspects of Teacher Education through Distance Learning.

She has research interest on Learning Assessment & Evaluation, Secondary Education in Bangladesh, Educational Leadership & Management, Open & Distance Education (ODE), ICT in ODE, ICT in Education. Her other major research publications are "Education, Income Generating Activities and Saving of Rural Women: Bangladesh Context", "Learners' Views Towards Course Materials, Electronic Media, Counselling Facilities of Bachelor of Education Program: BOU Perspective" & "Strength and Weaknesses of Bachelor of Education program of Bangladesh Open University: Learners' Perspective" in the different journals of Bangladesh Open University. She has written several books jointly with other writers like 'Essential Teaching Skills' & 'Learning, Evaluation and Reflective Practice' that are published by the Bangladesh Open University.

Sakiba FERDOWSI

Assistant Professor (Education) School of Education, Bangladesh Open University

Gazipur-1705, BANGLADESH

Tel & Fax: 88-02-9291107 (off.)

Cell: 88-01715-752776

Email: sakibaferdowski@yahoo.com

REFERENCES

Appleton, M. (1994). Investigating library services for post-graduate off-campus students. In T. Evans & D. Murphy (Eds.), *Research in distance education 3* (pp. 78-90). Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Beare, P. L. (1989). The comparative effectiveness of videotape, audiotape, and telelecture in delivering continuing teacher education. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 3*(2), 57-66.

Bell, J. (1999). *Doing your research project: A guide for first-time researchers in education and social science*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Burge, E. J., & Howard, J. L. (1990). Audio-conferencing in graduate education: A case study. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 4*(2), 3-13.

Cavanagh, A. (1994). The role of libraries in off-campus study. In T. Evans & D. Murphy (Eds.), *Research in distance education 3* (pp. 91-102). Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Charp, S. (1997). Strategies for bridging distances. *THE Journal (Technological Horizons in Education), 24*(9), 6-8.

Chen, L. (1997). Distance delivery systems in terms of pedagogical considerations: A revolution. *Educational Technology, 37*(4), 34-37.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Delbeq, A., & Scates, D. (1989, August). *Distance education through telecommunications: A review of lessons learned*. A special report of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.

- Dillon, C., Gunawardena, C., & Parker, R. (1992). An evaluation of learner support services in a distance education system. *Distance Education, 13*(1), 29-45.
- Egan, M. W., Sebastian, J., & Welch, M. (1991, March). Effective television teaching: Perceptions of those who count most distance learners. *Proceedings of the Rural Education Symposium*. Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED373708)
- Foks, J. (1987). Towards open learning. In P. Smith & M. Kelly (Eds.), *Distance education and the mainstream* (pp. 74-92). London: Croom Helm.
- Garrison, G. R. (1990). *Understanding distance education: A framework for the future*. London: Routledge.
- Hilgenberg, C., & Tolone, W. (2000). Student perceptions of satisfaction and opportunities for critical thinking in distance education by interactive video, *The American Journal of Distance Education, 14*(3), 59-73.
- Holmberg, B. (1986). *Growth and structure of distance education*. Kent, England: Croom Helm.
- Holmberg, B. (1989). *Theory and practice of distance education*. New York: Routledge.
- Hyland, F. (2001). Providing effective support: Investigating feedback to distance language learners. *Open Learning, 16*(3): 234-247.
- Johnstone, S. (1991). Research on telecommunicated learning: Past, present and future. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, 514*, 49-57.
- Jones, T. (1992). *IITS students' evaluation questionnaires for the fall semester of 1991*. A summary and report. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 345716)
- Keegan, D. (1990). *Foundations of distance education* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge
- Kirkup, G., & Jones, A. (1996). New technologies for open learning: The superhighway to the learning society? In P. Raggatt, R. Edwards, & N. Small (Eds.), *Adult learners, education and training 2: The learning society - challenges and trends* (pp. 272-291). London: Routledge.
- Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Lewis, R. (1995). Support for the in-company learner. In F. Lockwood (Ed.), *Open and distance learning today* (pp. 242-254). London: Routledge.
- Lewis, R., & Spencer, D. (1986). *What is open learning?* London: Council for Educational Technology.
- Lim, C. K. (2001). Computer self-efficacy, academic self-concept, and other predictors of satisfaction and future participation of adult distance learners. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 15*(2), 41-51.

- McCleary, I. D., & Egan, M. W. (1989). Program design and evaluation: Two-way interactive television. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(1), 50-60.
- McDonough, J., & McDonough, S. (1997). *Research methods for English language teachers*. London: Arnold.
- Morgan, A. R. (1995). Student learning and students' experiences. In F. Lockwood (Ed.), *Open and distance learning today*: (pp. 56-66). London: Routledge.
- Murphy, D., & Yum, J. C. K. (1998). Understanding Hong Kong distance learners. *Distance Education*, 19(1), 64-80.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (1999). *Distance education at postsecondary education institutions: 1997-98* (NCES2000-013). Report prepared by L. Lewis, K. Snow, E. Farris, & D. Levin. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/2000013.pdf>
- Poppleton, P. (1988) Teacher professional satisfaction: Its implications for secondary education and teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 18, 5-16.
- Robinson, B. (1995). Research and pragmatism in learner support. In F. Lockwood (Ed.), *Open and distance learning today* (pp. 221-231). London: Routledge.
- Rogers, A. (1996). *Teaching adults*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- Rogers, J. (1989). *Adults learning*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.
- Rumble, G. (1989). "Open learning," "distance learning," and the misuse of language. *Open Learning*, 4(2), 28-36.
- Rumble, G. (1992). *The management of distance learning systems*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Rust, J., & Golombok, S. (1992). *Modern psychometrics: The science of psychological assessment*. London: Routledge.
- Schlosser, C. A., & Anderson, M. L. (1994). *Distance education: Review of the literature*. Ames, IA: Research Institute for Studies in Education.
- Seliger, H. W., & Shohamy, E. (2000). *Second language research methods*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Sewart, D. (1988). Distance teaching: A contradiction in terms? In D. Sewart, D. Keegan, & B. Holmberg (Eds.), *Distance education: International perspectives* (pp. 46-61). New York: Routledge.
- Simpson, O. (2000). *Supporting students in open and distance learning*. London: Kogan Page.

Snowden, B. L., & Daniel, J. S. (1988). The economics and management of small post-secondary distance education systems. In D. Sewart, D. Keegan, & B. Holmberg (Eds.), *Distance education: International perspectives* (pp. 398-424). New York: Routledge.

Speth, C. (1991). *Important themes and concepts in technology based distance education: A review of the research literature* (Monograph Reviewing Research Literature). Manhattan: University of Kansas.

Stone, H. (1990). *Does interactivity matter in video-based off-campus graduate engineering education?* Unpublished manuscript.

Tait, A. (1995). Student Support in open and distance learning. In F. Lockwood (Ed.), *Open and distance learning today* (pp. 232-241). London: Routledge.

Tait, A. (2000). Planning student support in distance and open learning. *Open Learning*, 15(3), 287-299.

Threlkeld, R. (1992). *Recent research and evaluation studies for high school distance learning*. Panel presentation, National University Continuing Education Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.

Threlkeld, R., & Brzoska, K. (1994). Research in distance education. In B. Willis (Ed.), *Distance education: Strategies and tools* (pp. 41-66). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

UKeU (2003). UK eUniversities Worldwide Web site. Available at http://www.ukeu.com/ukuniversities_partners.php

Verduin, J. R., Jr., & Clark, T. A. (1991). *Distance education: The foundations of effective practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Walonick, D. S. (1997). *Survival statistics*. Minneapolis, MN: StatPac Inc.

Willen, B. (1981). *Distance education at Swedish universities: An evaluation of the experimental programme and a follow-up study*. Stockholm: Uppsala Studies in Education.

APPENDIX

Distance Learning Questionnaire

Learners' experiences on the MEd Distance Learning Program

1. How satisfied are you with the course materials provided on the program?
Very satisfied [] Satisfied [] Dissatisfied [] Very dissatisfied []
2. How satisfied are you with the choice of modules available on the program?
Very satisfied [] Satisfied [] Dissatisfied [] Very dissatisfied []
3. How satisfied are you with the feedback you have received for your assignments?
Very satisfied [] Satisfied [] Dissatisfied [] Very dissatisfied []
4. How satisfied are you with the length of time you are given to complete your assignments?
Very satisfied [] Satisfied [] Dissatisfied [] Very dissatisfied []
5. How satisfied are you with the range of support provided on the program (i.e., in terms of local tutors, RRC's)?
Very satisfied [] Satisfied [] Dissatisfied [] Very dissatisfied []
6. How satisfied are you with the level of support provided on the program (i.e., is it enough)?
Very satisfied [] Satisfied [] Dissatisfied [] Very dissatisfied []
7. What aspects of the support provided on the program do you like or dislike?
8. What areas (if any) of the program could be improved?

Very many thanks for your participation.

All responses and personal information will be kept strictly confidential.