



ONE PERCEPTION DOESN'T FIT ALL:

Are you prepared to meet all your online learners' needs?

An Interpretive Study

One perception doesn't fit all:

Are you prepared to meet all your online learners' needs?

by

Ulinda Lucas

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Magister Educationis

in

Computer-Assisted Education

in the Department of Curriculum
Studies of the Faculty of Education
University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. J.G. Knoetze

February 2004

Acknowledgements

There are so many people who have supported me in this effort, that I cannot help but to think of this as a group project!

I would first like to extend sincere thanks to my family (Johnny, Brendon and Michelle) for their support and oodles of patience! Johnny reviewed the entire report and provided me with invaluable feedback. Thanks for your tenacity in sticking with me throughout this study!

Another person who deserves special recognition is my coach and mentor, Prof Knoetze who made me see the light when I only saw darkness! He provided the type of feedback that I could understand and use, so that this report became continually better.

A big “Thanks” is conveyed to all the participants in this research study. Without your contributions, this research report would not have become a reality.

My deepest thanks goes to e-Degree and Absa for allowing me to consult with their online facilitators and learners.

Finally, I wish to thank my Creator for providing me with the necessary confidence and wisdom to complete this project.

Summary

One perception doesn't fit all: Are you prepared to meet all your online learners' needs?

by

Ulinda Lucas

Supervisor:

Prof. Dr. J.G. Knoetze

Department:

Curriculum Studies of
the Faculty of Education

Degree:

Magister Educationis
in Computer-Assisted
Education

Online innovations have been growing rapidly in the past number of years. The integration of online learning with these technological advancements creates significant challenges in determining how the use of technology can contribute to the delivery of learning materials. An area where little research has been undertaken is in determining the skills and attributes online facilitators need to be effective. This study is based on inputs gathered from both online facilitators and online learners. These inputs provided empirical information pertaining to the roles and tasks of both facilitators and learners in an ideal online learning environment.

Of what benefit would this study be to future online learning? Taking cognisance of an ideal online environment, the outcomes of this study are categorised into unique groups that will provide insight to the future development of online facilitators and the tasks to be executed in addressing the diverse needs of the online learner in the knowledge era.

Key Words: Online learning; Online facilitation tasks, skills and attributes; Online learner needs; Cybergogy; Learner-centered approach; Online learner and facilitator perceptions; Delphi technique; Q-sort; PQMethod; Skills gap matrix.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Chapter 1: Research Framework | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Theoretical Underpinning of the Research Study | 2 |
| 1.3 Research Problem and Purpose | 4 |
| 1.4 Research Questions and Methodology of the Study | 5 |
| 1.5 How this Report is Organised | 6 |
| 1.6 Conclusion | 6 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review | 8 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 8 |
| 2.2 Online Learning and the Online Environment | 8 |
| 2.2.1 Online Learning versus Face-to-Face Learning | 9 |
| 2.2.2 Pedagogy versus Andragogy versus Cybergogy | 11 |
| 2.2.3 Stages of Online Learning | 13 |
| 2.2.3.1 <i>Stage one: Access and motivation</i> | 13 |
| 2.2.3.2 <i>Stage two: Online socialisation</i> | 13 |
| 2.2.3.3 <i>Stage three: Information exchange</i> | 13 |
| 2.2.3.4 <i>Stage four: Knowledge construction</i> | 14 |
| 2.2.3.5 <i>Stage five: Construction</i> | 14 |
| 2.3 Role Profile of the Online Learner | 15 |
| 2.3.1 Online Learning Challenges Faced by Learners | 15 |
| 2.3.2 Learning Needs of Online Learners | 17 |
| 2.3.3 Elements that Constitute a High Quality Online Learning Experience | 18 |
| 2.4 Role Profile of the Online Facilitator | 20 |
| 2.4.1 Defining Online Facilitation | 20 |
| 2.4.2 The Profile of an Online Facilitator | 22 |
| 2.5 Research Issues | 27 |
| 2.6 Conclusion | 28 |
| Chapter 3: Research Design | 29 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 29 |
| 3.2 Investigation Methods, Instruments and Subjects | 31 |

ONE PERCEPTION DOESN'T FIT ALL

| | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| 3.2.1 | The Delphi Technique | 32 |
| 3.2.1.1 | <i>Purpose of the Delphi technique</i> | 32 |
| 3.2.1.2 | <i>The Delphi process</i> | 32 |
| 3.2.2 | Q-sort Technique | 36 |
| 3.2.2.1 | <i>The Q-sort process</i> | 36 |
| 3.3 | PQMethod | 38 |
| 3.4 | Conclusion | 39 |
| Chapter 4: Data Collection & Analysis | | 41 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 41 |
| 4.2 | Data Collection | 43 |
| 4.2.1 | The Delphi Process | 43 |
| 4.2.1.1 | <i>Identifying and recruiting online facilitation experts</i> | 43 |
| 4.2.1.2 | <i>Round one: Initiating first contact</i> | 43 |
| 4.2.1.3 | <i>Round two: Distributing the first questionnaire</i> | 44 |
| 4.2.1.4 | <i>Round three: Distributing the second questionnaire</i> | 46 |
| 4.2.1.5 | <i>Round four: Distributing the last questionnaire</i> | 46 |
| 4.2.2 | The Q-sort Process | 48 |
| 4.2.3 | PQMethod | 51 |
| 4.3 | Data Analysis | 52 |
| 4.3.1 | Factor Q-sort Values | 52 |
| 4.3.2 | Normalised Factor Scores | 53 |
| 4.3.3 | Distinguishing Characteristics | 54 |
| 4.3.4 | Summary Profile of Subgroups | 55 |
| 4.3.5 | Allocating Tasks to Roles | 56 |
| 4.3.6 | Identifying Unique Task and Role Selections | 57 |
| 4.3.7 | Profile Descriptions of the Subgroups | 60 |
| 4.3.7.1 | <i>Profile description of the Online Facilitator Subgroups</i> | 60 |
| 4.3.7.2 | <i>Profile description of the Online Learner Subgroups</i> | 63 |
| 4.4 | Survey Results of Learners and Facilitators | 65 |
| 4.4.1 | Profile of the Online Learner Participants | 65 |
| 4.4.2 | Profile of the Online Facilitator Participants | 67 |
| 4.5 | Conclusion | 68 |
| Chapter 5: Discussion & Recommendations | | 69 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 69 |
| 5.2 | Mapping Skills to Learner and Facilitator Profiles | 70 |

ONE PERCEPTION DOESN'T FIT ALL

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 5.3 | Creating a Skills Gap Matrix | 76 |
| 5.4 | Research Limitations | 78 |
| 5.5 | Future Research Recommendations | 79 |
| 5.6 | Conclusion | 79 |
| | List of References | 81 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 2.1 | Pedagogical, andragogical and cybergogical learning theories | 11 |
| Table 2.2 | Learning needs of online learners | 17 |
| Table 2.3 | Facilitative tasks for each stage of online learning | 23 |
| Table 2.4 | The role profile of an online facilitator | 24 |
| Table 4.1 | Example of subgroup Q-sort values for the online facilitators | 52 |
| Table 4.2 | Example of Normalised Factor scores for Subgroup 1 of the Online Facilitators | 53 |
| Table 4.3 | Example of distinguishing characteristics for subgroup 1 of the online facilitators | 54 |
| Table 4.4 | Example of a profile summary for subgroup 1 of the online facilitators | 55 |
| Table 4.5 | Classification of importance values | 56 |
| Table 4.6 | Example of unique selections performed by the online facilitator subgroups | 57 |
| Table 4.7 | Unique task selections by the online facilitator subgroups | 58 |
| Table 4.8 | Unique task selections by the online learner subgroups | 59 |
| Table 5.1 | Recommended facilitator skills and attributes per online learner subgroup | 70 |
| Table 5.2 | Facilitator skills and attributes portfolio per online facilitator subgroup | 72 |
| Table 5.3 | Facilitator skills gap per learner subgroup | 77 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 1.1 | Research problem identification approach | 2 |
| Figure 1.2 | Overview of the research report | 6 |
| Figure 2.1 | Five stages of online learning | 14 |
| Figure 2.2 | Factors comprising high quality online learning: The learner's view | 19 |
| Figure 3.1 | Research design | 30 |
| Figure 3.2 | Q-sort distribution for key issues | 36 |
| Figure 3.3 | Main screen for PQMethod | 39 |
| Figure 4.1 | Research methods and expected results | 42 |
| Figure 4.2 | Example of the email message accompanying the first questionnaire to the participants | 44 |
| Figure 4.3 | Example of the final questionnaire | 47 |
| Figure 4.4 | Q-sort Distribution for Online Facilitator Tasks | 50 |
| Figure 4.5 | WebQ-sorting example | 50 |
| Figure 4.6 | Eigenvalues of the online facilitator group | 52 |
| Figure 4.7 | Distribution of learner sample by age group | 66 |
| Figure 4.8 | Distribution of facilitator sample by age group | 67 |
| Figure 5.1 | Skills gap matrix | 76 |

List of Addendums

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Addendum A | Delphi Technique: Questionnaire 2 | 87 |
| Addendum B | Average rating for each task/statement | 94 |
| Addendum C | Biographical questionnaire for Online Facilitators | 100 |
| Addendum D | Biographical questionnaire for Online Learners | 102 |
| Addendum E | Instructions to the Q-sort activity | 104 |
| Addendum F | PQMethod report pertaining to online learner responses | 108 |
| Addendum G | PQMethod report pertaining to online facilitator responses | 167 |
| Addendum H | Factor Q-sort values | 226 |
| Addendum I | Normalised factor scores for subgroups | 233 |
| Addendum J | Distinguishing characteristics | 254 |
| Addendum K | Summary profiles | 261 |
| Addendum L | Role categorisation | 283 |
| Addendum M | Unique task and role selections | 311 |