BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akinade, E. A. (1998). *Counselling services during distance education tutorials.* A paper presented to distance education tutors during a workshop organised by the Centre for Continuing Education: Gabarone, Botswana, July 1998, 23-24.

Andrews, D. & Goodson, L. (1980). A comparative analysis of models of instructional design. *Journal of Instructional Development*, Volume 3, Number 4, 2-15.

Andrews, R. (2003). *Research Questions*. London and New York: Continuum.

Anglin, G. J. (Ed.). (1995). *Instructional technology: Past, present and future.* (2nd ed.), Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Ashby, A. (2004). Monitoring student retention in the Open University: Definition, measurement, interpretation and action. *The Journal of Open and Distance Learning,* Volume 19, Number 1, February 2004, 65-77.

Atman, K. S. (1990). *Psychological type elements and goal accomplishment style: implication for distance education.* In: Moore, M. G. (1990), **Contemporary Issues in American Distance Education**, (1st ed), 136-150. Pergamon Press.

Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. (2002). *The practice of social research.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press, Southern Africa.

Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of social research,* (4th ed). New York: Free Press.

Bak, N. (2004). *Completing your thesis: A practical guide*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Banathy, B. H. (2003). Dialogue: The Method of Choice in Collective Communication. *Educational Technology*, Volume 43, Number 2, March-April 2003, 11-18.

Banathy, B. H. (1991). *Systems Design of Education: A Journey to Create the Future.* Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications.

Barbour, M. K. & Reeves, T.C. (2006). *Michael Graham Moore: A Significant Contributor to the Field of Educational Technology.* University of Georgia: USA.

Barefoot, B. O. (2004). Higher education's revolving door: Confronting the problem of student drop out in US colleges and universities. *The Journal of Open and Distance Learning,* Volume 19, Number 1, February 2004, 9-18.

Barefoot, B. O. (2003). Higher education's revolving door: Confronting the problem of student dropout in US colleges and universities. Paper prepared for the Conference, *Student retention in open and distance learning,* Madingley Hall, Cambridge, 27-28 May, cited by Yorke in *The Journal of Open and Distance Learning,* Volume 19, Number 1, February 2004, 19-32.

Bates, A. W. (1994). *Distance Education: Education Technology*. The International Encyclopedia of Education. Husen, T & Postlewaite, T.N. (Eds), (2nd ed). Oxford: Pergamon.

Beaudoin, M. F. (2003). Distance Education Leadership for the New Century. Online *Journal of Distance Learning Administration,* Volume 6, Number 2, Summer 2003. State University of West Georgia: Distance Education Centre.

Bednar, A. K., Cunningham, D., Duffy, T.M. & Perry, J.P. (1995). *Theory into practice: How do we link?* In: Anglin, G. J. (Ed.), ***Instructional technology: Past, present and future***. (2nd ed.), 100-111. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.

Bernardes, A. (2008). Training policies and practices in large enterprises: Current situation and future. *Sísifo/Educational Science Journal*. Number 6, 57-70, May-Aug 2008. ISSN 1646-6500.

Black, E. (1995). *Behaviourism as a learning theory*. [On-line]. http://129.7.160.115/inst5931/Behaviourism.html Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Blank, J. & Russell, J. D. (2000). The Program Planning Model for Adult and Continuing Education. *Educational Technology*, Volume 40 Number 2, 47-51.

Bless, C. (2002). Creating Partnerships in the DOD. *SANDF Bulletin for Educational Technology*, January 2003, Special Edition: DOD ETD Conference 2002. Pretoria: SANDF COLET.

Bless, C & Higson-Smith, C. (2000). *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods: An African Perspective*. (3rd ed). Lansdowne: Juta Education (Pty) Ltd.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bason.

Boyd, (1966). In Mueller, C. (1997). *"Transactional Distance."* The Ultimate Instant Online Encyclopaedia. http://tecfa.unige.ch/staf/staf9698/mullerc/3/transact.html Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Boyle, P. G. (1981). *Planning Better Programs*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bradley, L. H. (2004). *Curriculum Leadership: Beyond Boilerplate Standards*. Scarecrow Education. Lanham: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

Breier, M. (Ed). (2001). *Curriculum Restructuring in Higher Education in Post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: Published by Education Policy Unit, University of the Western Cape.

Briel, C. (2001). *Evaluation of learning programmes*. Pretoria: SANDF COLET.

Briggs, L. J., Gustafson, K. L., & Tilman, M. H. (Eds) (1991). *Instructional Design: Principles and Applications*. New Jersey, Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications.

Briggs, L. J. (1970). *Handbook of Procedures for the Design of Instruction.* Pittsburgh, PA: American Institutes for Research.

Brockett, R. G. & Hiemstra, R. (1991). *Self-Direction in Adult Learning: Perspectives on Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, K. S. & Bilimoria, D. (1985). Assessing Effectiveness in Higher Education. *Review of Higher Education*, Volume 9, 101-118.

Carl, A. (2009). *Teacher empowerment through curriculum development – Theory into practice*. (3rd ed). Lansdowne: Juta and Company Ltd.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*. London: Falmer Press.

Chan, B. Y. (1977). After Tyler, What? A current issue in Curriculum Theory. *Education Journal*, Volume 14, 21-31.

Cheng, C. & Lam, M. (1993). *Exporting distance learning: The question of student support*. In: Nunan, T. (Ed), ***Distance Education Futures***. Adelaide: Australian and South-Pacific External Studies Association.

Clements, D. H. & Battista, M. T. (1990). Constructivist Learning and Teaching. *Arithmetic Teacher*, September 1990, 34-36. Reston, Virginia: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM).

CMC Resource Site, (2004). *Transactional Distance Theory*. [On-line] http://cde.athabascau.ca/cmc/transactional.html Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Collins, M. P. & Berge, Z. L. (2003). Using instructional design for faculty development in a post-secondary, technology-enhanced environment. *Educational Technology*, Volume 43, Number 6, November-December 2003, 21-27.

Doll, W. E. (1993). *A Post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collins, K. J., Du Plooy, G.M. & Grobbelaar, M. M. (2000). *Research in the social sciences*. Muckleneuk, Pretoria: University of South Africa (UNISA).

Comstock, D. (2000). *Theoretical Foundations of Distance Education. Edtech 650*. www.davidcomstock.com/portfolio/worksamples/edtech650/distancelearning.pdf Retrieved on 11 January 2010.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996). *Security Services: Defence*. As adopted on 8 May 1996 and amended on 11 October 1996 by the Constitutional Assembly, ISBN 0-620-20214-9, 113-114, (English Version), Act 108 of 1996.

Cookson, P. S. (1990). *Persistence in distance education: A review*. In: Moore, M. G., ***Contemporary issues in American distance education***. (1st ed), 192-204. Pergamon Press.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crome, D. & Charles, T. (2005). *Creating the Workplace Learning Culture: Consequences of E-learning Implementation*. Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation, and Education Conference (I/ITSEC), USA, 2005.

Dale, A., Arber, S. & Procter, M. (1988). *Doing secondary analysis*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Daniels, D. (2007). Advancing critical thinking about adult basic education through academic service learning. *Education as Change*, Volume 2, Number 3, 23-36, December 2007, Special Issue. CSL.

Davies, I. K. (1981). *Instructional Technique*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Davis, R. H., Alexander, L. T. & Yelon, S. L. (1974). *Learning System Design: An Approach to the Improvement of Instruction*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

De Boer, A. L., Steyn, T. & Du Toit, P. H. (2001). A whole brain approach to teaching and learning in higher education. *SAJHE/SATHO*, Volume 15, Number 3, 185-193, ISSN 1011-3487.

De Fazio, T., Gilding, A. & Zorzenon, G. (2000). *Student Learning Support in an Online Learning Environment.* Centre for Educational Development and Support. ASCILITE 2000 conference proceedings.

De Ture, M. (2004). Cognitive Style and Self-Efficacy: Predicting Student Success in Online Distance Education. Applied Center for Instructional Design, Florida Community College at Jacksonville. *The American Journal of Distance Education,* Volume 18, Number 1, 21-38. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

De Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C. B. & Delport, C. S. L. (2005). *Research at grass roots: For the social sciences and human service professions*. (3rd ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik.

De Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C. B. & Delport, C. S. L. (2002). *Research at grass roots: For the social sciences and human service professions*. (2nd ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. The Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series; A Touchstone Book. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Diamond, R. M. (1989). *Designing and Improving Courses and Curricula in Higher Education: A Systematic Approach*. Josey-Bass Inc. Publishers: San Francisco. In: Dick, W. & Carey, L. (1996). *The Systematic Design of Instruction*. (4th ed.). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

DOD Annual Report, (1995/1996). Published by the South African Department of Defence, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria.

DOD Annual Report, (2003/2004). Published by the South African Department of Defence, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria.

DOD Annual Report, (2002/2003). Published by the South African Department of Defence, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria.

DOD Annual Report, (2001/2002). Published by the South African Department of Defence, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria.

DOD Curriculum Policy Document [Undated]. Draft document., Drafted by the South African Department of Defence (Training Command Formation), Republic of South Africa: Pretoria.

DOD ETD Project Team (1997a). *First DOD ETD Project Team Report*. Published by the South African Department of Defence, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria, 28 August 1997.

DOD ETD Project Team (1997b). *Second DOD ETD Project Team Report*. Published by the South African Department of Defence, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria, 01 September 1997.

Dron, J. (2006). *Social Software and the Emergence of Control*. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies. The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineer (IEEE).

Dron, J[1]., Seidel, C[2]. & Litten, G[2]. (2004). Transactional distance in a blended learning environment. *ALT-J, Research in Learning Technology,* Volume 12, Number 2, 163-174, June 2004; University of Brighton, UK[1];Crawley College, UK[2]. Carfax Publishing, Taylor & Francis Group.

Du Plooy, G. M. (2006). Bridging the chasm between theory and research/practice in Communication Science: a challenge in higher education. *Communicare*, Volume 25, Number 2, 62-84, December 2006.

Duangploy, O., Williams, M. & Gray, D., (2007). Transactional Distance Theory Applied When Designing International Accounting Online Courses. *The Texas Journal of Distance Learning* [Online serial], Volume 4, Number 1, 13-24.

Earl, T. (1987). *The Art and Craft of Course Design*. New York, NY: Nichols Publishing Company.

Erasmus, B. J. & Van Dyk, P. S. (2003). *Training management in South Africa.* (3rd ed.). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Ertmer, P. A. & Newby, T. J. (1993). *Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective.* Performance Improvement Quarterly, Number 4, 50-70.

Esterhuyse, A. (2009). Distance education and e-learning: The SANDF should get it right! *African Security Review,* Institute for Security Studies, Volume 18, Number 3, September 2009.

Fink, M.L. (2002). *Rethinking faculty support services.* Syllabus: New Directions in Education Technology, Volume 15, Number 7, 27-29.

Fisher, C. D., Schoenfeldt, L. F. & Shaw, J. B. (1993). *Human resources management.* (2nd Ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Flew, A. (Ed.). (1981). *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Third imprinting. London: Pan Books.

Fraser, W. J. & Nieman, M. M. (1995). *The knowledge accessing modes, performance determinants and instructional preferences of first year students at eight major distance education institutions in South Africa: Research Report*. Pretoria: University of South Africa (UNISA).

Frick, L., Albertyn, R. & Rutgers, L. (2010). The Socratic method: adult education theories. *Acta Academia Supplementum*. Matieland: Department of Curriculum Studies, Stellenbosch University.

Gagné, R. M. & Briggs, L. J. (1979). *Principles of Instructional Design*. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Garrison, D. R. (1996). *Quality Access in Distance Education. Theoretical Principles of Distance Education*. London: Routledge.

Garrison, D. R. (1989). *Understanding Distance Education: A Framework for the Future*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gibson, C. C. (1990). *Students and Learning: A Discussion of Selected Research*. In: Moore, M.G. (1990), **Contemporary issues in American distance education**. 121-135. Pergamon Press.

Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F. & Whitehead, B. M. (2006). *Curriculum Leadership: Development and Implementation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gokool-Ramdoo, S. (2008). Beyond the Theoretical Impasse: Extending the applications of Transactional Distance Theory. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, Volume 9, Number 3, October 2008, 1-17, Athabasca University; *ISSN: 1492-3831*.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. (1990). *Educational psychology: A realistic approach*. (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gooler, D. (1979). Evaluating Distance Education programmes. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, Volume 6, Number 1, 43-55.

Gorsky, P. & Caspi, A. (2005). A critical analysis of Transactional Distance Theory. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, Volume 6, Number 1, 1-11. Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Gorsky, P. & Caspi, A. & Tuvi-Arad, I. (2004). Use of Instructional Dialogue by University Students in a Distance Education Chemistry Course. *Journal of Distance Education (Revue De L'Èducation Á Distance)*, Spring/Printemps 2004, Volume 19, Number 1, 1-19.

Gravett, S. (2001). *Adult Learning: Designing and Implementing Learning Events – A Dialogic Approach*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Greyling, E. S. G., Geyser, H. C. & Fourie, C. M. (2002). Self-directed learning: adult learners' perceptions and their study materials. *SAJHE/SATHO*, Volume 16, Number 2, 112-121, ISSN 1011-3487.

Grinnell, R. M. (1993). *Social work research and evaluation*. (4th ed). Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Gujjar, A. A., Chaudhry, B. N. & Chaudhry, A. H. (2009). A comparative study of student support services of Allama Iqbal Open University and the Open University of Sri Lanka. *Educational Research and Review*, Volume 4, Number 7, 354-364, July 2009.

Habermas, J. (1989). *On the logic of the social sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hakim, C. (2000). *Research design: Successful designs for social and economic research*. London: Routledge.

Harrison, N. & Bergen, C. (2000). Some Design Strategies for Developing an Online Course. *Educational Technology,* Volume 40, Number 1, January-February 2000, 57-60.

Hass, G. (Ed) (1987). *Curriculum Planning: A New Approach*. Fifth Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Hass, G. & Parkay, F. W. (1993). *Curriculum Planning: A New Approach*. (6th ed). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Hoadley, U & J. Jansen. (2009). *Curriculum: Organising knowledge in the classroom.* (2nd ed). Goodwood: Oxford University Press.

Holberg, G. (1985). *Status and Trends of Distance Education*. Lund: Lector Publishing.

Holmberg, B., Moore, M G. & Peters, O. (2007). Theory and theorists: Why Theory is Important for Research. U. Bernath and M. Vidal (Eds). Entretiens et Confêrences; Distances et saviors, Volume 5, Number 3, 2007.

Hosken, G. (2004). SANDF courses worthless, says training authority. *The Pretoria News,* 20 October 2004, 5. Pretoria.

Hrubý, M. (2008). Freedom in Adult Education. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, Volume 1, Number 2, 12-19, ISSN 1803-1617.

Hũlsmann, T. (2000). The Cost of Open Learning: A Handbook. Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg. In: Welch, *et al*. (2004). ***Quality Criteria and Critical Success Factors for Distance Education Provision in Sub-Saharan Africa***. *Open Learning Through Distance Education (OLTDE)*, Volume 10, Number 1, 12-15.

Johnson, K. (1998). *Viewpoint: Soldiers Who Work Together Should Train Together*. [On-line]: http://www.now.org/issues/military Retrieved on 23 April 2007.

Jonassen, D. H. (1991). Objectivism versus constructivism: Do we need a new philosophical paradigm? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, Volume 39, Number 3, 5-14.

Jonassen, D. H. (1990). Thinking Technology: Toward a Constructivist View of Instructional Design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, Volume 30, Number 9, September 1990, 32-34.

Kang, S. (2004). Instructional Design and Development: A Brief Historical Overview. *Educational Technology*, Volume 44, Number 6, 39-45, November-December 2004.

Kaufman, R. A. (1982). *Needs assessment*. In: English, F.W. (Ed.), ***Fundamental curriculum decisions***, 53-67. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kearney, R. (1986). *Modern movements in European philosophy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Keegan, D. (Ed.), (1993). *Theoretical Principles of Distance Education*. London: Routledge.

Keegan, D. (1990). *Foundations of Distance Education*. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Kelchtermans, G. (2010). 'Editorial', Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice. *International Study Association for Teachers and Teaching*, Volume 16, Number 5, October 2010, 525-527. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713447546 Retrieved on 18 October 2010.

Kelly, A. V. (2004). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*. (5th ed). Sage Publications.

Keller, J. B. & Reigeluth, C. M. (2004). Revolutionizing School Reform for Educational Transformation. *Educational Technology*, Volume 44, Number 5, September-October 2004, 17-23.

Kember, D. (1989). An illustration, with case studies of linear-process model of drop-out from distance education. *Distance Education*, Volume 10, Number 2, 196-211.

Kember, D., Lee, K. & Li, N. (2001). Cultivating a sense of belonging in part-time students, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, Volume 20, Number 4, 326-341.

Kemp, J. E. (2003). Relationship Between Instructional Design and Education. *Educational Technology*, Volume 43, Number 2, March-April, 2003, 57-58.

Kizlik, B. (2010). Information about curriculum, curriculum development and planning. http://www.adprima.com/curricutility.htm Retrieved on 14 August 2010.

Knowles, M. (1970). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy vs. Pedagogy*. New York: Association Press.

Kubota, T., Terashima, K., Nakahashi, Y., & Morioka, H. (2008). Analyzing Learning Environments of Distance Education in Japan. *Distance Learning and the Internet Conference*. Japan: Waseda University.

Kumar, S. (2001). *Conceptual Framework*. http://www.columbia.edu/ccnmtl/draft/dbeeb/kumar/2003Files/matroot/concepfrmw Retrieved on 15 December 2006.

Le Roux, C. (2004). Can indigenous knowledge systems (IKSs) come to the rescue of distance adult learning facilitation? *SAJHE/SATHO*, Volume 18, Number 3, 92-105, Unisa Press.

Leedy, P. D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. (7th ed). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Levy, S. (2003). Six Factors to Consider when Planning Online Distance Learning Programs in Higher Education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, Volume 6, Number 1, Spring 2003. State University of West Georgia: Distance Education Center.

Lewis, J. A., Lewis, M.D., & Souflee, Jr. F. (1991). *Management of human service programs*. (2nd ed.). Brooks: Cole Publishers.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Lockwood, F. (1995). *Open and Distance Learning Today*. London: Routledge.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1984). *Analysing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. (2nd ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc.

Longman. (2001). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (3rd ed), Longman Corpus Network, British National Corpus. Pearson Education Limited.

Lowe, W. (2000). Transactional distance theory as a foundation for developing innovative and reactive instruction. *Educational Technology & Society, Volume 3, Number 1*, ISSN 1436-4522; Oracle, Canada.

Lynch, M. M. (2001). *Effective student preparation for online learning*. The Technology Source. [On-line]. http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=901 Retrieved on 06 November 2001.

Mabaso, J., Meyer, M., & Lancaster, K. (2001). *ETD Practices in South Africa*. Durban: Butterworths Publishers.

Madi, M., Parasuraman, B., Muniapan, B., Koren, S. & Jones, M. (2008). Motivating factors associated with adult participation in distance learning program. *International Education Studies*, Volume 1, Number 4, 104-109, November 2008.

Magagula, C. M. & Ngwenya, A. P. (2004). A Comparative Analysis of the Academic Performance of Distance and On-campus Students. Turkish [Online]. *Journal of Distance Education – TOJDE*, October 2004, ISSN 1302-6488, Volume: 5, Number: 4, 1-11. http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/tojde16/articles/magagula.htm Retrieved on 29 October 2004.

Mager, R. F. & Beach, Jr K. M. (1967). *Developing vocational instruction*. David S. Lake Publishers.

Makin, V. (2001). Trends and needs in distance education research: the death of distance. *Progressio*, Volume 23, Number 2, 25-36.

Malan, D. J. (2004). Riding the Wave of ETD Reforms: Opportunities and Challenges. *SANDF Bulletin for Educational Technology*, December 2004, 1-5. Pretoria: SANDF COLET.

Marcuse, H. (1973). *Studies in Critical Philosophy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Mark, R, (1996). *Research made simple: A handbook for social workers*. London: Sage.

Marshal, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Martin, B. L. (2004). ISD: The 'S' is for Sytems!. *Educational Technology*, Volume 44, Number 2, 13-19, March-April 2004.

Massy, W. & Zemsky, R. (2004). Thwarted innovation: The research says what it says. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, Volume 5, Number 4, 2004, 11-12; Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Mayer, R. R. & Greenwood, E. (1980). *The Design of Social Policy Research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McGivney, V. (2004). Understanding persistence in adult learning. *The Journal of Open and Distance Learning*, Volume 19, Number 1, 33-46.

McCarthy, T. (1994). *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas*. Ninth printing. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction*. (5th ed). New York: Longman.

McVay, M. (1998). *How to be a Successful Distance Student: Learning on the Internet*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Mergel, B. (1998). *Instructional Design & Learning Theory*. University of Saskatchewan: Educational Communications and Technology.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide,* (2nd ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, M., Opperman, C., & Dyrbye, C. (2003). *Measuring Return on Investment in Training: A Practical Implementation Guide*. Randburg: Knowres Publishing.

Meyer, M.(Ed), Bushney, M., Katz, M., Knoke, G., Lategan, A., Ludike, J., Meyer, M., Nel, B., Schenk, H., Smith, S., van Niekerk, J. & Wolfson, R. (2007). *Managing Human Resource Development: An outcome based approach*. (3rd ed). Durban: LexisNexis.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mills, R. (1996). *The role of study centres in open and distance education: A glimpse of the future*. In: Mills, R. and Tait, A., **Supporting the Student in Open and Distance Learning**. London: Pitman Publishing.

Moatlhodi, S. (2003). *Causes of non-completion of COLET programmes: With special reference to the role of tertiary education and training some SANDF students are pursuing*. Unpublished Statement of Research Report. Pretoria: SANDF COLET.

Moll, I., Welch, T. & Naidoo, J. (2004). *Curriculum Responsiveness in Programme and Materials Development for Distance Instructor Education*. A paper presented to the NADEOSA Conference, St John's College, Johannesburg, 25 August 2004.

Monette, D. R., Sullivan, T. J. & DeJong, C. R. (1988). *Applied social research: Tool for the human services*. (4th ed). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Montgomerie, T. C., Irvine, V. & Davenport, M. (2001). *Design and Implementation of a Next Generation Distance Education System*. [On-line] http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/~CraigM/ Retrieved on 29 October 2004.

Moon, J. (2002). *The Module & Programme Development Handbook: A practical guide to linking levels, learning outcomes & assessment*. London, UK: Kogan Page Limited.

Moore, M. G. (1972). *Student autonomy: The second dimension of independent learning*. Convergence, Volume 2, 76-88.

Moore, M. G. & Thompson, M. M. (1997). *The effects of distance learning*. Revised Edition. Pennsylvania State University: American Centre for the Study of Distance Education.

Moore, M. G. & Kearsley, G. (1996). *Distance education: A system view*. Wadsworth, CA: Belmont.

Moore, M. G. (1993). *Theory of transactional distance*. In Keegan, D. (Ed): ***Theoretical Principles of Distance Education***, 22-38. London: Routlege.

Moore, M.G. (1991). Editorial: Distance education theory. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, Volume 5, Number 3, 1-6.

Moore, M. G. (Ed.), (1990). *Contemporary issues in American distance education*. Pergamon Press.

Moore, M.G (Ed), (2007). Handbook of Distance Education (2nd ed). ISBN/ISSN: 0-8058-5847-4.

Morse, J. M. (1991). *Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation*. Nursing Research, Volume 40, Number 1, 120-123.

Moyer, S. S. (2004). A New Direction for Distance Education in the US Army. *Educational Technology*, Volume 44, Number 2, March-April 2004.

Mueller, C. (1997). *"Transactional Distance."* The Ultimate Instant Online Encyclopaedia. http://tecfa.unige.ch/staf/staf9698/mullerc/3/transact.html Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Nash, S. S. (2005a). *Military Success Hinges on Enhanced Student Autonomy*. Military Tech, 26 February 2005. [On-line].

Nash, S. S. (2005b). *The Instructor and the Online Military Student: A Confession*. Military Tech, 05 March 2005. [On-line].

Nash, S. S. (2004a). *Considerations for Young Enlisted E-Students*. Military Tech, 04 December 2004. [On-line].

Nash, S. S. (2004b). *Failing the Military: Where Online Courses Miss the Mark*. Military Tech, 25 December 2004. [On-line].

National Association of Distance Education Organisations of South Africa (NADEOSA), (2003). *Criteria for Quality Distance Education Organisations in South Africa.*

National Association of Distance Education Organisations of South Africa, (NADEOSA), (1996). *The Nadeosa Quality Criteria and Minimum Targets for Distance Education in South Africa*.

Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. (3rd ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Newlands, D. & Mclean, A. (1996). *The Potential of Live Instructor Supported Distance Learning: A Case Study of the Use of Audio Conferencing at the University of Aberdeen*: London.

Nicholls, A. & Nicholls, S. H. (1972). *Developing a Curriculum: A Practical Guide*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

Nielsen, H. D. & Tatto, M. T. (1993). *Instructor upgrading in Sri Lanka and Indonesia*. In Perraton, (Ed). **Alternative Routes to Formal Education: Distance Teaching for School Equivalency**. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nonyongo, E. P. & Ngengebule, A. T., (Eds, 1998). *Student support Services: Case Studies of DEASA Member Institution*s. Pretoria: University of South Africa (UNISA).

Nopachai, S. & Zhang, J. (1999). *Distance Learning and WWW*. http://www.acal.etl.vt.edu/dl/default.ht. Retrieved on 06 June 1999.

Ollman, B. (2007). *The dance of the dialectic*. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, Columbia University Press, www.cc.columbia.edu/cu/cup/ Retrieved on 17 March 2010.

O'Neil, T. D. (2006). *How Distance Education Has Changed Teaching and the Role of the Instructor.* Indiana University of Pennsylvania, North Apollo, PA, USA. Slovakia: E-Leader.

Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (2009). *Curriculum Foundations, Principles and Issues*. (5th ed). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Osman, R. & Castle, J. (2006). Making space for adult learners in higher education. *SAJHE/SATHO*, Volume 20, Number 4, 515-527, Unisa Press; ISSN 1011-3487.

Parker, A. (1999). A Study of variables that predict dropout from distance education. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, http://www.ao.uiuc.edu/ijet/v1n2/parker/index.html Retrieved on 29 October 2004.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. (2nd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Perry, W. & Rumble, G. (1987). *A short Guide to Distance Education*. London: International Extension College.

Peters, O. (1998). *Learning and Teaching in Distance Education*. (1st ed). London, UK: Kogan Page Limited.

Posner, G. J. & Rudnitsky, A. N. (2006). *Course Design: A Guide to Curriculum Development for teachers*. (7th ed). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Pulkkinen, J. (2003). *The Paradigms of e-Education: An analysis of the Communication Structures in the Research on Information and Communication Technology Integration in Education in the years 2000-2001*. (Trustworthiness of the research), Oulu University Library (2003). [On-line], http://herkules.oulu.fi/isbn9514272463/html/x321.html Retrieved on 12 February 2009.

Qureshi, E., Morton, L.L. & Antosz, E. (2002). An Interesting Profile-University Student who Take Distance Education Courses Show Weaker Motivation Than On-Campus Students. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration,* Volume 5, Number 4, Winter 2002.

Reeder, K., Macfadyen, L. P., Roche, J. & Chase, M. (2004). Negotiating cultures in cyberspace: Participation patterns and problematics. *Language Learning & Technology*, Volume 8, Number 2, 88-105, May 2004. ISSN 1094-3501.

Roblyer, M. D. & Wiencke, W. R. (2003). Design and use of a Rubric to Assess and Encourage Interactive Qualities in Distance Courses. *The American Journal of Distance education,* Volume 17, Number 2, 77-98. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rose, E. (2004). Instructional design and Curriculum development: Deconstructing the difference. *Educational Technology,* Volume 44, Number 2, March-April 2004, 3-12.

Rothwell, W. J. & Sredl, H. J. (1992). *The ASTD Reference Guide to Professional Human Resource Development Roles and Competencies*. Boston: HRD Press Inc.

Rovai, A. P. (2003). In search of higher persistence rates in distance education online programs. *The Internet and Higher Education*, Volume 6, (2003), 1-16. Virginia Beach, VA: Pergamon.

Rowland, G. (2003). The Worthwhile Quest for Integration of Theories of Learning. *Educational Technology,* (Reader Comments), Volume 44, Number 6, November-December 2003, 63.

Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (2001). *Research Methods for Social Work.* (4th ed). Wadsworth, CA: Belmont.

Ruffini, M. F. (2000). Systematic Planning in the Design of an Educational Web Site. *Educational Technology,* Volume 40, Number 2, March-April 2000, 58-64.

Rumajogee, A. R. (2002). *Distance Education and Open Learning in sub-Saharan Africa: A Literature Survey on Policy and Practice.* Working Group on Distance Education and Open Learning, February 2002. Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA). Paris, France: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Rumble, G. (2001). *The Costs of Providing Online Student support Services: Student Services at the UK Open University.* Paper presented at the 20th World Conference of the International Council of Open and Distance Education, 1 – April 2001, Dusseldorf, Germany.

Saba, F. (1988). Integrated telecommunications systems and instructional transaction. *The American Journal of Distance Education,* Volume 2, Number 3, 17-24E.

Saettler, P. (1990). *The Evolution of American Educational Technology*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited Inc.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. L. (1973). *Field research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Schiffman, S. S. (1995). *Instructional systems design: Five views of the field.* In: Anglin, G.J. (Ed.). **Instructional technology: Past, present and future.** (2nd ed), 131-142. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited Inc.

Schifter, C. C. (2002). Perception Difference About Participating in Distance Education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration,* Volume 5, Number 1.

Schlosser, C.A. & Anderson, M. L. (1994). *Distance Education: Review of the Literature*. Ames, Iowa: Instructor Education Alliance Iowa Distance Education Alliance.

Schumacher, S. & McMillan, J. H. (1993). *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction*. (3rd ed). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Schuman, L. (1996). *Perspectives on instruction*. [On-line]: http://edweb.sdsu.edu/courses/edtec540/Perspectives/Perspectives.html Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Schwier, R. A. (1995). *Issues in emerging interactive technologies*. In Anglin, G.J. (Ed.), *Instructional technology: Past, present and future*. (2nd ed), 119-127. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.

Seyoum, A. A. (2003). Distance education development in Ethiopia. *Open Learning Through Distance Education* Volume 9, Number 2; 8-9. SAIDE.

Sharma, H. L. (2002). Student support Services In Distance Learning System: A Case of Directorate of Distance Education (DDE), Maharshi Dayanand Univ*ersity*. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE* October 2002 ISSN 1302-6488 Volume: 3 Number: 4 [Online] http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/tojde16/articles/s_usun.htm Retrieved on 11 September 2004.

Shearer, R. (n.d). *Instructional Design in Distance Education: An Overview; ThePennsylvania State university.*

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, Volume 29, Number 7, 4-44, October 2000.

Siaciwena, R. (1996). *The management of student support services in a dual-mode university.* In: **Open Praxis**, Volume 2, International Council for Distance Education (ICDE), 14.

Simpson, O. (2004). The impact on retention of interventions to support distance learning students*. The Journal of Open and Distance Learning,* Volume 19, Number 1, 79-95.

Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era*. (2nd ed). New York: Routledge.

Smith, D. L. & Lovat, T. J. (2003). *Curriculum: Action on Reflection*. (4th ed). Tuggerah, NSW: Social Science Press.

Smorgansbord, A. (Undated). *Constructivism and instructional design*. [On-line]. http://www.hagar.up.ac.za/catts/student/smorgan/cons.html Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

South African Defence Review, (1998). Published by the South African Department of Defence, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria.

South African Institute for Distance Education, (1999).

South African Military Health Service (2004). Course Material. Special Unit Order No 14 of 2004, 31 May 2004.

South African White Paper on Defence, (1996). Published by the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

Spady, W. G. (1994). *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Stewart, D. (1993). Student support systems. In Scriven, B., Lundin, R. & Ryan, Y., (Eds). ***Open Learning,*** Volume 8, Number 3, 3-12.

Stirling, D. L. (1997). *Toward a Theory of Distance Education: Transactional Distance.* [On-line]. http://www.stirlinglaw.com/deborah/stir4.htm Arizona State University, Spring 1997. Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Struwig, F. W. & Stead, G. B. (2001). *Planning, designing and reporting research.* South Africa: Masker Miller Longman (Pty) Ltd, Pearson Education.

Sullivan, E. & Rocco, T. (1997). *Guiding principles for distance learning in a learning society.* [On-line]. http://www.pbs.org/als/agenda/articles/credo.htmi Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Tait, A. (1995). Student support in open and distance learning. In: Lockwood, F., ***Open and Distance Learning Today***. London: Routledge.

Tait, J. (2004). The tutor/facilitator role in student retention. *The Journal of Open and Distance Learning,* Volume 19, Number 1, 97-109.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, J. C. (2001). *Fifth Generation Distance Education.* Keynote address delivered at the ICDE 20th World Conference, Dusseldorf, Germany, 1-5 April 2001. [On-line] http://www.usq.edu.au/users/taylor/conferences.htm Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Taylor, J. C. (2000). *New Millennium Distance Education.* Conference paper delivered at IGNOU Conference, New Delhi, India in 2000. [On-line] http://www.usq.edu.au/users/taylor/publications/presentations/2000IGNOUdo Retrieved on 18 August 2004.

Taylor, J. C. (1995). Distance education technologies: The fourth generation. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology,* Volume 11, Number 2, 1-7.

Tennyson, R. D. (1990). Integrated Instructional Design Theory: Advancements from Cognitive Science and Instructional Technology. *Educational Technology,* Volume 30, Number 7, July 1990, 9-15.

Terre Blanche, M., & Durrheim, K. (1999). *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences.* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Thompson, J. B. & Held, D. (1982). *Habermas: Critical Debates.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* (2nd ed). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, Volume 45, 89-125.

Toohey, S. (1999). *Designing Courses for Higher education*. Celtic Court, Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Trentin, G. (2000). The Quality-Interactivity Relationship in Distance Education. *Educational Technology*, Volume 40, Number 1, 17-27, January-February 2000.

University of Pretoria. (2009). *Distance Education Policy*. Pretoria: Faculty of Education, Unit for Distance Education, University of Pretoria.

University of South Africa (UNISA, 2010). *Conceptual framework for student support at UNISA*. Task Team 4: Student Support, STLSC 10 may 2010.

Usun, S. (2004). Student support Services in Distance Education System: A Case Study of Turkey. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE* October 2004 ISSN 1302-6488 Volume: 5 Number*: 4* [Online] http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/tojde16/articles/s_usun.htm Retrieved on 15 August 2004.

Valentine, D. (2002). Distance Learning: Promises, Problems, and Possibilities. *Journal of Distance Learning Administration,* Volume 5, Number 3. http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall53/valentine53.html Retrieved on 23 May 2003.

Van der Walt, A. (2004). Distance Learning in the Department of Defence. *SANDF Bulletin for Educational Technology*, December 2004. Pretoria: SANDF COLET.

Van Gerwen, R. (2001). Hegel's dialectics was geared to art, he had no business 'ending' it. *Hegels Ästhetic. Die Kunst der Politik-Die Politik der Kunst*, *Akademie Verlag*, 68-74, 2001.

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

Viljoen, A. (1999). *Guidelines for the development of a distance learning system as form of individualised training in the SANDF*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pretoria: UNISA.

Vithal, R. & Jansen, J. (1997). *Designing your first research proposal*. Lansdowne: Juta & Co, Ltd.

Vrasidas, C. & McIsaac M. S. (1999). Factors Influencing Interaction in an Online Course. *American Journal of Distance Education*.

Wallace, R. (2003). Online Learning in Higher Education: a review of research on interactions among teachers and students. *Education, Communication & Information,* Volume 3, Number 2, July 2003. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.

Wang, C. & Liu, Z. (2003). Distance education: basic resources guide. *Collection building*; Volume 22, Number 3, 120-130, ISSN 0160-4953; MCB UP Limited; http://www.emeraldinsight.com/0160-4953.htm Retrieved on 17 November 2004.

Watson, C., Correia, A., Lee, M., & Schwen, T (2004). Fostering Constructive Dialogue: Building Toward More Effective Communication in the Educational Technology Field. *Educational Technology*, Volume 44, Number 2, March-April, 2004.

Welch, T., Mwagiru, W., & Mays, T. (2004). Quality Criteria and Critical Success Factors for Distance Education Provision in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Open Learning Through Distance Education (OLTDE),* Volume 10, Number 1, April 2004, 12-15. SAIDE.

Welch, T. & Reed, Y. (2005). *Designing and Delivering Distance Education: Quality Criteria and Case Studies from South Africa*. Braamfontein, South Africa: National Association of Distance Education of South Africa (NADEOSA).

Wikipedia (2007b). Dialectic. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialectic Retrieved on 06 December 2007.

Willis, B. (Ed) (1994). *Distance Education: Strategies and Tools. Educational Technology Publications, Inc*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

Willis, B. (1993). Distance Education: A Practical Guide. *Educational Technology Publications, Inc*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

Wilmore, E. L. (1999). *Benchmarking Instructor Education: What Can We Learn from the Military*. Opinion Papers (120). Military Academy (West Point), NY. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), ED 430 950, SP 038 534.

Wilson, B. G. (1997). Thoughts on theory in educational technology. *Educational Technology,* January-February, 22-27.

Wolfson, R. & Lancaster, K. (1999). *Evaluation and assessment*. In Meyer, M. (Ed.). Managing human resource development: An outcomes-based approach. Durban: Butterworths.

Woodley, A. (2004). Conceptualizing student dropout in part-time distance education: Pathologizing the normal? *The Journal of Open and Distance Learning,* Volume 19, Number 1, 47-63.

Wulf, K. M. & Schave, B. (1984). *Curriculum design: A handbook for educators*. Glenview, Illinois, London: Scott Foresman and Company.

Yorke, M. (2004). Retention, persistence and success in on-campus higher education, and their enhancement in open and distance learning. *The Journal of Open and Distance Learning*, Volume 19, Number 1, 19-32.

Summary of education, training and development problems and recommendations as reported by the DOD ETD Project Team in 1997.

1.   Department of Defence (DOD) instructors

During the assessment period, the DOD ETD Project Team realized that a shortage of qualified distance learning instructors at most training institutions was a general trend. Very few institutions had more than two members qualified at the Ed Tech 2 level (or train the trainer programme). This problem was exacerbated by the personnel climate where units were forced to utilize "unqualified" instructors and hence could not release the instructors to obtain the necessary ETD qualifications. In certain units, the training task was severely impeded by the shortage of instructors. This situation leads to certain distance teaching and learning functions being ceased owing to a lack of training personnel.

In certain instances the majority of instructors were executing their training functions out of goodwill but were negatively affected by diminishing resources. The fact that training of a high standard would still being presented was attributed to the positive attitude and conscientiousness of these members. In other instances personnel policies of other institutions was also found to be the cause of the problem. For instance, in the SAAF pilot contracts impacted negatively on the retention of flying instructors. This situation was further exacerbated by lucrative offers offered in the civilian aviation. This problem was also experienced in the air-traffic control and artisan environment.

The DOD ETD Project Team recommended that consideration had to be given to the contract system (especially in the case of pilots) and the timing of the placement of instructors in order to maintain a capacity. This aspect had to be liaised with the Provide Personnel process. The Team further recommended that optimal utilization of an institution such as the College of Educational Technology (COLET) had to enjoy consideration. These institutions had to have an adequate capacity for the training of a large number of distance learning instructors and remuneration of ETD practitioners and a specific career path, in order to retain competent practitioners, must be considered.

2.   Department of Defence (DOD) learning courses

In general, the Project Team felt that very good distance training programmes were presented in various Arms of Service (AoSs) but suffice to say that there were problems. For instance, training that was common to all four AoSs or within an AoSs was not co-located or centrally

coordinated. This practice was an unnecessary duplication of courses that lead to inappropriate utilization of support personnel, resources and facilities. In certain instances, there was very little or no coordination between training institutions regarding the common distance learning courses or training requirements they present.

It was also discovered that the problem of coupling courses to promotion lead to courses being done for the purpose of qualifications only and not necessarily for personnel development. This practice did not inculcate the right attitude to learning and usually the member did the course too late in his/her career. More often than not, the member mastered most of the skills required by means of "in-service" training and merely completed the course for qualification. Most training was qualification based instead of being outcome based.

The Project Team felt that the practice of using courses as a means of evaluating personnel (especially at staff course levels) should be called into question. It further suggested that another question should be raised about the mentoring, advisability and/or support of all officers undergoing staff training at distance learning. A staff qualification was required for promotion to a certain rank level. The Team further discovered that most courses in the SANDF (with a few exceptions) did not make provision for the training of the Reserves or Part Time Force (PTF) component (as part of the "one force concept"). This was also evident within the civilian component widely known as Public Service Act Personnel (PSAP).

The Project Team recommended that the control of ETD had to be centralised in order to bring about the co-ordination of providing ETD opportunities. In addition, training for personal development and training for operational functions would have to be separated where possible. If this was unavoidable clear command and control guidelines had to be provided. The Team also suggested that the outsourcing of non core-business ETD had to be investigated and central co-ordination of outsourcing had to be a pre-requisite.

The Team further recommended that the possibility of joint training where applicable and possible had to be investigated. In addition, co-location options regarding common distance training and the possibility of outsourcing aspects, in order to eradicate unnecessary duplication of ETD, had to be investigated. The Team further recommended that all ETD had to be post related. This would imply that PSAP would undergo the same training as uniformed members (commonly known as Defence Act Personnel – DAP). In addition, specific requirements of the PTF regarding ETD had to be taken into account while foreign ETD opportunities and tertiary training for these members had to also be investigated. The

Team further recommended that the focus had to shift from focusing on qualifications to competencies and outcomes. Greater client involvement had to be required in order to spell out the competencies that a person, group or organisation would require in order producing a specified outcome.

3.   Infrastructure and facilities

The DOD ETD Project Team realized that the DOD had numerous training facilities in various locations around the country. These facilities varied in quality ranging from distance learning tailor made to make shift facilities. Most training facilities were experiencing problems in being maintained owing to budget constraints and Public Works Department (PWD) ineptitude and diminished capabilities. A number of training units used private funds to undertake necessary maintenance. The implication of this situation was that the majority of training units would not be able to provide, adequately, distance learning as mode of delivery in such existing infrastructures and maintain the bare minimum standard for much longer.

In general, ETD infrastructure appeared to be sufficient in terms of accommodation. The quality of the infrastructure varied greatly. The spatial geographic distribution of training institutions had the effect that a number of facilities were under-utilized and/or not suitable for distance education. This situation impacted negatively on the maintenance as discussed above. At the time of the assessment by the Project Team, a number of institutions were awaiting capital building and maintenance programmes to be implemented. However, according to the team, in certain instances a large amount of capital earmarked for a building and maintenance project appeared dubious in terms of the distance learning output or outcome.

The Project Team recommended that the optimal utilization of facilities had to be attained by means of co-location, re-organisation and central control where applicable. Where facilities were no longer, economically viable demolition had to be considered. The Team further recommended that unit commanders had to be provided with the means to maintain their facilities by transferring the PWD budget allocation to the DOD. This would have to be liaised with the Provide Logistics process.

4.   Technology

According to the DOD ETD Project Team, good distance learning technology opportunity was available in the ETD environment within the DOD but a lack of coordination existed regarding the acquisition of computer hardware and software. In the absence of a clear

distance learning policy in this regard, each AoSs operated virtually independently. This resulted in a lack of standardization, leading to software integration problems, unnecessary duplication and in certain instances, under utilization of technology in distance learning mode of delivery.

The Project Team recommended that a clear distance learning policy be formulated in the ETD environment and all ETD technology acquisition had to be centrally coordinated. In addition, close liaison with the CMI and Acquisition processes had to be maintained.

5.   Tertiary training

The DOD ETD Project Team reported that the Military Academy, situated in Saldanha, Cape Town, was under utilized and functions mainly as a military university and not as a military academy (such as the US Army Academy, West Point in the USA). Unlike the US Army Academy, the distance learning programmes were non-existent in the Military Academy. The then Medium Term System (MTS) applicable to a significant, number of students would provide a poor return on the educational investment made by the DOD. Other ranks were severely neglected in this field. Tertiary education was almost exclusively reserved for officers. The Project Team recommended that tertiary training of Warrant Officers (WOs) and Non-Commissioned Officers (NCOs), where applicable, had to be investigated and the establishment of an NCO/WO academy had to be considered to address the problem.

The Military Academy introduced distance learning format in 2002. It now offers three learning programmes in this mode. The entry requirements for the two options differ significantly. In the distance learning option, there are no restrictions on rank, age or marital status. These programmes allow students a maximum of six years to complete their studies and available to all serving members of the SANDF, the DAP and PSAP.

One such programme is a B Mil programme in Human and Organisation Development. This programme focuses on knowledge, skills and competencies required to function effectively in the area of human resource and organizational development. Both learning options, residential and distance are presented at Certificate, Diploma and Degree level. Successful completion of each qualification is required for advancing to the next level.

APPENDIX B

Statement of survey findings (unpublished) on the causes of non-completion of COLET programmes; with special reference to the role of tertiary education and training that some students were pursuing between 1998 and 2002 reported by Moatlhodi in 2003.

1.   Why some students do not complete COLET learning programmes in terms of assignments and assessment preparation?

      a.   According to the information gathered only 50.7% of students were able to complete their learning programmes, whereas 41.8% did not complete their learning programmes and 7.5% of them did not respond. This can be attributed to the following factors:

            i.   Workload.
            ii.   Support from supervisors.
            iii.   Lack of knowledge on ETD.
            iv.   Being compelled to register with COLET.
            v.   Student's Academic level.

2.   What influence do tertiary academic studies have on students whilst registered with COLET?

      a.   According to information gathered, tertiary academic studies do not impact much towards the completion of COLET's learning programmes. Only 31.3% indicated that they were registered with COLET and other tertiary institution. This is supported by the following factors:

            i.   Dual registration.
            ii.   Support from lecturers/facilitators.
            iii.   Hindrances that prohibited them from submitting their assignments on time.

3.   What are the influential factors on this matter, in particular the role played by workplace environment (as this is the distance learning mode)?

      a.   It is shown in the information gathered that 58.2% of students do get support from their supervisors and 70.1% from their colleagues. 38.8% of the supervisors requested progress reports from the students. This is supported by the following factors:

            i.   Support from supervisors.
            ii.   Support from colleagues.

4.   Is the non-completion of compulsory assignments submission the same for COLET and the Tertiary Education programmes?

      a.   The students who were registered with COLET and other tertiary institution did experience some problems. The workload factor is the one that has been mentioned from time to time.
            i.   Workload.
            ii.   Hindrances that prohibited them from submitting their assignments on time

5.   What can be done to motivate/encourage students to complete their programmes on time?

    a.   Allocation of time for submission of assignments.

    b.   Provision of facilities and resources.

Pilot study results done by the researcher with COLET facilitators in 2003 on distance learning problems experienced by instructors.

1. No clear guidelines.

2. No clear methods to be used.

3. Students do not complete their work in a Distance Learning mode of delivery.

4. Members of the DOD are not familiar with this type of learning or are not ready.

5. It is difficult to teach a skill (like Facilitation) by means of Distance Learning.

6. Distance Learning is not always a good or best way of learning as students learns in different paces (e.g. slow students).

7. Facilitators do not check if students need help or not in a Distance Learning.

8. Technology used to present learning programmes is obsolete and old fashioned.

9. The DOD is not geared for Distance Learning because we place too much emphasis on the facilitator and not encouraging the student to take responsibility for their own learning.

10. Adult learning or "student-centeredness" approach is preached but not practiced.

11. The DOD members are not committed to DL and their attitude needs to change.

12. The programme content does not determine the delivery mode.

13. Learning material is still not geared for Distance Learning.

14. Distance Learning is not implemented correctly.

15. Distance Learning approach is not transparent to students.

16. The Quality Assurance system or the Systems Integrity is not in place yet.

17. Guidance and counselling on time management is not considered in this mode.

18. Administration, support systems and contact with students is not up to standard.

19. Access to information is not made easy and simple.

20. The DOD had not prepared our students for changes to Outcome Based Education in a Distance Learning mode.

APPENDIX D

Distance learning institutions and their corresponding programmes in the DOD as determined by Viljoen in her unpublished doctoral thesis (1999)

1. School for Tactical Intelligence: Formal training for the Reserve Force SA Army Intelligence Corps members.

2. School of Armour: South African Armour Corp (SAAC) senior battle handling courses. 03 / 04 Regimental Cdr Course.

3. SA Army Engineer Formation: Reserve Force Training.

4. School of Artillery: Currently none but envisaged for Permanent Force & Reserve Force in future.

5. Infantry School: All senior courses.

6. SA Army College: Junior Command and Staff Duties Course (theory).

7. SA Naval Staff College: JSWC MoD 1 ROY Reserve Force.

8. SAS Simonsberg:

    a. PWO (to some extent).
    b. EW (limited use).
    c. SWO 1 & 2 (limited use).

9. SAS Saldahna: The Military Training for ratings Part 3 Reserve modules is partly presented at a central Reserve Unit (normally in East London or Port Elizabeth). Whether this can be defined as comprehensive DL is debatable.

10. SA Air Force College:

    a. Senior Air Power Program (Partly distance).
    b. Junior Command and Staff Course (Individual Study Phase).
    c. Senior Supervisor Course (Individual Study Phase).

Focused group interview questions

1. What is the distance education (DE) teaching and learning character of this institution (or in your Arm of Service)?

2. How are your distance learning (DL) programmes designed in this institution? or What are the requirements for designing DL programmes?

3. How are students encouraged to achieve the intended outcomes?

4. What impact does transactional dialogue has on students, what are their comments on the impact of dialogue?

5. What is the involvement of students in the designing of DL   programmes?

6. What had been your experiences with the DOD ETD Process?

7. What do you do to encourage students to talk to each other / What do you do to encourage or foster interaction?

8. What do you do to encourage students to express themselves freely / How do you allow freedom of expression?

9. How do students and instructors negotiate communication across transactional dialogue?

10. What are the reasons for considering DL mode in this institution?

11. What technologies do you use (is applicable) here in this institution to talk to students when they are far away?

12. How are your DL instructors prepared for DL instruction in this institution?

13. What has been the impact of drop-out and failure of students?

14. What is your opinion about the DOD DL policy?

15. How can the existing problems be solved or addressed?

Original responses of the Army College focused group and codes allocated

1.   What is the Distance Education (DE) teaching and learning character of this institution (in the SA Army)?

TLC1:   Students are given a 'workbook' to prepare for distance learning (DL) during the preparatory development (Prep Dev) phase.
TLC2:   We have the induction week.
TLC3:   We have the contact sessions.
TLC4:   We have the residential phase.
TLC5:   Our distance learning (DL) is content-based.
TLC6:   Our learning is self-regulated learning.
TLC7:   Our teaching and learning is collaborative in approach.
TLC8:   We apply adult approach where students are responsible for the planning, designing and assessing their work is used.
TLC9:   Our students are able to continue their learning in their places of work where the Army College is able to continue assisting them.
TLC10:   We apply formative assessments.
TLC11:   We apply summative assessments.
TLC12:   We make sure our students are not isolated.
TLC13:   The Army College model is called learning management system (LMS).

2.   How are your distance learning (DL) programmes designed in this institution? What are the requirements for designing DL programmes?

DDLP1:   Our programme designs are based on problem assessment, redesign & implementation.
DDLP2:   They are in accordance with the curriculum.
DDLP3:   They include the training purpose.
DDLP4:   They contain the specific outcomes.
DDLP5:   They contain the exit level outcomes.
DDLP6:   They include the assessment guidelines.
DDLP7:   They contain the learning strategy.
DDLP8:   They are based on the learning content.
DDLP9:   They have the overview of the facilitation approach.
DDLP10:   They are based on the student pathway.
DDLP11:   They are designed with the LMS in mind.
DDLP12:   They have the references.

3.   How are students encouraged to achieve the intended outcomes?

AIO1:   The students must be found competent in the specific outcomes during the distance education module (DEM).
AIO2:   Before the students attend the Residential Module (RM) they must be found competent in the DEM.
AIO3:   The role of outcomes-based education (OBE) is emphasized.
AIO4:   We adhere to the principles of Assessment.
AIO5:   They are told verbally of what is required from them.
AIO6:   They are also practically shown.
AIO7:   They are constantly reminded of the intended outcomes.

4.   What impact does Transactional Dialogue has on students, what are their comments on the impact of dialogue?

TD1:   All the subjects have an instructor.
TD2:   Instructors work day and night giving feedback.
TD3:   Students are being mentored all the time.
TD4:   There are time frames to submit some assignments through the LMS.
TD5:   The students are measured on what they submit.
TD6:   In their units we sensitize the supervisor and unit commanders about the student's programme.
TD7:   We write a letter through Chief of the Army to communicate that.
TD8:   We encourage their units to give students timeframes of doing their work during working hours (but not the whole day).
TD9:   In terms of communication we are reminding them about the target dates to submit not to wait for the last date.
TD10:   When they are going back to their units they must present the programme (to their Supervisors) that is created on the milqual (Military qualification).
TD11:   Students are told that DL is a lot of work they must be very dedicated.
TD12:   We are committed to communicate with the students than having the student
in   the classroom the whole time.
TD13:   There is lot of communication through the telephone; the students are not left behind to sit on their own.

5.   What is the involvement of students in the designing of DL programmes?

LID1:   Students are not directly involved in designing the DL programmes.
LID2:   The student's debriefs assist in upgrading / changing the Army College DL system.
LID3:   We also take lots of student's inputs into consideration.

6.   What had been your experiences with the DOD ETD Process?

ETDP1:   We haven't seen that in a long time.
ETDP2:   We don't really apply it on paper, but some of it.
ETDP3:   As said before, we do problem assessment, redesign & implementation.

7.   What do you do to encourage students to talk to each other / What do you do to encourage or foster interaction?

LI1:   This is mentioned in all the documents and is discussed with the students all the time.
LI2:   The senior instructor discusses this with the students as the skill to be learned.
LI3:   They send them messages by e-mail through the LMS function.
LI4:   The communication is immediate and directly.
LI5:   The target of the contact session is to communicate with the students.
LI6:   They are informed well in advance if there is something to take note of.
LI7:   The subject is designed such that students can participate in groups.

8.   What do you do to encourage students to express themselves freely / Do you allow freedom of expression?

FE1:   The opportunity to speak is always afforded to the students and they love to speak.

FE2:	Small group discussions are meant for students to express themselves.
FE3:	When the students mingle, they can say whatever.
FE4:	During the facilitation process, they are free to say anything.
FE5:	Debriefs every week are meant for students to participate.
FE6:	There is also a feedback on the exercises they submitted through the LMS to get now physically with the DSs on one-on-one.
FE7:	In DE, we focus on theory so that students can express themselves.

9. How do students and instructors negotiate communication across Transactional Dialogue?

L/ICTD1:	We tell them what is expected of them and what they'll be able to do as learning is an emotional thing, it's not only cognitive.
L/ICTD2:	When we communicate with them, the communication is clear of what is expected of them.
L/ICTD3:	We encourage them to work collaboratively.
L/ICTD4:	Authenticity is always a problem because some students do not always render their own work.
L/ICTD5:	The discussion of the problem is not done once during the introduction, it is done continuously.
L/ICTD6:	The instructors are always available after hours for students to catch-up.

10. What are the reasons for considering DL mode in this institution?

CDL1:	The DL phase of the course or module must lead to the reaching of specific outcomes as stated in the curriculum.
CDL2:	DE is focused on getting the students to understand the residential phase.
CDL3:	The Warrant Officers (WO) module students do the practical side theory on DOD policies and DOD Instructions at the College for the Regimental aspects on the parade ground.
CDL4:	It helps to expose the student to a larger spectrum of knowledge.
CDL5:	The person develops far better understanding and is supposed to be more skilled.
CDL6:	The student must be able to take the DE as his own and develops as a life-long student.
CDL7:	The student is able to optimize his own potential to stay positive.
CDL8:	It enables the students to challenge themselves of what is expected of them.
CDL9:	DE is now a guideline that all courses should consider to implement.
CDL10:	There are a lot of advantages in DE.

11. What technologies do you use (is applicable) here in this institution to talk to students when they are far away?

TEC1:	Telephone.
TEC2:	Fax machine.
TEC3:	Computer.
TEC4:	The Intranet (LMS).
TEC5:	Laptop.

12. How are your DL instructors prepared for DL instruction in this institution?

DLIP1:	Some instructors did a Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCHE) at Pretoria University.

DLIP2:   We attend ETD Conferences.

13. What has been the impact of drop-out and failure of students?

DOF1:   The students withdraw from the course due to unforeseen circumstances like
             a family tragedy.
DOF2:   We do not necessarily produce failures.

14. What is your opinion about the DOD DL Policy?

DOD DLP1:   We haven't seen the policy for sometime now.
DOD DLP2:   But we think we are in line with the policy.

15. How can the existing problems be solved or addressed?

PS1:   Through sharing your problems with others.
PS2:   Through benchmarking with colleagues.

Original responses of the Air Force College focused group and codes allocated

1.   What is the distance learning (DL) teaching and learning character of this institution (the Air Force)?

TLC1:   Students are prepared for DL in the 'study school'.
TLC2:   There's an induction session.
TLC3:   There's a contact session.
TLC4:   There's a residential phase.
TLC9:   Diversified DL Centres are utilised by the Air Force College.
TLC10:   Formative assessments.
TLC11:   Summative assessments.
TLC13:   The Air Force College DL model is called the 'individual study'(IS) phase.
TLC14:   There are three structured modules (module A, B & C).
TLC15:   Facilitation method of teaching is used.

2.   How are your distance learning (DL) programmes designed in this institution? What are the requirements for designing DL programmes?

DDLP10:   Our programmes must have Pathways.

3.   How are students encouraged to achieve the intended outcomes?

AIO5:   They are verbally encouraged to achieve the outcomes.
AIO8:   They are told of time management.
AIO9:   DS telephone numbers that they can use to phone through out the day and also leave the message.
AIO10:   A manual of how to study is used.
AIO11:   The programme is very flexible in that the student can arrange to write an exam at the suitable time if they have a problem.
AIO12:   Students are encouraged to contact each other.
AIO13:   We accommodate students as long as students communicate with us.
AIO14:   We lack to monitor the progress of students where they are in different places because they are also (or could also) be in different Projects.

4.   What impact does transactional dialogue has on students, what are their comments on the impact of dialogue?

TD13:   We communicate through the telephone.
TD14:   They do communicate verbally their appreciation (they express their appreciation).

5.   What is the involvement of students in the designing of DL programmes?

LID1:   Students are not directly involved.
LID2:   Their involvement only comes out from the feedback or debriefs.
LID5:   Students are not part of the planners or designers.
LID6:   They are involved through questionnaires.
LID7:   They phone if there is something to be rectified in the manual.

6.   What had been your experiences with the ETD Process?

ETDP1:   No, we don't utilize it.

ETDP2:   On the other hand, the DOD ETD Process is not necessarily done or followed formally.

ETDP4:   The needs analysis is not done correctly sometimes because of the time factor.

7.   What do you do to encourage students to talk to each other / What do you do to encourage or foster interaction?

LI2:   We do encourage students to talk to each other and also talk to students who had done the course.

LI5:   In the contact session, they do make some arrangements to be in contact (in touch) with each other.

LI8:   But copy and paste is not allowed nor encouraged.

8.   What do you do to encourage students to express themselves freely / Do you allow freedom of expression?

FE1:   We constantly do so, we have told them to express themselves and be analytical.

FE8:   We expect that their answers cannot be necessarily the same.

9.   How do students and instructors negotiate communication across Transactional Dialogue?

L/ICTD7:   Communication is done by face-to-face contact.

L/ICTD8:   Communication is still paper-based.

L/ICTD9:   We communicate with students telephonically.

L/ICTD10:   We communicate through faxing.

L/ICTD11:   We communicate during the residential phase.

10.   What are the reasons for considering DL mode in this institution?

CDL2:   It's a very good idea, on paper, to prepare them for the residential phase after a   gap of 10, 15 years.

CDL11:   Students are helped to be back into the studying mode in a more or   less controlled environment.

CDL12:   It is a wonderful way of preparing the student for their promotion.

CDL13:   It is used as a developmental vehicle to develop my students into becoming better, better leaders, and managers and to work with a budget.

CDL14:   It is meant to give students more information in the Air Force.

11.   What technologies do you use (is applicable) here in this institution to talk to students when they are far away?

TEC1:   Telephone.

TEC2:   Faxing

TEC3:   Computer.

TEC6:   Lotus notes but not everybody has access to it.

TEC7:   Face-to-face contact.

TEC8:   It is still paper-based.

12. How are your DL instructors prepared for DL instruction in this institution?

DLIP3:   They do NQF level 4 that used to be presented at COLET, Assessor Course, and Moderators Course, Planning and Design course.

13. What has been the impact of drop-out and failure of students?

DOF1:   We have withdrawals not failures.
DOF3:   We also have students who do not hand in tasks.

14. What is your opinion about the DOD DL Policy?

DOD DLP1:   I haven't seen the policy.
DOD DLP3:   We haven't used the policy.

15. How can the existing problems be solved or addressed?

PS1:   There are a lot of stakeholders in addressing the problem.
PS2:   Benchmarking is also another way to address these problems (benchmark with other AoSs).
PS3:   Our first step would be identifying the problems as the College running the programme in order to address the needs of the Air Force.
PS4:   Formulate a dedicated Working Group from the ETD side, from career planning side.
PS5:   There must be a link between the individual study (IS) and residential phase.
PS6:   The duration between the individual study (IS) and residential phases must not be too long.
PS7:   This joint pathway should also be looked into.
PS8:   Things need to be standardized.
PS9:   There should be building blocks; one should be finished before proceeding to the next.
PS10:   Alignment with pathways.
PS11:   We need to do a bit of the needs analysis.

Original responses of the School for Military Health Training focused group and codes allocated

1.   What is the DL teaching and learning character of this institution (the Air Force)?

TLC2:   There's an Induction phase (referred to as 'initial briefing'.
TLC3:   We have a contact session.
TLC4:   There is a residential phase.
TLC14:   Six (6) modules in all can be completed (or settled) in 3 years.
TLC16:   Subject specialists are utilised in distance learning (DL).

2.   What are the requirements for designing DL programmes?

DDLP13:   Our programme design emphasizes on the assignments.
DDLP14:   Our programmes require a pre-requisite exam.

3.   How are students encouraged to achieve the intended outcomes?

AIO1:   Students must adhere to specific outcomes.
AIO5:   All course objectives are communicated during the initial briefing session.

4.   What impact does Transactional Dialogue has on students, what are their comments on the impact of dialogue?

TD13:   Telephone numbers of the course coordinator who contacts the entire module or subject specialist.
TD15:   The communication that will take place during the course is spelled-out in the 'Course Instruction'.

5.   What is the involvement of students in the designing of DL programmes?

LID1:   They are not necessarily involved in designing.
LID2:   They give their comments in the "SWOT analysis" format at the end of the course.
LID4:   The student's complains are taken into consideration.
LID8:   But sometimes the shortcomings are not rectified but only analysed.

6.   What had been your experiences with the ETD Process?

ETDP1:   No, we don't utilize it.
ETDP5:   There are specialized people who design by following a similar process but not necessarily the DOD ETD Process.
ETDP6:   Our members are involved (or participate) in other DOD forums where they are trying to design one curriculum so that members of the DOD can be able to speak one language and do the same things.

7.   What do you do to encourage students to talk to each other / What do you do to encourage or foster interaction?

LI2:   Students are taught certain skills to be able to express themselves.

LI7: They are grouped according to their common area where they come from (in syndicate form).

8. What do you do to encourage students to express themselves freely / Do you allow freedom of expression?

FE1: We have a theory of 'open door' policy.
FE9: Students have the right to approach the Student Committee about their problems.
FE10: The OC holds a meeting with a 6-member Student Committee once a week.
FE11: Well we don't have a policy that encourages that on the ground.

9. How do students and instructors negotiate communication across Transactional Dialogue?

L/ICTD1: We communicate with students through the 'Course Instruction'.
L/ICTD9: Telephonically.

10. What are the reasons for considering DL mode in this institution?

CDL15: There reason was the backlog of people who had been promoted to do the course but could not because of the stagnation within the SAMHS.
CDL16: A very small chunk of people were doing the course that resulted on the
course to be very slow.
CDL17: As members of the SAMHS are mostly professionals, like doctors, social workers, etc., it is usually not possible to keep such people in class for long; like for six months in a residential phase (if students are away from the course for 3 or more days they are automatically withdrawn from the course.
CDL18: Students who are professionals like doctors are always in demand or needed somewhere within the SANDF; therefore, they can finish the course in 3 years (i.e. 2 modules per year).
CDL19: Opportunity to include many students in the course at the same time.

11. What technologies do you use (is applicable) here in this institution to talk to students when they are far away?

TEC1: Telephone.

12. How are your DL instructors prepared for DL instruction in this institution?

DLIP3: They do NQF level 4 from COLET and MentoNet.
DLIP4: Some have done Senior Management Course.
DLIP5: Some have Bachelor's degrees.

13. What has been the impact of drop-out and failure of students?

DOF1: Yes we do have drop-outs or those who do not finish the course (those who do not complete a certain part of the module are being withdrawn from the course and come back later).
DOF4: Students are also withdrawn from the course after absent for 3 days.
DOF5: Lack of discipline is another reason for not completing and thus withdrawal.
DOF6: Those who cannot cope due to their level of understanding.
DOF7: Extra classes are being provided to those who lack behind.

14. What is your opinion about the DOD DL Policy?

DOD DLP1:   No one at SAMHS has seen it.
DOD DLP3:   We don't use it.

15. How can the existing problems be solved or addressed?

PS1:   We should be able to talk to others in the DOD.
PS12:   The implementation of DL in the SAMHS should be done correctly.
PS13:   The resources of DL are scarce or rather not there, so they need to look into the resources of doing teaching and learning in a DL mode.
PS14:   Institute SAMHS DL satellites where DL instructors can meet there once to discuss problems they are faced with and address student's concerns.
PS15:   These satellites should also serve as central point for receiving students' assignments before students report for contact and/or residential phases.
PS16:   These satellites should also serve as a point where students can direct their calls about their concerns.
PS17:   These satellites should also be able to accommodate subject specialists so that students do not wait up until their queries are answered when they report to the school.
PS18:   We should be able to communicate with the students throughout the duration of the course.

APPENDIX I

Added individual (or personal) interview questions

1.   To what extent does the function of a training branch or section depend on the prescriptiveness of subject content?   [When designing, are you allowed to think independently or you must go by the book?]

2.   How much freedom is allowed when it comes to the selection of content to support the achievement of the outcomes?   [How fixed is the content?]

3.   How much deviation is allowed from a fixed norm?   [Can you deviate from a fixed content or how much freedom is allowed from a fixed content?]

4.   How does the DOD emphasize learning tasks when students have to master outcomes from study guides? [How are the learning tasks emphasized in the study guides when students have to master their outcomes? How are these learning tasks designed in the study guides? Or how are students supported in order to master the learning tasks in these study guides?]

5.   How is the authenticity of these learning tasks designed in order to provide students with authentic learning experience when having to master the outcomes? [How do you ensure that the study guides are authentic in ensuring student participation/collaboration/corporation? Or, how is student's participation, corporation, collaboration and, maybe, their attention encouraged in the study guides through their learning tasks? How are they supported?]

6.   How important is it for the DOD to encourage and allow students to communicate their answers and/or debate freely?   [What is the DOD Policy or comments in encouraging students to communicate freely? What is the DOD policy on free thinking in learning or is there such a policy in your institution that encourages free thinking?]

7.   How would the students' answers be considered when having to determine that they have mastered the outcomes? [Are the students allowed to answer their minds as long as they achieve the intended outcomes? or are students allowed to think "outside the box" (whether in oral or written work like in exams or in discussions when, of course, they have to master the intended outcomes?]

Original School for Military Health Training added individual responses and codes allocated

1.   To what extent does the function of a training branch or section depend on the prescriptiveness of subject content?   [When designing, are you allowed to think independently or you must go by the book?]

DPC1:	In our case we do not design the curriculum.
DPC2:	It is given to us.
DPC3:	We only design the modules.
DPC4:	The curriculum is designed for us.
DPC5:	The curriculum is prepared for us.
DPC6:	We are given the guidelines to design the modules.
DPC7:	The Directors specify to the training management what they need for their students.
DPC8:	The doctor, the nurses, the social workers, their curricula is designed according to their specific needs from their Directors.
DPC9:	The Directors are supposed to give the training management direction as to how training must be done and designed.
DPC10:	The Directors design the curricula.
DPC11:	A curriculum gives you the overall of what is supposed to take place in the learning.
DPC12:	It generalizes the way things are supposed to be done.
DPC13:	It is the overall learning expectation of Directors.
DPC14:	It is the document the Directors are saying this is the way we want things to look like.
DPC15:	It is prescriptive.
DPC16:	It is now our duty to design modules according to different levels from the curriculum.
DPC17:	There's no differentiation too much because the content of the modules is based on the curriculum.
DPC18:	We take it from the curriculum as it is.
DPC19:	We don't change anything.
DPC20:	We don't modify anything.
DPC21:	We don't have powers to modify or change anything on the curriculum or from the content.
DPC22:	A certain part of the curriculum we put it on a certain part of a certain course as content as it is.
DPC23:	It is like a doctrine to us.
DPC24:	There's nothing you can change in a doctrine.

2.   How much freedom is allowed when it comes to the selection of content to support the achievement of the outcomes?   [How fixed is the content?]

FSC1:	What ever we take from the curriculum to use for our own good, must look as it is.
FSC2:	There's no way that you can change or modify it.
FSC3:	We are not allowed to select the content of our own.
FSC4:	It is fixed as you put it there.

3.   How much deviation is allowed from a fixed norm?   [Can you deviate from a fixed content or how much freedom is allowed from a fixed content?]

DAFC1:	Within that curriculum, there are spaces that are being given that there's nothing that has been written on.
DAFC2:	Written on because of uniqueness of a particular course.
DAFC3:	So, the Medics also have their own uniqueness they need to put in that empty space.
DAFC4:	Expectations from Directors to us as trainers.
DAFC5:	The modification may happen in this scenario.
DAFC6:	It is being given by the Directors that is written officially as it is in a curriculum.

4.   How does the DOD emphasize learning tasks when students have to master outcomes from study guides? [How are the learning tasks emphasized in the study guides when students have to master their outcomes? How are these learning tasks designed in the study guides? Or how are students supported in order to master the learning tasks in these study guides?]

LTSG1:	What we do in our environment mostly we give the students assignments that they must go and do.
LTSG2:	We sit with them.
LTSG3:	We discuss with them in syndicates.
LTSG4:	Then, as syndicates, they must discuss these assignments as we gave them.
LTSG5:	During the discussion in the class everybody's scope is broadened.
LTSG6:	They broaden even our understanding as instructors.
LTSG7:	We come with our standard operating procedures (SOPs).
LTSG8:	We identify them according to their groupings.
LTSG9:	We give them these tasks according to their specific areas.
LTSG10:	We usually divide them according to those roles.
LTSG11:	We group them according to their specialisations.

5.   How is the authenticity of these learning tasks designed in order to provide students with authentic learning experience when having to master the outcomes? [How do you ensure that the study guides are authentic in ensuring student participation/collaboration/corporation? Or, how is student's participation, corporation, collaboration and, maybe, their attention encouraged in the study guides through their learning tasks? How are they supported?]

SGA1:	We have a serious problem of 'cut-and-paste'.
SGA2:	What we usually do, is to give them one and the same scenarios.
SGA3:	We give them different scenarios but they are similar but there are changes if you don't know, you may not discover them.
SGA4:	A student copies the work of another student that has done the course before.
SGA5:	You cannot be 100% sure when they are on their distance learning phase.

6.   How important is it for the DOD to encourage and allow students to communicate their answers and/or debate freely?   [What is the DOD policy or comments in encouraging students to communicate freely? What is the DOD policy on free thinking in learning or is there such a policy in your institution that encourages free thinking?]

PFC1:	There's absolutely nothing on that.

PFC2:	There are policies that we were supposed to have as trainers that we had been given by our Directors.
PFC3:	No one is there to provide us with policies of these issues.
PFC4:	The fact that school is not registered or accredited with the Seta is a problem.
PFC5:	There is no guideline or policy on that.
PFC6:	We do not get a certain area where we can say there is a policy on.
PFC7:	We've got some piece and bits of policies on these things.
PFC8:	Some are designed for the issue at hand like the policy on harassment, sexual harassment.

**7.	How would the students' answers be considered when having to determine that they have mastered the outcomes?** [Are the students allowed to answer their minds as long as they achieve the intended outcomes? or are students allowed to think 'outside the box' (whether in oral or written work like in exams or in discussions) when, of course, they have to master the intended outcomes?]

TOB1:	We base ourselves on the 'mark sheet' as our marking template.
TOB2:	If a student answer is not on the mark sheet, therefore that answer is wrong.
TOB3:	The DoD does not use the moderators as much as other departments.
TOB4:	An instructor in the DoD designs, instructs, evaluates, marks and moderate
the	work of his or her students at the same time as he or pleases.

Original Arm College added individual responses and codes allocated

1.   To what extent does the function of a training branch or section depend on the prescriptiveness of subject content?   [When designing, are you allowed to think independently or you must go by the book?]

DPC25:	The branch function depends on the prescriptiveness of the subject content.
DPC26:	When we design a learning programme, there are guidelines from the higher HQ.
DPC27:	Also we need to adhere to the SA Army doctrine.
DPC28:	We think independently when benchmarking.
DPC29:	We align our subject contents with what we have in terms of capabilities of all Corps of the SA Army.
DPC30:	For each and every module we compile debriefs from student side and also instructors.
DPC31:	Also we think independently in sequencing the logical flow of subjects.
DPC32:	We think independently in planning or scheduling of presentations.

2.   How much freedom is allowed when it comes to the selection of content to support the achievement of the outcomes?   [How fixed is the content?]

FSC5:	To support the achievements of the outcomes, we start to consider the needs analysis for the learning programme.
FSC6:	We consider designing a programme according to the client's needs and profile of the product.
FSC7:	In the achievement of the outcomes, we consider the understanding of the Outcomes-Based Education (OBE).
FSC8:	Training or teach towards outcomes and Assess against outcomes.
FSC9:	In terms of achieving outcomes, we adhere to the principles of assessment.

3.   How much deviation is allowed from a fixed norm?   [Can you deviate from a fixed content or how much freedom is allowed from a fixed content?]

DAFC7:	A fixed norm allows us to stick to the learning strategy that the needs analysis requires.
DAFC8:	There's no deviation as such.

4.   How does the DOD emphasize learning tasks when students have to master outcomes from study guides? [How are the learning tasks emphasized in the study guides when students have to master their outcomes? How are these learning tasks designed in the study guides? Or how are students supported in order to master the learning tasks in these study guides?]

LTSG12:	The importance of the study guides are to direct the students the approach to follow learning in a proper way.
LTSG13:	This is the measure for competency by the student on a learning programme.
LTSG14:	Study guides are designed to reach the outcomes.
LTSG15:	Our study guides are based on the tasks that will be given.
LTSG16:	The study guides, they are not always the same.
LTSG17:	They are based on the debriefs and guidance of the students.

LTSG18:   After the learning programme has taken place, some of the comments given by the students are altered.

LTSG19:   These study guides do have these tasks.

LTSG20:   It is a sort of assessment confirmation.

5.   How is the authenticity of these learning tasks designed in order to provide students with authentic learning experience when having to master the outcomes? [How do you ensure that the study guides are authentic in ensuring student participation/collaboration/corporation? Or, how is student's participation, corporation, collaboration and, maybe, their attention encouraged in the study guides through their learning tasks? How are they supported?]

SGA6:   Lecture for authenticity is presented during distance and also is emphasized in the assessment instructions.

SGA7:   The assessment committee do spot checks on products.

SGA8:   Before even we introduce this Outcomes Based Education and also we are talking about the facilitation.

SGA9:   We give them the roles of the DS on a facilitation problem.

SGA10:   We give them the roles of a student on a facilitation problem.

SGA11:   We confirm this by doing the SRDs (Syndicate Room Discussions).

SGA12:   So where the DS is going to facilitate, everyone is going to be given the chance to say something.

6.   How important is it for the DOD to encourage and allow students to communicate their answers and/or debate freely?   [What is the DOD Policy or comments in encouraging students to communicate freely? What is the DOD policy on free thinking in learning or is there such a policy in your institution that encourages free thinking?]

PFC9:   The learning is conducive encouraging the students to participate themselves at learning.

PFC10:   Facilitation allows students to debate and express their views.

PFC11:   Video lessons are making students to communicate freely by demonstrating.

PFC12:   We are going to align now the outcomes in our analysis to have the relevant unit standards.

PFC13:   The policy of the ETD that also includes all these learning.

PFC14:   We must give them a free way of talking.

PFC15:   We must also encourage them of this free way of talking of students.

PFC16:   The SRDs discussions encourage those who are not prepared like the quite people.

7.   How would the students' answers be considered when having to determine that they have mastered the outcomes? [Are the students allowed to answer their minds as long as they achieve the intended outcomes? or are students allowed to think "outside the box" (whether in oral or written work like in exams or in discussions when, of course, they have to master the intended outcomes?]

TOB5:   A process of student preparation is conducted to achieve the intended outcomes.

TOB6:   Students were also advised not to copy directly from the textbooks   when completing assignment.

TOB7:   We do not allow them to take words as is in book.

TOB8:   The meaning and understanding is important.

TOB9:   A feedback is given for better development and improvement.

Original Air Force College added individual responses and codes allocated

1.   To what extent does the function of a training branch or section depend on the prescriptiveness of subject content?   [When designing, are you allowed to think independently or you must go by the book?]

DPC33:   An instructor may think independently as long as the outcomes of the unit standards have been addressed.
DPC26:   The guidelines stipulated by higher authority must be included.
DPC34:   Any additional information that the instructor considers to be of assistance to the student may be included.

2.   How much freedom is allowed when it comes to the selection of content to support the achievement of the outcomes?   [How fixed is the content?]

FCS10:   The content is not restricted only by the outcomes.
FCS11:   The instructor may include additional information which will assist the student.
FCS12:   The additional information may also enhance the transfer of learning.
FCS13:   The additional information may boost the learning experience.

3.   How much deviation is allowed from a fixed norm?   [Can you deviate from a fixed content or how much freedom is allowed from a fixed content?]

DAFC9:   The instructor just needs to keep in mind what are the outcomes of the unit standard.
DAFC10:   The instructor just needs to keep in mind the level at which the unit standard is written.
DAFC11:   Too much deviation may mean that the information of higher level is included.
DAFC12:   Too much deviation may not be necessary.
DAFC13:   Too much deviation may not address the outcomes.
DAFC14:   Too much deviation may be too high for the prescribed outcomes.

4.   How does the DOD emphasize learning tasks when students have to master outcomes from study guides? [How are the learning tasks emphasized in the study guides when students have to master their outcomes? How are these learning tasks designed in the study guides? Or how are students supported in order to master the learning tasks in these study guides?]

LTSG21:   The task settings and the study guides work hand in hand.
LTSG22:   A student needs to complete the task by utilizing the study guide.
LTSG23:   The study guide is designed is such a way that the student can complete the task step by step.
LTSG24:   If the student experiences difficulties in completing the task the last resort would be to contact the instructor who is coordinating the process.
LTSG25:   The learning tasks are included in the study guides normally after each chapter in the specific module.
LTSG26:   The learning tasks also determine if the student has mastered that section of the subject before moving onto the next section or chapter.

5.   How is the authenticity of these learning tasks designed in order to provide students with authentic learning experience when having to master the outcomes? [How do you ensure that the study guides are authentic in ensuring student participation/collaboration/corporation? Or, how is student's participation, corporation, collaboration and, maybe, their attention encouraged in the study guides through their learning tasks? How are they supported?]

SGA13:   In certain subject the same study guides are utilized.
SGA14:   The instructor has first hand feedback with regards to the use of the study guide.
SGA15:   When a programme is completed the student is requested to give feedback with regards to their experience during the particular programme.
SGA16:   The student is encouraged to share inputs and ideas with the instructors and programme managers.

6.   How important is it for the DOD to encourage and allow students to communicate their answers and/or debate freely? [What is the DOD policy or comments in encouraging students to communicate freely? What is the DOD policy on free thinking in learning or is there such a policy in your institution that encourages free thinking?]

PFC17:   The general training policy is to gain feedback from the students.
PFC2:   There is no official policy that states students must communicate freely.
PFC5:   There is no official policy that encourages students to communicate freely.
PFC18:   Students in all training institutions think that if they speak freely that it has a detrimental effect on their results.
PFC19:   Students are encouraged to 'think out of the box'.
PFC20:   Training is dynamic.
PFC21:   Training is not stagnant and rigid.

7.   How would the students' answers be considered when having to determine that they have mastered the outcomes? [Are the students allowed to answer their minds as long as they achieve the intended outcomes? or are students allowed to think 'outside the box' (whether in oral or written work like in exams or in discussions when, of course, they have to master the intended outcomes?]

TOB10:   In certain tasks there is a set memorandum whereby the task is assessed.
TOB11:   In other tasks there are set objectives that the instructor would like to achieve.
TOB12:   The student may broaden their discussion on a particular subject just as long as the objectives of the task have been met.
TOB13:   The student may air their opinion on a particular subject just as long as the objectives of the task have been met.
TOB14:   Students are not expected to study the subject content off by heart.
TOB15:   The student is encouraged to "think outside the box".

Original information gathered from the student reports of Army College using Nadeosa Criteria and codes allocated.

1.   Policy and Planning

PP1:	The references to policies are not correct and complete.
PP2:	The South African Military doctrine should be corrected to avoid contradiction.
PP3:	The instructors' meetings should not be allowed to disturb learning.
PP4:	A policy to involve external assessors must be drawn.

2.   Learners

LN1:	Some learners are slower than others.
LN2:	Extra classes and lessons are available to those who need them.
LN3:	What the learners need to know must be standardized.
LN5:	Learners from different backgrounds should be brought to the same level at the beginning of the course.

3.   Programme Development

PD1:	The instructions of the exercises should be streamlined and standardized.
PD2:	There should be no break within modules; the programme must continue to flow.
PD3:	The guidelines must be standardized.

4.   Course design

CD1:	Syndicates are too large to be catered by an instructor.
CD2:	Exercises should be standardized to avoid confusion.
CD3:	Some learners felt that the outcomes were not achieved.
CD4:	The level of content is too high for the current level of training.
CD5:	The Air Force presentation had no meaning to the learners.

5.   Course Materials

CM1:	Some information on the maps and/or documents is incorrect and some contradictory.
CM2:	Some of the study guides (manuals) are outdated.
CM3:	Current doctrine or theory must be revised.
CM4:	There is a serious lack of computers.
CM5:	Available computers must be regularly maintained (clean the viruses).
CM6:	The fact that the books were already available in the rooms was appreciated and saved time.

6.   Assessment

ASM1:	Peer and formative assessment occurred to a limited degree.
ASM2:	The layout of the summative assessment must be verified and rectified.
ASM3:	Time available not enough for the assessment.
ASM4:	The approach to the assessment was very fair and the learners knew what was expected of them.

ASM5:   Provide with extra instructors during the assessments.

ASM6:   Some assessment technique (e.g. fill-in missing words) should be revised.

ASM7:   An assessment approach should be standardizes.

7.   Learner Support

LS1:   Pre-briefing by the Exercise instructor excellent despite power failure sometimes.

LS2:   Pre-briefing by the Exercise instructor of high standard.

LS3:   Instructor expectations or outcomes were not clear to the learners.

LS4:   We knew what was expected from us at all times.

LS5:   All documentation must be handed out at the beginning of the Exercise.

LS6:   The effort to give guidelines and help after hours was good.

LS7:   The effort for revision by the instructor for learners to recap was very good.

LS8:   The learners were informed on the basic arrangements and receive a block programme for the week.

LS9:   Some instructors do a lot of preparation with reference to their lectures.

LS10:   There was no relation between the distance education module (DEM) and the residential education module (REM.

LS11:   Build up of outcomes on the DEM course is applicable to the outcomes on the REM course.

LS12:   There is a good link-up between the DEM and REM.

LS13:   The subject matter could be presented in more depth during the DEM phase in order for us to understand it in the REM phase.

LS14:   Not enough time allowed to do the corrections.

LS15:   Feedback must be provided to the learners by means of examples.

LS16:   The effectiveness of information technology (IT) remains a challenge.

8.   Human Resource Strategy

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the Army College student reports.

9.   Management and Administration

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the Army College student reports.

11.   Quality Assurance

QA1:   The quality of preparations during the distance education module (DEM) was insufficient for application during residential education module (REM).

QA2:   The general quality of the exercises needs to be improved.

12.   Information Dissemination

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the Army College student reports.

Original information gathered from the student reports of Air Force College using Nadeosa Criteria and codes allocated.

1.   **Policy and Planning**

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the Air Force College student reports.

2.   **Learners**

LN4:   Learner's rights were not necessarily respected throughout the Programmes.
LN6:   Learners were not necessarily confident that they can transfer the learning to their workplace.

3.   **Programme Development**

PD4:   Learning sequence was not logical to assist understanding.
PD5:   Training methods were not necessarily appropriate and contributing to learning.

4.   **Course design**

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the Air Force College student reports.

5.   **Course Materials**

CM7:   More learning guides, to master some skills, should be provided.
CM8:   The learning materials were not necessarily clear, nor sufficient and promoting learning.
CM9:   Lack of adequate books in the library to do research.
CM10:   The video machine was not made available.
CM11:   There was a lack photocopying machine.
CM12:   Reference material for beginning learners should be made available.

6.   **Assessment**

ASM8:   The assessment appeals' procedures are not necessarily easy to use.

7.   **Learner Support**

LS17:   The responsibilities of some learners towards their families should be taken in into consideration.

8.   **Human Resource Strategy**

HRS1:   The staff was not friendly.
HRS2:   The training staff (or instructors) did not conduct themselves in a professional manner.
HRS3:   Course morale was not positive and conducive to learning.
HRS4:   Practitioners (or instructors) were not always well prepared to deliver the learning plan.

HRS5:   Practitioners (or instructors) were not necessarily able to transfer learning effectively.

HRS6:   Practitioners (or instructors) were not necessarily competent and knowing the subject matter.

9. Management and Administration

MA1:   The learning venue was not suitable for course purposes.
MA2:   Catering was not sufficient to cater for group needs.
MA3:   Accommodation was not suitable.
MA4:   Pre-course induction was not necessarily clear and useful.

11. Quality Assurance

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the Air Force College student reports.

12. Information Dissemination

ID1:   The language and explanations were not necessarily clear and understandable.
ID2:   Interaction was not necessarily encouraged and supported.
ID3:   Learner guidance and support was not always readily available and useful.
ID4:   The pace of delivery did not match learner requirements.
ID5:   Feedback on progress was not always regular, sufficient and useful.

Original information gathered from the student reports of the School for Military Health Training using Nadeosa Criteria and codes allocated.

1. **Policy and Planning**

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the School for Military Health Training student reports.

2. **Learners**

LN7:   The course content was very informative but pitched at a higher level.
LN8:   Sometimes assumptions are made that everyone understands.

3. **Programme Development**

PD6:   The time allocated for the course might be too short.

4. **Course design**

CD6:   The content lacked detail because of little time.
CD7:   The content lacked clarity on certain processes.
CD8:   The content had no value.

5. **Course Materials**

CM13:   Study guides (or learning materials) were not provided in other subjects.

6. **Assessment**

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the School for Military Health Training student reports.

7. **Learner Support**

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the School for Military Health Training student reports.

8. **Human Resource Strategy**

HRS7:   Some presenters (or instructors) do not prepare properly.
HRS8:   Some presenters (or instructors) were boring as they read the material to learners.
HRS9:   Some presenters (or instructors) were unable to answer some questions.
HRS10:   Some instructors lacked expertise of the subject matter.
HRS11:   Some instructors had poor presentation skills.

9. **Management and Administration**

MA5:   Time management on the part of the instructors was lacking.
MA6:   The approach of some instructors is very prescriptive.

11. Quality Assurance

QA3:   Some aspects of the learning programme were not relevant.

12. Information Dissemination

No relevant information for this Nadeosa criterion was gathered from the School for Military Health Training student reports.