



UNDERSTANDING THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE: DOING THINGS BETTER IN STUDYING FIRST-TIME DISTANCE LEARNERS

*Mark Brown, Dublin City University, Ireland,
Helen Hughes, University of Bristol, United Kingdom*

Introduction

Online learning has enabled many institutions to explore ways of widening access to educational offerings to a group of diverse and geographically dispersed learners. It is calculated that in the United States, 34% of all higher education students now take at least one course online (Allen & Seaman, 2014). Furthermore, Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) have quickly helped online learning to become a popular mainstream activity. However, the exponential growth of online students is juxtaposed with the retention and completion problems that have plagued distance learning ever since the first correspondence courses in the 19th Century (Dede cited in Waldrop, 2013).

There is growing concern internationally about enhancing student success as the return on the public investment in higher education comes under greater scrutiny. In New Zealand, for example, a recent Ministry of Education (2014) report on the higher education sector claims that distance delivered courses with an e-learning component have far lower completion rates than other delivery modes (see Figure 1). Although this study raises a number of unanswered methodological questions about how the data were gathered and interpreted, Figure 2 taken from the report compares completion rates for New Zealand's largest distance education provider, Massey University, with the Open University in the United Kingdom. Notably, the rates are much higher for Massey although in many respects this is an unfair comparison.




Figure 1. Internural and extramural completion rates and e-learning delivery

Massey University is a dual mode provider – that is, it offers distance education along with internal courses on three campuses throughout New Zealand. In contrast the Open University only offers courses by distance and is a truly open university. Nevertheless, an earlier study on the problem of retention found that at the Open University only 22% of undergraduate distance students completed their study within eight academic years (HEFCE, 2009). Thus, regardless of the methodological trustworthiness of either study, current concerns over retention and completion rates for distance learners are justified and clearly institutions need to do more to support student success. That said, we know from the literature that the study of retention is particularly complex and there are no magic bullets (Tinto, 2006-2007).




Figure 2. Comparison of part-time undergraduate completion rates with UK Open University

Simpson (2004) cautions against a ‘goulash’ approach during which institutions try lots of interventions that might work but, meanwhile, fail to focus on the most important things and cannot ever discover what is working best. Moreover, the problem of enhancing retention is often framed around promoting student engagement from an institutional definition rather than from a student perspective. In this respect the concept of engagement has many different faces and in the context of new digitally mediated forms of distance education we need to better understand what it means to be an active and engaged online learner.

Typically distance students who choose to study off-campus have very different backgrounds from campus-based students (Poskitt et al., 2011). In the developed world, generally speaking, the background demographics of distance learners indicate they are more likely to be over the age of 25, women or from a lower socio-economic group, returning to study after a break, and/or working part-time or full-time. While we know quite a lot about the background of distance learners, there is a significant gap in the literature in understanding the experiences of these students from their own perspective. Seeking to address this gap, the research reported in this paper sought to explore the 'lived experiences' of first-time online/distance learners in their own words over their first semester of study. In so doing the research raises a number of methodological issues that are outlined in the sections below.

Selecting the sample

This first challenge in studying a group of first-time distance learners is identifying a sample of prospective students before they have formally registered. This is not an easy task. Nevertheless, the importance of doing so is that we have growing appreciation of how the decisions prospective students make in the initial period of the study lifecycle can significantly influence their chances of success. In our case to obtain a sample of first-time distance learners we had to rely upon access to institutional data from people who had formally expressed their intent to enrol. For ethical and internal institutional reasons it was not possible to source the sample through an independent communication channel, although such an approach may have been more successful in locating people much earlier in the study lifecycle. This remains an interesting methodological challenge in designing this type of study and potentially biases the sample by excluding people who discontinue before completion of the formal registration process.

Prior to the start of Semester 2 in 2011, with approval from the University's Human Ethics Committee, enrolment data was obtained for 750 students studying via distance for the first time. The method of recruitment was by email from the Project Leader to all potential participants at the point when their registration had been approved. The invitation included a Participant Information Sheet, which fully explained why students might consider recording video diaries for the purpose of research.

In total, 144 students volunteered to participate. This was a larger sample than anticipated and to acknowledge the high level of interest in participating in the study, and to add another valuable dimension to the research, these students were invited to complete an online questionnaire on their initial experiences of being a distance learner. Based on the survey responses, coupled with demographic data, 20 students were purposefully selected to participate in the main study (see Table 1). In selecting this sample the intention was to broadly represent the diversity of first-time distance learners. The profile of diversity was informed by a demographic analysis of the University's distance students during the 2010 academic year. Selection criteria included: age, gender, ethnicity, geographic location, subject

of study, level of study, entry qualification, along with prior or current experience of tertiary study on-campus.

Table 1: Summary of participant sample

Gender	Male (7), Female (13)
Age	Under 25 (4), 25-29 (4), 30-39 (6), 40-49 (4), 50-59 (2)
Ethnicity	Pakeha / European (12), Māori and/or Pasifika (8)
Location	A campus town (11), Other urban town (3), Remote (4), Overseas (2)
Mode	Distance only (17), Mixed mode (3)
Total papers	Undergraduate: One (6), Two (6), Three (0), Four (6); Postgraduate (2)
Subject	Business (8), Humanities (6), Education (3), Sciences (3)
Prior education	High school (8), Diploma (2), Degree papers (5), Degree (5)
Employment	Full time (11), Part time (3), Casual (1), None (3), Full time mother (2)
Dependents	None (11), One (1), Two or three (5), Four or more (3)

Methodological decisions

This section expands on some of the methodological decisions and challenges associated with researching the student experience whilst endeavouring to maintain a strong sense of the learner's voice. In particular, it describes some of the issues and decision points that arose from adopting a phenomenological approach to data collection and analysis. Phenomenology is concerned with describing events as one experiences them by placing a person's experience at the centre of any investigation. Although the role of the researcher in phenomenology can be problematic as they cannot be entirely neutral, the intention is to seek to understand the essence of something as experienced by the participant.

Of the many methods and techniques of gathering qualitative data, some are more suited to phenomenology than others. Methods with a closer affinity to the approach include interviewee narratives, participant observation, and reflective diaries, to name a few. The current study was partially inspired by a method designed by Cashmore, Green and Scott (2010) who gathered video diary data with undergraduate students at the University of Leicester. They provided participants with small, hand-held video cameras and asked them to submit a minimum of a five-minute video diary on a weekly basis. In an attempt to minimize interventions during the data gathering process, students were informed that they could focus on any topic, theme or concern that they felt was important to their lives and their student experience. However, amid their commitment to free-flowing ethnographic data collection, Cashmore, Green and Scott acknowledged wide variation among participants with some submitting five minutes every fortnight and others submitting more than 20 minutes every week.

Mindful of the challenges associated with managing and making sense of free-flow video diary data, the research team considered a number of options of how to gather participant contributions in a way that ensured enough consistency in the questions and experiences being explored, whilst remaining true to the intent of trying to understand what it means to be a first-time distance learner from a student's perspective.

In trying to strike a balance between structure and free-flow the study also drew on the ‘Day Experience Method’ employed by the Learning Landscape Project at the University of Cambridge (Riddle & Arnold, 2007). This project had in turn been informed by the ‘Experience Sampling Methodology’ from the behavioural sciences (Hektner et al., 2006). The aim of the Learning Landscape Project was to minimize recall distortion by encouraging participants to provide detailed accounts of their daily experiences over time and capture the ebb and flow of these experiences as they occur in situ. Riddle and Arnold therefore asked participants to diarize the answer to five pre-specified questions (What time is it? Where are you? Who are you with? What are you doing? How do you feel about it?) when prompted via text message every 30 to 90 minutes between 8am and 10pm on three separate days.

After considering the pros and cons of various data collection methods we devised a ‘Reflective Prompt’ protocol that provided some structure but also maintained an element of individual free-flow expression. The protocol requested that each participant would upload at least one five-minute digital video file per week via a secure website (Moodle) to which only the Research Assistant had access. Within 48 hours of a participant uploading their video file, the Research Assistant would transcribe the video data before responding to the individual participant via the project email account (In Your Own Words). The original intention was that the email would contain an amiable yet emotionally detached greeting followed by a set of ‘reflective prompts’ designed to trigger reflections for the participant’s next video diary. In other words, all participants would be encouraged to reflect on their online/distance learning experiences by prompting their thoughts with personalised ‘fish-hooks’ that were based on each individual trajectory, as it emerged over time.

The ‘reflective prompt’ framework aimed to uphold the general principle that phenomena should be allowed to present themselves with minimum influence or imposition from the researcher. Therefore, the framework was structured as follows:

- **Prompt 1:** What’s on your mind at the moment?
- **Prompt 2:** Fish-hooks for learning-related experiences
e.g. You mentioned an assignment was due. How did that go?
- **Prompt 3:** Fish-hooks for support-related experiences
e.g. You mentioned waiting for an email response. Any news on that?
- **Prompt 4:** What’s on your plate next week?

However, during the first few weeks of the study it became increasingly apparent that many of the participants were forming a close bond with the Research Assistant. It was quickly apparent that the ‘reflective prompt’ framework and video diary interventions along with the weekly email exchanges with the Research Assistant were having a significant impact on the student experience. The Research Assistant had inadvertently become a default point of contact with the institution and this role was having a positive impact on their sense of belonging as a first-time distance learner. After discussing this situation amongst the research team, and consulting with the University’s Ethics Committee, we did not believe it was

appropriate to reduce the level of interaction with the participants or depersonalise the reflective fishhooks.

Data analysis

A considerable amount of rich qualitative data was collected from all 20 participants during the first six weeks. Originally the research was intended to explore just the first few weeks of study but after realising the positive impact the intervention was having on participants they were given the opportunity to continue until the end of semester. Although continuation of the video diaries beyond the initial six weeks was not part of the original plan as we were primarily interested in the initial stages of the study lifecycle, it was considered potentially unethical to cease data collection at this point. Moreover, we had already learnt from the participants that the provision of student support was crucial beyond the first few weeks of study.

Eight participants chose to conclude at this point, while 12 opted to continue for sixteen weeks – that is, until after the examination period and official end of semester. In total, including this extended period, more than 22 hours of video data were collected, which provided rich insights into the student experience. In order to accurately tell the student's story of their lived experiences of being a first-time distance learner, we employed a six-step thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2003). The six steps are described below:

1. Familiarizing yourself with the data

This step recognises that it is vital for a researcher to immerse themselves in their data to the extent that they are familiar with the depth and breadth of the content. Throughout the study, the Research Assistant transcribed video files within 48 hours of receipt, which was a process that achieved almost 'real-time' immersion. Importantly, the researcher did not attempt to thematicize the data at this stage.

2. Generating initial codes

This step sought to identify and code particular data that appeared relevant to the research objective. Although data can never be coded in an epistemological vacuum, the aim was to discover meanings in the data whilst remaining open to unexpected interpretations. The end of this step was a series of meaning units still expressed in the participant's own everyday language.

3. Searching for themes

This step is where elemental units of coded data were combined to form overarching candidate themes. While we found that some units did not collate naturally with other units nothing was abandoned.

4. Reviewing themes

At this stage of the process it became evident that some candidate themes did not have enough data to support them. Other candidate themes were better collapsed to form one theme. This was an iterative process that helped us over the course of the semester to more clearly identify the emergent themes.

5. Defining themes

This step involved identifying the ‘essence’ of what each theme was about by returning to collated data extracts and connecting them together. Of course the problem here is that raw data (i.e. the participant’s story) was transformed at this point by our interpretation, which we could not avoid being influenced by our own stories. Nevertheless, to remain true to telling the participant’s story we sought validation of the full transcripts and endeavoured to share our interpretations with students. The question remains whether the participants truly validated their own data by engaging in this process. Although we had limited control over this aspect of the methodology, wherever possible we tried to use direct quotes as part of larger extracts to encapsulate the full context.

6. Producing the report

It is important that any written analysis provides a concise, accurate and interesting account of the story that the data tells. To this end we attempted to share enough data extracts to demonstrate the prevalence of each theme, whilst also providing an analytic narrative of discoveries that related to the research questions. Again the challenge during this stage was maintaining the integrity of the participants’ stories within our larger analysis of the meta-story. This issue became more difficult as time elapsed in reporting the findings and the research team became more distant from the original data.

Reflecting on key findings

The lived experience of first-time distance learners presented itself as a complex phenomenon involving a dynamic process of personal adjustment to study amid enabling and inhibiting triggers. We have chosen not to report on the findings in any great detail as they have already been described at length in other publications (Brown et al., 2013). However, three points are noteworthy. Firstly, in terms of preparedness to meet the academic and emotional demands of learning by distance, more than one third of participants were returning to study for the first time since secondary school. Notably, they were returning to study after an interval of more than a decade. From within this sub group, the majority of them struggled to find effective study techniques to meet the demands of university-level study. Notably, few students knew about or took advantage of the support services available for first-time distance learners.

Secondly, a significant period of risk was identified in the second half of semester when the majority of participants began to question their ability to complete their programme of study. During this period, students often resolved to study fewer units (modules) per semester or

concluded that online/distance education did not suit either their approach to learning or their lifestyle at that point in time. This second at risk period highlighted the misperceptions that most students began with concerning the flexibility of studying from a distance.

Lastly, there is a ‘chicken-or-egg’ debate over what comes first: the preference towards an inherently ‘lone wolf’ approach among learners who choose to study by distance; or failings among distance education providers to establish connectedness with and between their students. The insights gained from the sample of first-time distance learners suggest that institutions could do more to challenge student’s self-sufficient conception of what it means to be a distance learner. It is not enough to rely on chance that they will take opportunities to interact with teachers, peers and academic support staff – or even find necessary levels of learning support from people in their immediate vicinity with whom they enjoy an established sense of relatedness.

Conclusion

This study has described how we sought to document the lived experiences of first-time distance learners as seen from 20 participants over a 16-week period. There is, to our knowledge, no other study that has described using the same video diary methodology the *lived experiences* during this key transition in the study lifecycle. In this paper we have focussed on some of the methodological lessons and challenges of doing things better in studying the student experience. Amongst other things this line of research has helped us better understand why the participants chose to enrol via distance learning, which was largely because of circumstance rather than by design. The study observed that only a minority of participants – all with more active and deep learning orientations – spoke in a consistently positive way about the joys of online/distance learning. In contrast, the majority of participants reported notable periods of isolation and despair. They spoke consistently about their first semester as a challenge during which they had struggled to balance study with other work and family demands. Above all this study has helped to personalise the problem of retention to real people and to underscore the imperative of why we need to do things better for this group of students.

References

1. Allen, I. and Seaman, J. (2014). *Grade Change: Tracking Online Learning in the United States*. Wellesley MA: Babson College/Sloan Foundation. Available from: <http://onlinelearningconsortium.org/publications/survey/grade-change-2013>
2. Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2003). Using thematic analysis in psychology. In *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, (pp. 77-101).
3. Brown, M.; Hughes, H.; Keppell, M.; Hard, N. and Smith, L. (2013). In their own words: Student stories of seeking learning support. In *Open Praxis*, 5(4), (pp. 345–354). Available from <http://www.openpraxis.org/index.php/OpenPraxis/article/view/87>
4. Cashmore, A.; Green, P. and Scott, J. (2010). An ethnographic approach to studying the student experience: The student perspective through free form video diaries. In *The International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), (pp. 106-111).
5. Hektner, J.M.; Schmidt, J.A. and Csikszentmihalyi, M (2006). *Experience Sampling Method: Measuring the Quality of Everyday Life*. London: Sage.
6. Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2009). *Part-time first degree study: Entry and completion*.
7. Ministry of Education (2014). *Extramural students' participation and achievement: Trends, patterns and highlights*. Ministry of Education, New Zealand. Available from <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/ict/145699>
8. Poskitt, J.; Rees, M.; Suddaby, G. and Radloff, A. (2011). Engaging with university at a distance: The differences in levels of student engagement among extramural and campus-based students. In A. Radolf (ed.), *Student engagement in New Zealand's universities*, (pp. 70–76).
9. Riddle, M. and Arnold, M. (2007). *The day experience method: A resource kit*. Retrieved from http://www.matthewriddle.com/papers/Day_Experience_Resource_Kit.pdf
10. Simpson, O. (2004). The impact on retention of interventions to support distance learning students. In *Open Learning: The Journal of Open and Distance Learning*, 19(1), (pp. 79-95).
11. Tinto, V. (2006-2007). Research and practice of student retention: What next? In *Journal of College Student Retention*, 8(1), (pp. 1-19).
12. Waldrop, M. (2013). Campus 2.0. *Nature*, 495, (pp. 160-163).

