STUDENT'S PERCEPTION ON TUTOR PERFORMANCE: A THREE SEMESTER STUDY

Adhi Susilo
Deddy Ahmad Suhardi
e-mail: adhi@ut.ac.id
Universitas Terbuka

ABSTRAK

Artikel ini menyajikan hasil studi selama tiga semester mengenai kepuasan mahasiswa dengan instruksi daring di Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia. Makalah ini membahas bagaimana kinerja tutor mempengaruhi persepsi mahasiswa dalam belajar secara daring. Penelitian ini mempelajari lebih jauh dari penelitian sebelumnya tentang kepuasan mahasiswa dengan e-learning. Peneliti melakukan serangkaian survei selama tiga semester. Empat puluh satu siswa berpartisipasi dalam studi ini. Secara keseluruhan, siswa menilai instruktur online sebagai cukup memuaskan. Tingkat kepuasan mahasiswa agribisnis dengan tutor online di UT terutama puas (63%). Lebih dari sembilan belas persen memiliki tingkat yang sangat puas. Berdasarkan analisis komponen utama, penelitian ini mengungkapkan enam struktur dari tingkat kepuasan dengan tutor online; (1) perantara diskusi (62,20%), (2) strategi tutorial (79,18%), (3) umpan balik pada pendapat siswa (84,69%), (4) tetap pada jadwal (89,12%), (5) membuat ringkasan (92,24%), dan (6) menyediakan bahan pembelajaran yang menarik (94,64%).

Kata kunci: analisis komponen utama, e-learning, instruksi daring, kepuasan mahasiswa

ABSTRACT

This article presents the results of a three-semester study of undergraduate students' level of satisfaction with online instruction at Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia. The paper discusses how tutor performance affect student's perception of online learning.The study expands on earlier research into student satisfaction with e-learning. Researcher conducted a series of surveys over three academic semester. Forty-one students participated in the study. Responses were consistent throughout, although there were some differences noted in the level of student satisfaction with their experience. Overall, students rated their online instructor as moderately satisfactory.The satisfaction level of agribusiness students with online tutor at UTwas mainly satisfied (63%). More than nineteen percent had a very satisfied level.Based on principal component analysis, this study revealed six structures of satisfaction level with online tutor; (1) moderating discussion (62,20%), (2) tutorial strategy (79,18%), (3) feedback on student's opinion (84,69%), (4) keep on schedule (89,12%), (5) making summary (92,24%), and (6) providing attractive learning material (94,64%).

Keywords: e-learning, online instruction, principal component analysis, student satisfaction

1. INTRODUCTION

Onlinetutorial has become an increasingly popular method for student learning in open and distance education. This presents numerous opportunities for the continued growth of distance education by providing current and prospective students with greater flexibility and opportunity for receiving quality tertiary education. The integrationof Internet technologies will potentially enhance student connectivity in distanceeducation and strengthen the learning environment (Zhang, Perris, & Yeung, 2005). The tutor role is important in distance learning program (Susilo, 2014a, 2014b). A number of studies have identified important dimensions of tutor performance which stimulate student learning. The tutor serves as afacilitator rather than as the group leader, ceding control of the direction of the discussion, and the agenda for solving the problem to the students. The tutor's task is to ask probing questions, to help students clarify their thinking, and, when necessary, to guide group processes (Carder, 2001; Felder & Brent, 1996). In their ten-year study of the nature and extent of online education in the United States, Allen and Seaman (2013) found that interest on the part of universities and colleges in online education shows no sign of abating. Online education continues to expand at a rate faster than traditional campus-based programs. The authors reported the number of students enrolled in at least one online course to be at an all-time high of 32% of all enrollments in participating institutions, representing an increase of 570.000 students from the previous year. Allen and Seaman also found that 77% of university leaders responding to the survey rated learning outcomes to be the same, if not better, with online education when compared with face-to-face learning. Their results support the *no significant difference phenomenon* that Russell (1999) found in his comparative study of student learning in the online and traditional classroom environments. Acknowledging that learning outcomes are equivalent, the question of how satisfied students are with their experiences with e-learning persists. This is important from the stand point of student retention which is, of course, relevant to enrollment and maintaining institutional revenue streams. Also, analysis of student satisfaction may point to improvements in e-learning practices which in turn could improve outcomes.

In Open University of Indonesia (Universitas Terbuka/UT), all tutors must be online for administrative purposes, but also increasingly for supporting learners. All tutors have a personalised home page, UT-Online, which provides access to their students' details, to course news, and to other Web-based resources, including the University library. Tutors are provided with access to the University's conferencing system, which provides them with an email account to usefor any communication with students or the University, as well as access to a widerange of computer conferences. Since 2009, tutors have been expected to use the electronic assignment submission system for most courses, and are increasingly expected to make use of computer conferencing, whether as an adjunct to other forms of support, or as the primary means of learner support to their student group. Since early of 2016, the University has moved to a virtual learning environment which integrates all online tools and resources within a single interface.

1.1. Literature Review

The Allen and Seaman (2013) report looked at online education, including the growing presence of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), from the institutional perspective, not from the student's. In their report, the authors noted that the remaining barriers to wide spread acceptance of online education were lack of faculty and employer acceptance, lack of student discipline and low retention rates. Of these, student *retention* in online programs is particularly relevant to the discussion of student satisfaction with their online experience.

Reinforcing the instructor's role in designing satisfying online curricula, Kranzow (2013) posited that if students were satisfied with their online experiences, they would be more likely to remain in the program.In various studies, the characteristics of tutors were defined as facilitating the critical thinking of students who meet problems (Das, Mpofu, Dunn, & Lanphear, 1998), supporting discussion (Felder & Brent, 1996; Tang & Harrison, 2011), eliminating conflicts (Hitchcock & Mylona, 2000), focusing on students' directing the learning process (De Grave, Dolmans, & Van Der Vleuten, 1999), supporting thelearning process (Pinto & Anderson, 2013) and knowing when and how to intervene (Haith-Cooper, 2000; Maudsley, 2002). There may be instances where the students' ability to understand course material is improved in a setting that provides immediate in-person contact with the instructor. But there also may be instances where the student is more comfortable participating in an online course(Cole, Shelley, & Swartz, 2013).

Tutoring and tutoring strategies are defined in different ways at different institutions. Kranzow (2013) poses a critical question for instructors working in the online environment. How can online courses be designed to maximize student satisfaction as well as student motivation, performance and persistence? Drawing on the literature, Kransow emphasizes the importance of building a sense of community in the online environment. Yet, building an online community that fosters student satisfaction involves strategies that go beyond facilitating interaction with course components. Building community also requires, among other elements, interaction with each other, that is, between student and instructor and among students in the course. Sher (2009), in his study of the role such interactions play in student learning in a Web-based environment, found interaction between student and instructor and among students to be significant factors in student satisfaction and learning. Tutoring may be designed for all students, or just those in need; it may be proactive orreactive; integrated into the curriculum or an additional support activity; based oninterpersonal relations or service-oriented (Hixenbaugh, Thomas, & Barfield, 2006).

Interaction-between student and instructor, among students, and with course content and technology-was the focus of Strachota's (2003) study of student satisfaction with distance education. In her study, learner-content interaction ranked first as a determinant of student satisfaction, followed by learner-instructor and learner-technology interaction. Interaction between and among students was not found to be significantly correlated with satisfaction. Bolliger and Martindale (2004) found three constructs to be important in measuring student satisfaction with online courses: interactivity, instructor variables and issues with technology.

This study reports on research into student satisfaction with online tutor in online education program conducted over three semesters. The research has focused largely on agribusiness students at Open University of Indonesia. The emphasis on student satisfaction with e-learning and online instructor is increasingly relevant for curriculum development which in turn is relevant for student persistence. Understanding what makes online instruction and e-learning satisfactory helps to inform instructional design.

This study is an extension of previous research on student satisfaction with face to face tutorial (Susilo, 2016). Researchers used a multi-item survey instrument to assess how well student expectations were met in selected online courses. Undergraduate students were asked first whether they were satisfied with their experience with e-learning. Following that, they were asked to explain what made the experience satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Student satisfaction is defined as "the learner's perceived value of their educational experiences in an educational setting" (Bolliger & Erichsen, 2013, p. 5).

1.2. Research Questions

This study focused on two survey questions:

1. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the online tutorials you have taken.
2. What made your experience with the online tutorial/s satisfactory or unsatisfactory?

Both survey questions were broken into two separate questions for purposes of analysis, resulting in three research questions:

1. How satisfied were students with their tutor of online tutorials?
2. What factors contributed to students' satisfaction with online tutorial?
3. What factors contributed to students' dissatisfaction with online tutorial?

2. METHOD

Researchers used a Web-based survey created in Lime Survey, an online survey software program. Following a pilot study in May, 2015, surveys were sent to students in undergraduate agribusiness courses over a period of one and a half years. Researchers used an analysis to evaluate responses to the selected questions. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize demographic data and survey responses. Results were transferred from Lime Survey to, and combined in, SPSS to analyze the first two research questions. The survey was anonymous. Students in each of the agribusiness classes were offered to fill in the survey voluntarily in the period of three semesters. Participation was solicited via an e-mail from the instructor. Each e-mail included the link to the Web-based survey developed in Lime Survey.

2.1. Sample and Participant Selection

The sample from the pilot study in May 2015, included undergraduate students from the Agribusiness Department of Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Science, UT. No changes to the survey design were indicated as a result of the pilot study. The second study was conducted over three semesters 2015.1; 2015.2 and 2016.1. The undergraduate agribusiness courses chosen for the study were taught by the different instructors.

Seventeen students participated in May 2015 survey, a response rate of 19%. Forty-one students participated in the second study, a response rate of 44%. Combined, the total number of participants was 58 of 93 enrolled students, for a response rate of 62%. This research explored the second study participants because of the completed responses given by them.

2.2. Procedure

Responses to the two questions on student satisfaction from tthe survey, provided the data for the analysis. Researchers used a 5 point Likert scale for the first and second survey question, asking students to rate their level of satisfaction with tutors of online tutorials. Five was equal to "very satisfied" whileone was equal to "unknown."

3. RESULTS

The survey question sought to capture respondents' level of experience with online tutor. Only responses from second studywas used for analysis.

3.1. RQ1 How satisfied were students with their tutor of online tutorials?

In the first and second survey question, students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with tutor of online courses taken. Students could respond to either part of the question or to both. To

the first part, level of satisfaction with fully online courses, there were 41 responses, 44% of the total 93 participants. A 5 point Likert scale was used to measure responses ranging from 1 (Unknown) to 5 (*very dissatisfied*).

The male respondents were higher (71%) than than females (29%).The age of respondents were varying. The highest population was age 35-39 years (26,8%).

Table 1. Demography Of The Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent
<25	9	22,0
25 – 29	8	19,5
30 – 34	9	22,0
35 – 39	11	26,8
40 – 44	1	2,4
>44	3	7,3
Total	41	100,0
Sex	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Female	12	29,3
Male	29	70,7
Total	41	100,0
Academic Background	**Frequency**	**Percent**
High School	12	29,3
Diploma 3	13	31,7
Bachelor	16	39,0
Total	41	100,0
Occupation	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Agricultural ext. agent	15	36,6
NonAgricultural ext. agent	25	61,0
Unemployed	1	2,4
Total	41	100,0

This research revealed that characteristics of the participants consist of the age of the respondents,sex, their level of formal education, and their occupation. Four groups of participants which were dominant (90,3%) were under 40 years old. It means the younger students are much more interested in online courses.

The characteristics of the participants were also influenced bytheir level of formal education. Most of students were bachelor degree (39%). Those students have other undergraduate degree from other higher education institution and they proposed credit transfer for the distance education.

In relation to the level of education stipulated by the Indonesian Ministry of Agricultural, a firstlevel extension agent has to have at least diploma3 (D3) qualification.The agricultural agents have met the requirement by more than 70% hold at least D3.

In implementing their tasks, agricultural extension agents are not only relying on formal education, but alsoon the training that's to improve their knowledge and skillas agricultural extension agents. This is due to their formal education may notsufficient or related to their work, hence, they will

need technical trainings such as, rice culture technique and training on agribusiness product marketing. These subjects were offered in online courses.

Table 2. The Satisfaction Responses

ID	Questions	Frequency				Percent			
		VD	D	S	VS	VD	D	S	VS
Q01	Explaining the online tutorial's aims and rules	3	2	30	6	7,3	4,9	73,2	14,6
Q02	Describing the online tutorial's benefits and relevance	5	0	35	1	12,2	0	85,4	2,4
Q03	Expert in the subject matters	1	7	27	6	2,4	17,1	65,9	14,6
Q04	Giving OER enrichment	4	8	20	9	9,8	19,5	48,8	22
Q05	Explaining the course subject interestingly and systematically	5	6	26	4	12,2	14,6	63,4	9,8
Q06	Using multi media	5	5	26	5	12,2	12,2	63,4	12,2
Q07	Using good language	1	3	24	13	2,4	7,3	58,5	31,7
Q08	Polite	2	0	22	17	4,9	0	53,7	41,9
Q09	Motivating student to be more active	4	0	23	14	9,8	0	56,1	34,1
Q10	Moderating the discussion appealingly	4	2	26	9	9,8	4,9	63,4	22
Q11	Giving the fair opportunity to students to give a comment	4	0	28	9	9,8	0	68,3	22
Q12	Giving task in week 3, 5 and 7	1	2	30	8	2,4	4,9	73,2	19,5
Q13	Giving feedback on the student's task	3	6	21	11	7,3	14,6	51,2	26,8
Q14	Making summary in the end of the session	4	7	23	7	9,8	17,1	56,1	17,1
Q15	Creating course plan	1	8	29	3	2,4	19,5	70,7	7,3
Q16	Creating learning materials based on course plan	1	5	31	4	2,4	12,2	75,6	9,8
Q17	Creating subject of discussion based on course plan	2	6	29	4	4,9	14,6	70,7	9,8
Q18	Giving task based on course plan	2	4	33	2	4,9	9,8	80,5	4,9
Q19	Opening the online tutorial each week	4	5	26	6	9,8	12,2	63,4	14,6
Q20	Greeting students at least once in a week	4	4	22	11	9,8	9,8	53,7	26,8
Q21	Answering the student's question promptly	3	9	18	11	7,3	22	43,9	26,8
Q22	Marking the student's discussion and task	1	8	24	8	2,4	19,5	58,5	19,5
Q23	Asking the student's opinion for online course improvement	3	2	21	15	7,3	4,9	51,2	36,6
	Total	67	99	594	183	7,1	10,5	63,0	19,4

Note : VD = Very Dissatisfied, D = Dissatisfied, S = Satisfied, VS = Very Satisfied.

The satisfaction level of agribusiness students with online tutor at UTwas mainly satisfied (63%). More than nineteen percent had very satisfied level. Only 7,1 percent had very dissatisfied with online tutor. When asked about their experience in distance learning education,the average experience of agribusiness student in distance learning education was more than 3 years.

Table 3. Univariate Marginal Parameters of Satisfaction Responses

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.	Thresholds		
Q01	5,056	3,481	0	1,000	8,719
Q02	0,372	0,319	0	1,000	
Q03	1,773	0,900	0	1,000	2,720
Q04	1,727	1,333	0	1,000	2,759
Q05	2,129	1,827	0	1,000	4,496
Q06	2,472	2,121	0	1,000	4,943
Q07	2,920	1,482	0	1,000	3,625
Q08	0,885	0,534	0	1,000	
Q09	0,760	0,587	0	1,000	
Q10	5,325	4,110	0	1,000	8,505
Q11	0.626	0,483	0	1,000	
Q12	3,805	1,931	0	1,000	5,463
Q13	2,140	1,473	0	1,000	3,051
Q14	1,912	1,476	0	1,000	3,316
Q15	1,647	0,836	0	1,000	2,861
Q16	2,146	1,089	0	1,000	3,557
Q17	2,077	1,254	0	1,000	3,701
Q18	2,741	1,654	0	1,000	5,481
Q19	2,483	1,917	0	1,000	4,500
Q20	2,969	2,291	0	1,000	4,385
Q21	1,601	1,103	0	1,000	2,283
Q22	1,647	0,836	0	1,000	2,365
Q23	5,056	3,481	0	1,000	6,250

Predicted variables that was influenced satisfactory responses have higher variance (high standard deviation and/or three level threshold). There were six variables that have three level threshold and high standard deviation: Q01, Q06, Q10, Q12, Q18 and Q23. Meanwhile, there were four variables that had small variance (homogeny responses): Q02, Q08, Q09 and Q11. These variables had two level distribution of threshold (0 and 1), therefore its standard deviation were small. It means these variables had small variance (the participants had similar answer) and the responses mostly were satisfied (see Table 2). For example: Q02 representing by 12,2% dissatisfaction and 87,8% satisfaction or very satisfaction.

Table 4. Correlations Between Satisfaction Responses and Principal Components

Questions	Component					
	PC_1	PC_2	PC_3	PC_4	PC_5	PC_6
Q01	0,679	**0,702**	--	--	--	--
Q02	0,784	0,399	--	--	--	--
Q03	0,705	--	--	--	--	--
Q04	0,878	--	--	--	--	--
Q05	0,799	--	--	--	--	--
Q06	0,785	--	--	--	--	--
Q07	0,754	--	--	0,462	--	--
Q08	0,754	--	--	--	--	--
Q09	0,786	--	--	--	--	--
Q10	**0,895**	--	--	--	--	--
Q11	0,783	--	--	--	--	--
Q12	--	0,689	--	**0,634**	--	--
Q13	0,863	--	--	--	--	--
Q14	0,692	--	--	--	**0,395**	--
Q15	0,417	--	--	0,444	--	--
Q16	0,515	--	--	--	--	**0,551**
Q17	0,774	--	--	--	--	--
Q18	0,489	0,671	--	--	--	--
Q19	0,840	--	--	--	0,365	--
Q20	0,833	--	--	--	--	--
Q21	0,824	--	--	--	--	--
Q22	0,724	--	--	--	--	--
Q23	0,888	--	**0,445**	--	--	--
Eigen value	49,64	13,55	4,4	3,54	2,49	1,92
% of Variance	62,2	16,98	5,51	4,43	3,12	2,4
Cumulative % of Var	62,2	79,18	84,69	89,12	92,24	94,64

(*) Extraction method : Principal ComponentsAnaysis, runing by LISREL.
(--) Coeficient of the Correlations under 0,35.

Six variables Q10, Q01, Q23, Q12, Q14, Q16, which had correlation with the level of satisfaction factors to determine students' response level with online tutor.Therefore, the students' satisfaction level on each variable were become students' satisfaction level in each aspect of question. Based on the PCA, this study revealed six structures of satisfaction level with online tutor:

1) Moderating discussion (62,20%), then
2) Making tutorial strategy (79,18%), then
3) Giving Feedback on student's opinion (84,69%), then
4) Keep on schedule (89,12%), then
5) Making summary (92,24%), and then
6) Providing attractive learning material (94,64).

Cumulative of variance for the first three level was almost 85%. So, the first three level will be explored further.

First factor (Q10)

Level of moderating the discussion appealingly was the greatest factor influencing students' satisfaction with online course, representing 85,4% satisfaction and 14,7% unsatisfaction of the total 41 comments expressing satisfaction. All of other variabel (except Q12) corelate to this factor with 62,2% of total satisfaction variability.

Second factor (Q01)

Level of explaining the online tutorial's aims and rules, represented 87,8% of the comments and 12,2 unsatisfaction. This factor supported (correlate) with Q12, Q18, and Q02. This factor contribute 16,98% to satisfaction variability

3rd factor (Q23)

Level of asking the student's opinion for online course improvement, represented 87,8% satisfaction and 12,2% unsatisfaction. This factor contribute 5,51% to satisfaction variability.

4th factor (Q12)

Level of the instructor who give task on schedule accounted for 92,7% and 7,3% unsatisfaction. This factor corelate with Q07 and Q15. This factor contribute 4,43% to satisfaction variability.

5th factor (Q14)

Level of making summary in the end of the session, represented 73,2% satisfaction and 26,9% unsatisfaction. This factor corelate with Q19. This factor contribute 3,12% to satisfaction variability.

6th factor (Q16)

Level of creating learning materials based on course plan, represented 85,4% satisfaction and 14,6% unsatisfaction. This factor contribute 2,4% to satisfaction variability.

Discussion

In several areas, results were consistent with other studies (Sher, 2009; Kuo, Walker, Belland, & Schroder, 2013). Student-instructor interaction was among the predictors of student satisfaction that Kuo, Walker, Belland and Schroder identified in their study of student satisfaction with online programs. In this study, student-instructor interaction was also important. But there were some differences of degree with regard to issues of instructor's communication and interaction with students. Jackson, Jones, and Rodriguez (2010) found that timeliness in responding to students, accessibility, clearly stated expectations, and instructor enthusiasm played a significant role in student satisfaction.

In this study, it was clear that students felt the lack of interaction with the instructor in the online environment. Onground instruction affords the student the opportunity to have questions answered and for the instructor to elaborate on points to be made at the time the student is experiencing difficulty. Interaction with peer and/or tutor contributes to the sense that there is a

community of learning and provides additional support for the student to expand his or her understanding of the material.

Palmer and Holt (2009) found that a student's comfort level with technology was critical to satisfaction with online courses. Secondary factors included clarity of expectations and the student's self-assessment of how well they were doing in the online environment. Drennan, Kennedy, and Pisarski (2005) also found positive perceptions of technology to be one of two key attributes of student satisfaction. The second was autonomous and innovative learning styles. Richardson and Swan (2003) focused on the relationship of social presence in online learning to satisfaction with the instructor. They found a positive correlation between students' perceptions of social presence and their perceptions of learning and satisfaction. For Sahin (2007), the strongest predictor of student satisfaction was personal relevance (linkage of course content with personal experience), followed by instructor support, active learning and, lastly, authentic learning (real-life problem-solving).

Kleinman (2005) looked at improving instructional design to maximize active learning and interaction in online courses. Over a period of ten years, Kleinman studied online communities of learning, concluding that an online environment which fosters active, engaged learning and which provides the interactive support necessary to help students understand what is expected, leads to a satisfied learning community. Swan (2001), too, found that interactivity was essential to designing online courses that positively affect student satisfaction. Wang (2003) argued that to truly measure student satisfaction researchers must first assess the effectiveness of online education.

It is important to note that online course quality is based on several factors (Johnson, 2016). This research considers these key success factors.

1. Course Design-Online courses need to have a strong focus. Focus can be accomplished by clearly identifying course goals and then aligning the instructional/learning strategies and the course assessments to these course goals.
2. Instructional/Learning/Assessment Strategies-To reach the learning objectives of a course, appropriate strategies are needed to help students develop and learn. If the course goal is to have students apply knowledge and skills in workplace setting, the instructional strategies should include more than readings and answering of questions in discussion boards. Instructors need to demonstrate the knowledge and skills and provide students with opportunities to practice their new knowledge and skills in carrying out a related task even if it is simulated in the learning environment. Further, students need to be assessed not just on the recall of facts but provided assessment similar to the practice environment or as part of a semester project.
3. Instructors-While many key success factors are based on the technology and tools used to teach a course, instructors in addition to being subject matter experts are still a key component in helping students learn. Expert teachers not only know the challenges of learning specific content and skills, but they can individualize student learning by providing insights as well providing meaningful feedback to students. Further, they can help relate the instruction to students that can ultimately be the key to helping students stay motivated and engaged in the course.
4. Interactions-There may be a tendency to enjoy the lack of synchronicity in online courses, interactions with peers and/or instructors can have a powerful effect. Social learning benefits the learner by providing support to encode ideas into memory, providing cognitive tension to challenge and developing knowledge and skills, and ideally provide emotional engagement with the excitement and challenges of learning.

5. Students-They are a key factor in their learning success. Their learning skills along with prior learning are one of the best predictors for successful learning. Also students' level of self-motivation is key in engaging in learning activities as well as persisting in practice.

Looking for success factors is often challenging to quickly see, butwith a course syllabus which may show the high level details and talking with students who have taken a class, instructor can judge if the course is focused as if the course strategies are aligned with the course goals. While all these key factors individually do not constitute quality, their combined synergistic effect provides students with the most optimal environment to achieve their learning success(Johnson, 2016).

Online education represents a major shift in how people learn and in turn, how learners are taught. The argument is made that, therefore, there is an increasing need to understand what contributes to student satisfaction with online learning (Sinclaire, 2011). Student satisfaction is one of several variables influencing the success of online learning programs, along with the institutional factors that Abel (2005) listed in his article on best practices (leadership, faculty commitment, student support, and technology). Sener and Humbert (2003)maintained that satisfaction is a vital element in creating a successful online program.

Pinto and Anderson (2013) found that the more the student felt a part of the class, the more satisfied the student reported to be with the hybrid format. As in this study, communication was important to the student's reporting satisfaction with e-learning.

As persistence is a key to the success of online programs in higher education, the relationship between students' satisfaction with their e-learning experiences and student retention is clear (Lorenzo, 2012). It is this role that makes ongoing studies of satisfaction with online education important.

3.2. Limitation

Notwithstanding the broad time span of the studies, the sample was small. As noted earlier, the authors' studies of student satisfaction in the online learning environment to date have focused largely on under graduate agribusiness students at one public university in Indonesia.

It needs to be noted as well that people are more likely to take the time to articulate dissatisfaction than they are to voice satisfaction. That tendency may be reflected in the responses to the open-ended question and may explain why the overall mean scores on the Likert scale indicated moderate satisfaction with online courses.

4. CONCLUSION

To date, there have been numerous studies of student satisfaction and student learning. There appears to be consensus that both online and onground instruction are effective (Wagner, Garippo, & Lovaas, 2011). There may be instances where the students' ability to understand course material is improved in a setting that provides immediate in-person contact with the instructor. But there also may be instances where the student is more comfortable participating in an online course. The argument is that both modes are effective given the right fit between student and course. As Wyatt (2005) noted in his comparison of students' perceptions of online and traditional classroom learning, some students thrive in the online environment while others languish.

In this study, overall, students rated their online instructor as moderately satisfactory.The satisfaction level of agribusiness students with online tutor at UTwas mainly satisfied (63%). More than nineteen percent had very satisfied level. Based on principal component analysis, this study

revealed six structures of satisfaction level with online tutor; (1) moderating discussion (62,20%), (2) tutorial strategy (79,18%), (3) feedback on student's opinion (84,69%), (4) keep on schedule (89,12%), (5) making summary (92,24%), and (6) providing attractive learning material (94,64%).

REFERENCES

Abel, R. (2005). Implementing best practices in online learning. *Educause Quarterly, 28(3)*, 75-77.

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group. Retrieved August 5, 2016, from http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/changingcourse.pdf.

Bolliger, D. U., & Erichsen, E. A. (2013). Student Satisfaction with Blended and Online Courses Based on Personality Type/Niveau de satisfaction des étudiants dans les cours hybrides et en ligne basé sur le type de personnalité. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology, 39(1)*, 1.

Bolliger, D. U., & Martindale, T. (2004). Key factors for determining student satisfaction in online courses. *International Journal on E-Learning, 3(1)*, 61.

Carder, L. (2001). Case-based, problem-based learning Information literacy for the real world. *Research Strategies, 18(3)*, 181-190. doi: 10.1016/S0734-3310(02)00087-3

Cole, M. T., Shelley, D. J., & Swartz, L. B. (2013). Academic integrity and student satisfaction in an online environment. In S. Wang & H. H. Yang (Eds.), *Cases on Online Learning Communities and Beyond: Investigations and Applications*. Hershey PA: IGI Global.

Das, M., Mpofu, D., Dunn, E., & Lanphear, J. H. (1998). Self and tutor evaluations in problem-based learning tutorials: is there a relationship? *Medical education, 32(4)*, 411-418. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.1998.00217.x

De Grave, W. S., Dolmans, D. H. J. M., & Van Der Vleuten, C. P. M. (1999). Profiles of effective tutors in problem-based learning: scaffolding student learning. *Medical education, 33(12)*, 901-906. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.1999.00492.x

Drennan, J., Kennedy, J., & Pisarski, A. (2005). Factors Affecting Student Attitudes Toward Flexible Online Learning in Management Education. *The Journal of Educational Research, 98(6)*, 331-338. doi: 10.3200/JOER.98.6.331-338

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (1996). Navigating the Bumpy Road to Student-Centered Instruction. *College Teaching, 44(2)*, 43-47. doi: 10.1080/87567555.1996.9933425

Haith-Cooper, M. (2000). Problem-based learning within health professional education. What is the role of the lecturer? A review of the literature. *Nurse Education Today, 20*(4), 267-272. doi: 10.1054/nedt.1999.0397

Hitchcock, M. A., & Mylona, Z.-H. E. (2000). Teaching Faculty To Conduct Problem-Based Learning. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine, 12(1)*, 52-57. doi: 10.1207/S15328015TLM1201_8

Hixenbaugh, P., Thomas, L., & Barfield, S. (2006). *Personal Tutoring in Higher Education*.

Johnson, T. (2016). Online learning quality (A. Susilo, Trans.) *Workshop of Online Learning*.

Kleinman, S. (2005). Strategies for Encouraging Active Learning, Interaction, and Academic Integrity in Online Courses. *Communication Teacher, 19(1)*, 13-18. doi: 10.1080/1740462042000339212

Kranzow, J. (2013). Faculty Leadership in Online Education: Structuring Courses to Impact Student Satisfaction and Persistence. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 9(1)*, 131.

Maudsley, G. (2002). Making sense of trying not to teach: an interview study of tutors' ideas of problem-based learning. *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, 77(2)*, 162-172. doi: 10.1097/00001888-200202000-00017

Palmer, S. R., & Holt, D. M. (2009). Examining student satisfaction with wholly online learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 25(2)*, 101. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2729.2008.00294.x

Pinto, M. B., & Anderson, W. (2013). A little knowledge goes a long way: Student expectation and satisfaction with hybrid learning. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies, 10*, 65-76.

Richardson, J. C., & Swan, K. (2003). Examining social presence in online courses in relation to students' perceived learning and satisfaction. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 7(1)*, 68-88.

Russell, T. (1999). *The no significant difference phenomenon*: Office of Instructional Telecommunications, North Carolina State University, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Sahin, I. (2007). Predicting Student Satisfaction In Distance Education And Learning Environments. *The Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 8(2)*, 113-119.

Sener, J., & Humbert, J. (2003). Student satisfaction with online learning: An expanding universe. Retrieved August 15, 2016, from wiki.sln.suny.edu

Sher, A. (2009). Assessing the relationship of student-instructor and student-student interaction to student learning and satisfaction in web-based online learning environment. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 8(2)*, 100-120.

Sinclaire, J. K. (2011). Student satisfaction with online learning: Lessons from organizational behavior. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 11*, 1-20.

Strachota, E. M. (2003). *Student satisfaction in online courses: An analysis of the impactof learner-content, learner-instructor, learner-learner and learner-teacher interaction. Dissertation Abstracts International, 64(8), 2746 Key: citeulike: 1029163.*

Susilo, A. (2014a). Emerging technologies acceptance in online tutorials: Tutors' and students' behavior intentions in higher education. *Open Praxis, 6(3)*, 257-274.

Susilo, A. (2014b). Exploring Facebook (FB) as an online tutorial complement in distance education. *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design, 4(4)*, 60-75.

Susilo, A. (2016). *Importance-satisfaction analysis of face to face tutorial : A case studi at Universitas Terbuka*. Paper presented at the Educational Technology World Conference 2016, Bali, Indonesia.

Swan, K. (2001). Virtual interaction: Design factors affecting student satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online courses. *Distance Education, 22(2)*, 306-331. doi: 10.1080/0158791010220208

Tang, J., & Harrison, C. (2011). Investigating university tutor perceptions of assessment feedback: three types of tutor beliefs. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36(5)*, 583-604. doi: 10.1080/02602931003632340

Wang, Y.-S. (2003). Assessment of learner satisfaction with asynchronous electronic learning systems. *Information & Management, 41(1)*, 75-86. doi: 10.1016/S0378-7206(03)00028-4

Zhang, W. Y., Perris, K., & Yeung, L. (2005). Online tutorial support in open and distance learning: students' perceptions. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 36(5)*, 789-804. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2004.00492.x