

7. REFERENCES

1. Biner PM, Summers M, Dean RS, Bink ML, Anderson JL and Gelder BC. Student satisfaction with interactive telecourses as a function of demographic variables and prior telecourse experience. *Distance Education* 1996; 17(1): 33–44.
2. Gruppen LD, Hutchinson SP, Gordon PJ, and Roser S. An evaluation of the efficacy of interactive videoconferencing in residency and continuing education. *Academic Medicine* 1996; 71(Suppl-1).
3. Lander R and Burns J. *Videoconferencing and teaching and learning within De Montfort University 1994–1998* De Montfort University, Learning in Virtual Environments Research Group at www.jtap.ac.uk/reports/htm/jtap-046-app.html.
4. Schiller J and Mitchell J. Interacting at a distance: Staff and student perceptions of teaching and learning via videoconferencing. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology* 1993; 9(1) 41–58.
5. Treagust DF, Waldrip BG, and Horley JR. *Effectiveness of ISDN video-conferencing: A case study of two campuses and two different courses* at www.usq.edu.au/material/unit/resource/treagust/treagust.htm.
6. Keast D. *Evaluating multi-point videoconferencing 1996* at specsess@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca.
7. Hailey D, Roine R, and Ohinmaa A. Systematic review of evidence for the benefits of telemedicine. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 2002; 8(Suppl-1): S1–S7.
8. Faulkner K and McClelland L. Using videoconferencing to deliver a health education program to women health consumers in rural and remote Queensland: An early attempt and future plans. *Australian Journal of Rural Health* 2002; 10: 65–72.
9. May CR, Williams TL, Mair MM, Shaw NT, and Gask L. Factors influencing the evaluation of telehealth interventions: Preliminary results from a qualitative study of evaluation projects in the UK. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 2002; 8(Suppl-2): S65–S67.
10. SAS Institute. *The SAS system for Windows—version 8.02*. Cary NC: SAS Institute, 2001.