The Evolution of Distance Learning

Linda D. Grooms
Regent University, USA

INTRODUCTION

The knowledge explosion, the increased complexity of human life, and the ubiquitous, 27/7 nature of technology coupled with the globalization of the marketplace herald the need to embrace the most effective methods and formats of teaching and learning. Currently providing powerful educational opportunities, the science and technology of distance learning continues to multiply at unprecedented rates. Where historically traveling from village to village verbally disseminating knowledge was the only process of training those at a distance, today's learners eagerly embrace the rapidly expanding web-based delivery systems of the 21st century, which offer a plethora of educational alternatives. So with this contrast, this begs the question, what exactly *is* distance learning and how has it evolved?

BACKGROUND

In very simplistic terms, distance learning is just that--learning that occurs at a distance (Rumble & Keegan, 1982; Shale, 1990; Shale & Garrison, 1990) or that which is characterized by a separation in geographical proximity and/or time (Holmberg, 1974, 1977, 1981; Kaye, 1981, 1982, 1988; Keegan, 1980; McIsaac & Gunawardena, 1996; Moore, 1973, 1980, 1983, 1989a, 1989b, 1990; Ohler, 1991; Sewart, 1981; Wedemeyer, 1971). In his 1986 theory of transactional distance, Moore (Moore & Kearsley, 1996) defined distance not only in terms of place and time but also in terms of structure and dialogue between the learner and the instructor. In this theory, distance becomes more pedagogical than geographical. As structure increases, so does distance. As dialogue increases, distance declines showing the role that interaction can play in the distance learning environment. Saba (1998) furthered this concept concluding,

> *the dynamic and systemic study of distance education has made 'distance' irrelevant, and has made mediated communication and construction of knowledge the relevant issue …. So the proper question is not whether distance education is comparable to a hypothetical 'traditional,' or face-to-face instruction, but if there is enough interaction between the learner and the instructor for the learner to find meaning and develop new knowledge. (p. 5)*

To facilitate greater interaction in the geographically and/or organizationally dispersed distance environment, today the convergence or fusion of technologies enables individuals to overcome the barrier of separation, affording institutional and learner opportunity to transcend intra- and inter-organizational boundaries, time, and even culture. By definition, the paradigm of distance learning revolutionizes the traditional environment (Martz & Reddy, 2005); however, even with this change, learning, which involves some manner of interaction with content, instructor, and/or peers, remains at the core of the educational process.

Although imperative in both environments, research shows these three types of interaction to be the hub of the ongoing traditional versus distance argument. Traditionalists often fear that with anything other than face-to-face instruction, interaction somehow will decrease thus making learning less effective, when in reality, numerous studies have revealed no significant difference in the learning outcomes between traditional and distance courses (Russell, 1999). In fact, distance courses have been found to "match conventional on-campus, face-to-face courses in both rigor and quality of outcomes" (Pittman, 1997, p. 42). Despite these findings, critics still abound.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-5888-2.ch219

Copyright © 2015, IGI Global. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global is prohibited.

Two distinguishing characteristics of the nontraditional environment--individualized learning and flexibility--often arouse suspicion and caution among traditionalists (Grooms, 2000). Many are convinced that with any form of study outside the confines of the typical brick and mortar, "every vestige of intellectual rigor [will] disappear into oblivion. . . . [These skeptics interpret] individualized learning as individualized isolation, especially from faculty, and they look on flexibility as no more than a synonym for escape from regulation and responsibility" (Gould, 1972, p. 9).

In contrast, with their introduction of Equivalency Theory, Simonson, Schlosser, and Hanson (1999) accentuated the concept of equivalency as "central to the widespread acceptance of distance education" (p. 72) thus supporting Keegan's (1989) call for parity in quality, quantity, and status. Further, recognizing the need to bring integrity and prestige to the field, Shale and Garrison (1990) suggested building a framework based not on isolation but upon interdependence, which would imply that distance learning would merely become an alternative method for delivering traditional content with the context dictating the type of interaction required. So how did we get to where we are now?

MAIN FOCUS OF THE ARTICLE

Distance Learning Evolution

As previously mentioned, distance learning has been with us in one form or another virtually since the creation of time. For years, itinerant teachers traveled from village to village verbally disseminating information to those hungry for knowledge; however, the invention of Guttenberg's printing press in 1440, made possible serious distribution of learning to larger numbers of people.

Capitalizing on this broader use of print media, correspondence study became a popular form of distance education, the first record of which was in 1728 when Caleb Philipps' advertised the introduction of shorthand (Battenberg as cited in Baath, 1980 & Holmberg, 1986). Often conjuring thoughts of isolation and autonomy, this record of instruction mirrored those images. In fact, in this account there was no mention of interaction of any type other than what was inherent with the content.

Over a hundred years later in his 1833 Swedish advertisement, although not directly stated, Meuller's offer to study composition seems to be the first to imply some form of exchange between the student and teacher. More definitively, in 1840, the most acknowledged root of distance learning explicitly employing learner-instructor interaction began in the United Kingdom. Using passages from the Bible, Isaac Pitman taught shorthand (Baath, 1980; Holmberg, 1974; Kaye, 1988; Rumble, 1986), yet this time, once learners transcribed these passages, they were returned for correspondence with the teacher via the penny post, thus some called it postal teaching (Dewal, 1988).

As evidenced in these early days of pure correspondence education, any offered guidance transpired through some form of dispatched communication such as the mail (Wedemeyer, 1971) and student contact, even with the instructor, was not necessarily encouraged. This is clearly seen in Keegan's (1980) classic article, *On Defining Distance Education,* where he documented that in its strictest sense, pure correspondence study advocates specified that "students enrol [sic] with them because they 'want to be left alone'" (p. 31). Directly challenging this belief, Holmberg (1982) advocated that "any post-graduate distance study must have a truly communicative character if more is meant than merely providing reading lists and odd comments on students' work" (p. 259).

While print remained the primary mode of distance learning until the 1920s and 30s, the introduction of radio broadcasts soon followed with television and satellite delivery systems initiating the labor pains for the birth of the current online technological revolution. Prior to the advent of the World Wide Web (WWW) in the early 1990s, interaction continued to transpire primarily between the learner and content with occasional interaction between the learner and the instructor through such means as telephone and videoconferencing.

As distance learning continued to evolve, learner-instructor interaction became increasingly important, thus catapulting the first of two significant paradigm shifts. While some (Daniel & Marquis, 1979) were

7 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:
www.igi-global.com/chapter/the-evolution-of-distance-learning/112637

Related Content

Feature Engineering Techniques to Improve Identification Accuracy for Offline Signature Case-Bases
Shisna Sanyal, Anindta Desarkar, Uttam Kumar Dasand Chitrita Chaudhuri (2021). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis (pp. 1-19).*
www.irma-international.org/article/feature-engineering-techniques-to-improve-identification-accuracy-for-offline-signature-case-bases/273727

A Comparison of Data Exchange Mechanisms for Real-Time Communication
Mohit Chawla, Siba Mishra, Kriti Singhand Chiranjeev Kumar (2017). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis (pp. 66-81).*
www.irma-international.org/article/a-comparison-of-data-exchange-mechanisms-for-real-time-communication/186859

Collaboration Network Analysis Based on Normalized Citation Count and Eigenvector Centrality
Anand Bihari, Sudhakar Tripathiand Akshay Deepak (2019). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis (pp. 61-72).*
www.irma-international.org/article/collaboration-network-analysis-based-on-normalized-citation-count-and-eigenvector-centrality/219810

A Framework for Exploring IT-Led Change in Morphing Organizations
Sharon A. Cox (2018). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition (pp. 694-706).*
www.irma-international.org/chapter/a-framework-for-exploring-it-led-change-in-morphing-organizations/183782

Two Rough Set-based Software Tools for Analyzing Non-Deterministic Data
Mao Wu, Michinori Nakataand Hiroshi Sakai (2014). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis (pp. 32-47).*
www.irma-international.org/article/two-rough-set-based-software-tools-for-analyzing-non-deterministic-data/111311