

How Online Learning Has Changed the Accessibility of Higher Education

Mani Kumar¹, Prof. G. Anburaj²

¹Master in Structural Engineering, School of Civil Engineering, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632 014, Tamil Nadu, India

²Assistant Professor of English, School of Social Sciences and Languages, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632 014, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

It has become more accessible, flexible, and affordable than ever before as it completely does away with geographical and time barriers as have persisted in traditional education. This aspect accelerated not just in presence but also with identifying strengths and weaknesses in online learning during the pandemic. An advantage of online education has been low cost, based on reduced physical infrastructure. Another is flexibility in learning that learners enjoy as it balances personal responsibilities with their educational needs. Additionally, access for disabled students exists through assistive technologies. Many institutions have embraced this hybrid model where both the traditional learning experience and the online learning experience can give personalized educational experiences. On the other hand, it has posed such problems as the digital divide: students from lower-income backgrounds and those residing in rural areas often cannot access the internet and its other technological tools, which remain inaccessible to a high number of students with disabilities.

This contributes to the isolation and disengagement of the online learners, who feel much more at home within the face-to-face learning setting. A further drawback relates to the issue of academic integrity in an online virtual learning environment, where there are no guarantees that students would be self-regulatory. The study examines how these challenges affect the accessibility of higher education and explores gaps in current research, such as the digital divide, inclusion of marginalized students, and the emotional and social impact of online learning. Online education has broadened access to higher education, but there is a need to ensure that all barriers are addressed so that equitable, high-quality learning opportunities are offered to all students.

Keywords: Online education, accessibility, higher education, digital divide, COVID-19, learning management systems, hybrid models, student engagement, educational equity, assistive technology, inclusivity.

Introduction

The integration of technology in education has dramatically increased over time with online education being the most widely offered and used among all educational courses and practices dished out in institutions of higher learning. Online education can also be described as the method of communicating educational material and teaching practices through the internet and other technologies. It has, therefore changed the way learning and teaching resources are accessed by being more accessible, easily used, and

more convenient for the learners and teachers. Such a mode of education which occurs without physical locations in which learners can be situated has advantages as well as disadvantages in higher learning institutions.

The pandemic of COVID-19 was a game-changer because it increased the pace of switching to online education as most schools hastened to harness the power of remote learning. This has made us see the other side of online education, particularly in how it enables learners to be in different locations while studying and how self-paced studying is achievable. But it exposed gaps also, such gaps include absence of social engagement measures, inconsistency in the quality of online services, and access to the internet where some students could not access some equipment as well as network. It has been realized that such imbalances make serious consideration of online learning paramount.

Apart from the advantages of affordability and convenience offered by e-learning, the attitude and the practices of the learner as well as the teachers have been changed in a way. The role of online education is also aiding in non-traditional learning modes and hence traditional teaching methods are being supplemented by online learning platforms. Many institutions of higher learning have implemented Learning Management Systems (LMS) in an attempt to manage the course content, student interaction, and assess their performance. Even during the pandemic, when students were forced to take classes in remote settings, the online mode of education became prevalent in courses that were primarily contact-based.

However, the networked mode of education developed problems for institutions, teachers, and students as well. The biggest problem is connected with the absence of real-time contact which would help to develop interpersonal and co-working programs that are usually realized in a real classroom. Similar problems arise while trying to maintain the academic integrity of students in learning that takes place in a virtual environment, where most students lack strong self-control and time management skills during independent learning. Teaching in online mode requires more effort for tutors because they have to learn new methodologies, and when one is not enough more resources are needed, which may be in short supply.

However, the disability-inclusive views have argued the provision of online education services to the disabled as some are print-disabled, such as the visually impaired or dyslexic. Further, for this category of students, some barrier concerns the access to digital content; though assistive technologies can ease some constraints, several online platforms are impossible to access entirely. This challenge focuses on incorporation of diverse learning needs into the design of digital environments to support education for every learner.

With the introduction of technology and the birth of the internet, competition within the learning environment shifted that led to some ripples in institutions of higher learning as far as student recruitment methods are concerned. Some 'traditional elite' institutions take longer to go online compared to 'experiments' institutions. However, this demand has pushed many traditional universities to launch hybrid or even fully online degrees, in some cases through partnerships with OPMs. This is consistent with the general trends in most countries, which are seeing a shift in belief on the part of institutions that online education is a viable product that forms part of the broader higher education system.

To summarize it all, the development of online education within higher education is a double-edged sword. It makes learning easier but simultaneously poses big challenges in terms of equity, quality, and the overall student experience. This research is set to explore such challenges and contribute to the development of policies that foster the effective use of online education while enriching the quality of higher education.

Problem Statement:

Online learning has completely transformed the way students can access higher education; there is no geographical, temporal, or physical limit anymore. Digital technologies open academic programs to students no matter where they are across the globe, making the provision of education accessible to everyone, such as those having a commitment to work or with family responsibilities or stay in remote areas. Online education also provided widely open opportunities for learners who were not conventional; it is for adult students and working professionals. Through online education, people could pursue higher education on a flexible basis.

However, online learning also brings forward new challenges which limit fair access despite promise. The digital divide characterised by unequal access to the reliable internet and technology will only disproportionately affect low-income students and those in rural or underserved regions who can never participate in online courses. More so, most online platforms can aid to assist students with special disabilities through assistive technology use, but most classes may not have sufficient accessibility features making a hard time for visual/auditory impaired or the rest of the cognitive ones to follow.

Besides, online learning generally involves reduced socialization and community participation, a learning aspect that would leave a learner feeling disengaged and isolated for some time. This would be very problematic for learners who find value in such in-class collaboration and feel a need for community.

This research aims to find out how online learning modifies access to higher education. In the process, it focuses on expansion and approaches that need to be confronted to make the process more inclusive.

Research Gap:

Although numerous literatures exist on online learning and its impact on higher education, several critical gaps persist, focusing on its influence in accessibility. While much of the literature at present emphasizes the generally positive virtues of online education—flexibility and convenience—to name a few—not much has been undertaken to explore how differences exist across these advantages for various student groups, especially those that are marginalized. Although online learning would better accommodate non-traditional learners, working professionals, and those who stay farther away from institutions, it is still not guaranteed that they are benefited that much.

The most significant gap is the lack of comprehensive studies on the digital divide and its effect on equitable access to online education. Many students, especially those from low-income backgrounds or rural regions, face challenges related to limited internet access and inadequate technology, but this issue is often addressed superficially in research. Besides, although several technologies were designed to support a learner with a disability, little investigation has been undertaken on the accessibility of any given online platform or system in as far as providing services that meet their requirements in the best way.

Another gap that exists in the exploration of learning online is the lack of discussion on the social and emotional aspects of learning. In most research studies, how the absence of face-to-face interaction can affect engagement, collaboration, and retention among students remains a relatively unexplored area, especially for students who need social dynamics to succeed in their academic performance.

Filling such research gaps will make future studies, in this case, describe exactly how online learning altered accessibility in higher education even to provide suggestions for improving it.

Result Analysis:

1. Reduced Physical Infrastructure Lowers Costs

Economies in charges: The greatest reason why a virtual learning system is often cheaper compared to a system of conventional education has to do with economies in overhead requirement in respect of physical infrastructure. Overheads in the traditional education scenario are mainly costs relating to the upkeep of such buildings, classrooms and libraries, and dorms incurring very high maintenance expense. Such expenses are absorbed by the students mainly by paying higher tuition fees they pay, campus accommodation charges, and, not forget these are also used towards sustaining maintenance charges. In fact, much of these costs are removed from online learning, which enables universities to deliver cheaper options of education.

With no travel commitment, and not moving to school, students save much more money. An idea like this dodges travel expenses, accommodation, and even meal plans, taking more money off a student's back. Besides, course literature for most online classes is digitalized texts and references, which is much cheaper as compared to paper products.

With improvements in technology, online education delivery may also become cheaper. Once the online platform is set up, it is expensive, but its maintenance and scaling is much, much lower than the cost for traditional education systems. This is a key advantage of online learning - that it makes higher education more accessible to a much wider population, especially those of a lower income.

2. Flexibility in Balancing Education and Personal Commitments

Online learning offers more flexibility and convenience, thus enabling students to strike a balance between education, work, family, and other obligations. The feature of hard scheduling is missing from traditional campus-based programs, as traditional campus-based programs lack this feature because online courses offer mostly asynchronous modes of learning. For example, students can access lectures, submit assignments, and take part in a course from their comfort and time.

This flexibility is particularly valuable to non-traditional students, who are usually working professionals, parents, or those having care-giving responsibilities. For most of these students, attending a traditional college or university with fixed class times is simply not feasible. Online education offers them the opportunity to pursue higher education without sacrificing too much in their personal or professional lives. Online learning will save one's time and reduce stress by avoiding a commute to a physical location. Not only will online learning benefit students living in remote or rural areas, but it also helps students study at odd hours, be it in the morning hours or at night. This flexibility is one reason an inclusive educational system would provide opportunities for all walks of life to succeed.

3. Complementing Traditional Education with Online Learning

Online learning has not made the traditional method of education obsolete but supplemented it instead. Many educational institutions nowadays are utilizing hybrid models, in which online and on-campus activities are combined for the benefit of the students. Blended learning models provide increased flexibility for those who are forced to take their online courses yet still need face-to-face interactions in a classroom.

This brings about another impact on traditional education, as new ways of teaching and learning are introduced to the class. A course can now easily adopt digital resources that may include video lectures, interactive simulations, and discussion forums, among others. This encourages institutions to adapt more innovative pedagogical approaches toward a much greater variety of learning preferences and needs.

Adding pressures to competition in the sphere of higher education from ever-growing demand in the web

learning area, forced classic institutions again to renew their courses offer to avoid losing positions on the competitive and prestige market. On the other side, adopting modern technologies integrating elements from the web based learning will make an even more interesting and efficient way for students. Applying the best from the field of online learning directly to traditional classroom structures provides a modern education system answering to the many demands within the population of modern students.

4. Enhanced Accessibility for Students with Disabilities

Students who face various disabilities can more advantageously access education than earlier since there are customized online tools and resources. Physical disability or lack of ability also occurs in traditional classes by reason of inaccessible building sites as well as the dearth of sufficient assistive technologies in that system. These usually tend to be incorporated by technology as it designs with regards to accessibility. Elements in it include closed captioned content, screen reading content, font size is custom changeable, or they might have alternative image texts among others.

This increased access enables students who have any kind of physical, hearing, sight, or other type of learning disability to take higher education without all the obstacles one might have when trying to access college campuses. What's more, this access to virtual classes will let these same students take lessons from the comfort of home or where they are as comfortable and adjusted to those surroundings. This minimizes the requirement of accommodation and aversion to assistive devices, or the need for support staff-a whole learning experience made more fluid and empowering.

With more online learning platforms designed user-friendly, students with little to no digital literacy would be able to navigate their course materials without much stress. Online education has widened the opportunities for students who are disabled, allowing them to pursue higher education or career advancement in ways which would have been difficult and even impossible in traditional setups.

5. Promoting Educational Equity and Diverse Learning Styles

Maybe online learning has transformed the more accessible availability of higher education in terms of educational equality. It is possible with online education to offer higher education to students who perhaps would be barred from it due to geographical location, socio-economic status, among other reasons. Students across rural areas, under-advantaged communities, or across countries with a limited, underdeveloped higher learning infrastructure can take online university courses from anywhere in the world.

Such diversity in multimedia and interactive material online allows accessibility to various learning styles. Some students would want to be taught using video and infographic, while others would appreciate the simulation and text material. In online learning, the learning environment allows a student to use the material in ways that best fit their preferences to improve their comprehension and retention.

Self-paced learning in online education allows students to learn at one's own pace, that is, whether one wants to understand the complex material a little better or speed up the learning process. Such flexibility levels the playing field for learners with difficulties due to various reasons like learning disabilities, language barriers, or personal commitments. Hence, it transformed higher education into an equitably accessible framework for all kinds of learners.

Discussion on Result

Benefits discussed above for e-learning include being cost-effective, flexible, and inclusive. Physical infrastructure of online education reduced in that there is no cost incurred for buildings, maintenance, and campus resources greatly reduce the burden on the cost of the institution as well as students. Online

education is so much cheaper, especially for those students who will be studying from home and they can save money from transport, accommodation, and other books traditionally.

Flexibility is yet another offer online learning provides. Education need not come in the way of personal or professional commitments. A learner can access an asynchronous course at his or her own time, which is quite convenient for working professionals, parents, or anybody with other responsibilities. Geographical inclusivity is yet another aspect of flexibility because the students in rural or remote areas can indulge in higher education without moving places.

Hybrid models, which integrate online learning with face-to-face interaction, supplement traditional education towards the possibility of innovation in teaching methodologies. The pressure on traditional institutions to improve quality and accessibility by getting higher education has increased due to the competition that online learning poses.

Web-based platforms, therefore, allow students with disabilities to have access to tailored accessibility tools such as screen readers and closed captioning, which help reduce the physical barriers of learning, thereby making it more accessible. In addition, varied multimedia options available online will give a better fit in accommodating different learning modalities, thus reaching a wider number of diverse students. With educational equity and adaptability, online learning has revolutionized access to college education and is indispensable in modern landscapes.

Unexpected Findings

It, however presents some unwanted findings that revile the assumption that online learning benefits everyone.

Yet another shocking revelation is that despite the cost going down when it comes to cutting down the physical infrastructure, not every student can afford it due to the reason that saving is less from the pocket. The digital divide proves to be a huge hurdle for those who come from a lower class or some remote place as there would be scarce availability of high-speed internet and technology which makes them ineligible for financial savings. The same factor dents the opportunity of online learning which otherwise can be as available as possible for everybody.

One other surprising feature that has been discovered here is that flexibility in distance education can become a source for heightened feelings of isolation and separation among students. Reduced interaction and a lack of an organized social environment to function in can be detrimental effects to student engagement, especially of students who are dependent upon such dynamics to excel academically. This would lead to lowered retention rates and more demotivated students with reliance on the in-learned interaction.

While easy accessibility is often the buzzword surrounding online learning for students with disabilities, few are optimized to take full advantage of assistive technologies. Incompatible learning management systems and adaptive tools such as screen readers expose inadequacies in accessibility, so that even the promise of an online learning environment cannot be accessed by students with disabilities.

Summarizing it all, findings have a gist of portraying the strengths of online learning while suggesting troubles that unevenly affect the underrepresented and vulnerable groups.

Scope For Further Research

Although very advanced, online learning still has areas that need to be further researched for its full realization and accessibility to all students.

The first area of research is that of the digital divide. Online education cuts down on the cost of physical infrastructure and increases flexibility, but it favors those students who have stable internet and advanced technology over others. Most students come from a rural background or low-income areas and are still excluded from online education due to the lack of digital infrastructure. Studies must be conducted in order to establish the point to which digital exclusion has hindered learning outcomes and its relief tools. Various strategies may include research on how the institutions can offer affordable access to technological means or partner with the government for the improvement of internet in unserved communities.

Another area of concern is the effectiveness of online learning for students with disabilities. Though online education has provided tools for most disabilities, including closed captions and screen readers, the usability and effectiveness of these tools are yet to be extensively researched. There have been cases in which certain platforms may not be optimized for specific needs, hence accessibility problems. Further studies are therefore still needed in terms of having a more comprehensive assessment on the students with disabilities using many e-learning environments to generate standards on how such an accessible e-learning system should be developed.

The social and emotional impacts of learning through the internet are a particularly promising area of further investigation. Since online learning is flexi, many students can expect to feel isolated and alienated because they shall not see their classmates and instructors face to face. It would especially benefit students who rely on peer collaboration or structured environments for success. The long-term effect of isolation on engagement and retention in these vulnerable populations-first generation college students, international students, or students with a disability-would be fascinating. A large, additional domain is blended learning models where online learning supplements face-to-face instruction. Actually, the model provides the benefit of online learning and some classroom benefits, but again little has been written regarding how demographics play a role with this model. The next research for blended learning must be done with other student populations and further investigation into best practices in terms of what a blend of online learning and traditional learning will enhance outcomes in education more effectively.

Lastly, still more research is required into exactly how online learning affects equity in education. Though online education opens it up to the remote and most inaccessible parts of society for accessing educational services, their comparative quality is yet a vague idea. Hence, one research area may ask how effective the learning websites of e-learning have proved themselves to be in maintaining better academic and professional grounds in life for those disadvantage students compared to traditional establishments; or do the disparities, in turn, worsen on those sites?.

Filling such gaps in research will be contributions to a much more inclusive and effective system of online education that indeed democratizes access to higher education.

Conclusion

Online learning is therefore flexible and cost-effective learning which can contribute so much both to the students and their institutions. With no classrooms and dormitories needed because of online education, costs in terms of operation consequently decrease the tuition fees plus other expenses the students go through. With less in terms of commuting and staying, the financial benefits the online learning has make further education more accessible for financially challenged students.

Aside from being cost efficient, the online education offers unmatched flexibility in that it is relatively easy for a student to harmonize with personal demands and activities such as working or bringing up children. An online course is asynchronous because it allows a student access at whatever time feels

comfortable. Therefore, this is good for the non-traditional student; either that, they are busy, maybe in work, in service, or busy having babies. This also helps spread the platform of education all over, thus opening avenues for students who are stationed in different rural or far-off areas and hence giving them an inclusive education and access.

Online learning does not replace classical education in any way, but it complements such education through hybrid models incorporating the benefits of online interaction and in-person interactions. It encourages innovation in methods of teaching, which subsequently entails competition that brings quality across the board.

It has also made access easy for students with disabilities by giving them tools that meet their needs. It also helps in the promotion of educational equity by allowing opportunities for students from various backgrounds and geographic locations. It levels the playing field for all learners.

It changed the nature of higher education, lowered some costs, and provided for flexibility, access, and inclusion. It has proved amenable to an individual's mode of learning and personal circumstances that, in many ways call for greater flexibility in learning and living, particularly favorable to increasing access to opportunities for education and enhancing learning.

REFERENCES:

1. Anh, D.H.M. (2022). Factors affecting satisfaction on online education on students digital teaching page in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 179-186.
2. Knightley, W. M. (2007). Adult learners online: Students' experiences of learning online. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 47(2), 264-288.
3. Lllupar, M.L., Malones, L.J.L., Sombria, A.J.F., and Calixtro, V.L. (2022). Development of folkdance videos for e-learning. *Indonesian Journal of Teaching in Science*, 2(1), 1-6
4. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., and Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-47.
5. Morze, N., Varchenko-Trotsenko, L., Terletska, T., and Smyrnova-Trybulska, E. (2021). Implementation of adaptive learning at higher education institutions by means of Moodle LMS. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1840(1), 012062.
6. Phanse, S. (2021). The online education impact on students during covid- 19 pandemic. *Indonesian Journal of Teaching in Science*, 1(2), 137-140.
7. Adams, J. (2007). Then and now: Lessons from history concerning the merits and problems of distance education. *Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education*, 7(1), 1–14. doi:10.3138/sim.7.1.002
8. Agassiz, E. C. (1971). Society to encourage studies at home. In O. Mackenzie & E. L. Christensen (Eds.), *The changing world of correspondence study* (pp. 27–30). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
9. Allen, I., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States*. Oakland, CA: Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group.
10. Allen, I., & Seaman, J. (2014). *Grade change: Tracking online learning in the United States*. Babson Park, MA: Sloan-C™.
11. Asunka, S. (2008). Online learning in higher education in sub-Saharan Africa: Ghanaian university students' experiences and perceptions. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 9(3), 1-23.

12. Athabasca University (2015). Mission & Mandate. Retrieved from <http://www.athabascau.ca/aboutau/mission/>
13. Bates, A. W. (2005). *Technology, e-learning and distance education* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
14. Bates, T. (2008). Transforming distance education through new technologies. In T. Evans, M. Haughey, & D. Murphy (Eds.), *International handbook of distance education* (pp. 217–236). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
15. Baggaley, J. (2008). Where did distance education go wrong? *Distance Education*, 29, 39–51. doi:10.1080/01587910802004837
16. Baggaley, J. (2013). MOOC rampant. *Distance Education*, 34, 368–378. doi:10.1080/01587919.2013.835768
17. Bayne, S. (2015). What's the Matter with “Technology-Enhanced Learning”? *Learning, Media and Technology*, 40(1), 5-20. Bayne, S., Knox, S., & Ross, J. (2015). Open education: The need for a critical approach. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 40(3), 247-250.
18. Battalio, J. (2007). Interaction online: A reevaluation. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8, 339–352.
19. Beldarrain, Y. (2006). Distance education trends: Integrating new technologies to foster student interaction and collaboration. *Distance Education*, 27, 139–153. doi:10.1080/01587910600789498
20. Bergmann, H. F. (2001). The silent university: The society to encourage studies at home, 1873-1897. *New England Quarterly*, 74, 447–477.
21. Black, L. M. (2013). A history of scholarship. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (3rd ed., pp. 21–37). New York, NY: Routledge.
22. Bolger, M. (2009). Globalization: An opportunity for the “uneducated” to become “learned” or further “excluded”? In U. Bernath, A. Szücs, A. Tait, & M. Vidal (Eds.), *Distance and e-learning in transition: Learning innovation, technology and social challenges* (pp. 303–310). London, UK: ISTE Ltd.
23. Bonk, C. (2009). *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
24. Bonk, C., Lee, M. M., Reeves, T. C., & Reynolds, T. H. (Eds.). (2015). *MOOCs and open education around the world*. New York, NY: Routledge.
25. Brabazon, T. (2007). Mobile learning: The iPodification of universities. *Nebula*, 4, 119–130.
26. Bradshaw, J. (2014, Jan 13). Ontario to launch \$42-million central hub for online postsecondary classes. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/ontario-to-launch-central-hub-for-online-postsecondary-classes/article16299333/>
27. Burge, E. J., & Polec, J. (2008). Transforming learning and teaching in practice: Where change and consistency interact. In T. Evans, M. Haughey & D. Murphy (Eds.), *International handbook of distance education* (pp. 237–258). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
28. Byrne, T. C. (1989). *Athabasca University: The evolution of distance education*. Calgary, Canada: University of Calgary Press.
29. Canadian Council on Learning. (2009). *State of E-learning in Canada*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Council on Learning.
30. Choi, H., Lee, Y., Jung, I., & Latchem, C. (2013). The extent of and reasons for not re-enrollment: A case of Korean National Open University. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 14(4), Retrieved from

<http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1314>

31. Cleveland-Innes, M. F., & Garrison, D. R. (Eds.). (2010). An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era. New York, NY: Routledge.
32. Cleveland-Innes, M. F., & Sangrá, A. (2010). Leadership in a new era of higher distance education. In M. F. Cleveland-Innes & D. R. Garrison (Eds.), An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era (pp. 227–247). New York, NY: Routledge.
33. Contact North. (2012). Online learning in Canada: At a tipping point, a cross-country check-up 2012. Thunder Bay, Canada: Contact North.
34. Daniel, J. (2012). Making sense of MOOCs: Musings in a maze of myth, paradox and possibility. Seoul, South Korea: Korean National Open University
35. Daniel, J. & Killion, D. (2012, July 4). Are open educational resources the key to global economic growth.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/higher-education-network/blog/2012/jul/04/open-educational-resources-and-economic-growth>
36. Daniel, S. J. (1999). Mega universities and knowledge media. London, UK: Kogan Page.
37. Davies, R. S., Howell, S.L., & Petrie, J. A. (2010). A review of trends in distance education scholarship at research universities in North America, 1998-2008. International Review of Research in <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/876/1607>
38. Edwards, R. (1995). Different discourses, discourse of difference: Globalisation, distance education and open learning. Distance Education, 4, 27–39. doi:10.1080/0158791950160206
39. Edwards, R. (2008). Actively seeking subjects? In A. Pejes & K. Nicoll (Eds.), Foucault and lifelong learning: Governing the subjects (pp. 21–33). New York, NY: Routledge.
40. Elloumi, F. (2004). Value chain analysis: A strategic approach to online learning. In T. Anderson & F. Elloumi (Eds.), Theory and practice of online learning (pp. 61-98). Athabasca, Canada: Athabasca University.
41. Evans, T., Haughey, M., & Murphy, D. (Eds.). (2008). International handbook of distance education. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
42. Evans, T., & Pauling, B. (2010). The future of distance education: Reformed, scrapped or recycled. In M. F. Cleveland-Innes & D. R. Garrison (Eds.), An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era (pp. 198–223). New York, NY: Routledge.
43. Feenberg, A. (1992). Subversive rationalization: Technology, power, and democracy. Inquiry, 35, 301–322. doi:10.1080/00201749208602296
44. Foucault, M. (1985). The history of sexuality, Vol. 2: The use of pleasure. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage. (Original work published 1984)
45. Foucault, M. (1990). The history of sexuality, volume 1: An introduction. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage. (Original work published 1976)
46. Foucault, M. (1995). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage. (Original work published 1977)
47. Garrison, D. R., & Cleveland-Innes, M. F. (2010). Foundations of distance education. In M. F. Cleveland-Innes & D. R. Garrison (Eds.), An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era (pp. 13–25). New York, NY: Routledge.
48. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2008). Changing distance education and changing organizational issues. In W. J. Bramble & S. Panda (Eds.), Economics of distance and online learning: Theory, pract-

- ice, and research (pp. 132–147). New York, NY: Routledge.
49. Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
 50. Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Toronto, Canada: Between the Lines.
 51. Guglielmo, T. (1998). Computer conferencing systems as seen by a designer of online courses. *Educational Technology*, 38 (3), 36-43.
 52. Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2009a). *Digital technologies in higher education: Sweeping expectations and actual effects*. New York, NY: Nova Science.
 53. Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2009b). Challenges facing distance education in the 21st century. In U. Bernath, A. Szücs, A. Tait, & M. Vidal (Eds.), *Distance and e-learning in transition: Learning innovation, technology and social challenges* (pp. 5–22). London, UK: ISTE Ltd.
 54. Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2009c). Distance education in the digital age: Common misconceptions and challenging tasks. *Journal of Distance Education*, 23, 105–122.
 55. Hamilton, E., & Friesen, N. (2013). Online education: A science and technology studies perspective. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 39(2). Retrieved from <http://cjlt.csj.ualberta.ca/index.php/cjlt/index>
 56. Harasim, L. (2000). Shift happens: Online education as a new paradigm in learning. *Internet and Higher Education*, 3, 41–61. doi:10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00032-4
 57. Harasim, L. (2012). *Learning theory and online technologies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
 58. Harris, D. (2008). Transforming distance education: In whose interests? In T. Evans, M. Haughey, & D. Murphy (Eds.), *International handbook of distance education* (pp. 417–432). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
 59. Harting, K., & Erthal, M., J. (2005). History of distance learning. *Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal*, 23(1), 35–43.
 60. Haughey, M. (2008). Section I: Diversity in distance education: Introduction. In T. Evans, M. Haughey, & D. Murphy (Eds.), *International handbook of distance education* (pp. 25–28). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
 61. Haughey, M. (2010). Teaching and learning in distance education before the digital age. In M. F. Cleveland-Innes & D. R. Garrison (Eds.), *An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era* (pp. 46–66). New York, NY: Routledge.
 62. Haughey, M., Evans, T., & Murphy, D. (2008). Introduction: From correspondence to virtual learning environments. In T. Evans, M. Haughey, & D. Murphy (Eds.), *International handbook of distance education* (pp. 1–10). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
 63. Holmberg, B. (1995). *Theory and practice of distance education* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
 - Hughes, B. B., & Hillebrand, E. E. (2006). *Exploring and shaping international futures*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
 64. Hülsmann, T. (2009). Access and efficiency in the development of distance education and e-learning. In U. Bernath, A. Szücs, A. Tait, & M. Vidal (Eds.), *Distance and e-learning in transition: Learning innovation, technology and social challenges* (pp. 119–140). London, UK: ISTE Ltd.
 65. Ice, P. (2010). The future of learning technologies: Transformational developments. In M. F. Cleveland-Innes & D. R. Garrison (Eds.), *An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era* (pp. 137–164). New York, NY: Routledge.

66. Jonassen, D. H. (1991). Objectivism versus constructivism: Do we need a new philosophical paradigm? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 39(3), 5-14.
67. Kanuka, H., & Brooks, C. (2010). Distance education in a post-Fordist time: Negotiating difference. In M. F. Cleveland-Innes & D. R. Garrison (Eds.), *An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era* (pp. 69–90). New York, NY: Routledge.
68. Keegan, D. (1980). On defining distance education. *Distance Education*, 1, 13–36. doi:10.1080/0158791800010102
69. Keegan, D. (1988). Problems in defining the field of distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 2(2), 4–11. doi:10.1080/08923648809526619
70. Keegan, D. (Ed.). (1993). *Theoretical principles of distance education*. London, UK: Routledge.
71. Keegan, D. (1996). *The foundations of distance education*. London, UK: Croom Helm.
72. Knowles, M. (1985). *Andragogy in action*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
73. Knox, J. (2013). Five critiques of the open educational resources movement. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(8), 821-832.
74. Larreamendy-Joerns, J., & Leinhardt, G. (2006). Going the distance with online education. *Review of Educational Research*, 76, 567–605. doi: 10.3102/00346543076004567
75. Laurillard, D. (2016). The educational problem that MOOCs could solve: Professional development for teachers of disadvantaged students. *Research in Learning Technology*, 24. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v24.29369>
76. Lee, K. (2015). Discourses and realities of online higher education: a history of [discourses of] online education in Canada's Open University. University of Toronto. Retrieved from http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/77614/1/Lee_Kyungmee_201511_PhD_thesis.pdf.
77. Lefranc, R. (1984). The openness of open learning. *Educational Media International*, 21(3), 3–7. doi:10.1080/09523988408548774
78. Levin, J. S. (2007). *Nontraditional students and community colleges*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
79. Lewis, M. (2008). Public good or private value: A critique of the commodification of knowledge in higher education—A Canadian perspective. In J. E. Canaan & W. Shumar (Eds.), *Structure and agency in the neoliberal university* (45-66). New York, NY: Routledge.