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Abstract:

The debate is whether distance learning is better or worse than traditional face-to-face (f2f) learning has been continued for last few decades. Opponents of Online/ distance learning mode of learning (Garrison, 1987; Jeffries, 1996; Fox, 1998; Phipps and Merisotis, 1999; Fitzpatrick, 2001); supporters of online mode of learning. (Beare, 1989; McCleary and Egan, 1989; Kabat and Friedel, 1990; Souder, 1993; Freeman, 1995; Mortensen, 1995; Heines & Hulse, 1996; Schutte, 1996; Gubernick and Ebeling, 1997; Bartlett, 1997; McKissack, 1997; Bothun, 1998; Sonner, 1999) However, both opponents and supporters concur to conclude that any method which suits to learner’s learning style enable him/her to achieve highest score at higher education level.
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1. Introduction

Since the inception of schooling that itself emerged from ‘factory model’ (Tomlinson 2000) in 18th century, the teaching and learning activities were restricted in school premises only. Either for Early Childhood Development (ECD) group to primary and secondary levels and to high schools or colleges, classrooms are meant to be essential place where teacher and students’ interaction is mandatory. Mostly in ‘traditional classrooms’ (Shachar & Neumann 2003) students’ interaction is pivotal for effective learning, as students learn a lot from teachers’ experiences. According to Fox (1998) students learn far too little when the teacher’s personal presence is not available because the student has more to learn from the teacher than the texts.

On the other hand, twenty first century classrooms challenge the ‘traditional’ teacher-centred curriculum (Shachar & Neumann 2003) that cannot meet the diverse needs of learners; it is important to acknowledge that each student has unique learning style that cannot be flourished through ‘only-one’ standard classroom instructions. (Thompson, 2003) Furthermore, ‘teacher centred approach’ encourages ‘transfer of knowledge’ (McDonald 2002) where students’ innate abilities become less important as compared to teachers’ experience in terms of knowledge and competence.

Berliner (as cited in Scherer, 2001) states that in teachers’ centred approach students only able to learn what teachers’ skills and competences are. If the teacher is ‘expert’ than that could bring reasonable changes in the lives of students; otherwise, novice teacher cannot deliver the quality input due to lack of his/her knowledge both in terms of content and pedagogy i.e. knowledge of how to teach. For many years, educationists, psychologists and philosophers have been debating upon the notion of ‘learner’s autonomy’ in charting out what he/she wishes to learn regardless of whether he achieves this through ‘teacher centred approach’ or ‘learner centred approach’. (Perkins, 1994; McCombs, 1997; Singham, 1998; McCombs & Whisler, 1997; Tomlinson, 2000; Altan and Trombly, 2001; Milamb 2001; Winograd, 2002; Henderson and Hawthorne, 2002; McDonald, 2002 & 2003; Thompson,2003; Marzano, 2003; Haycock, 2003; Blackwell, Futrell, and Imig, 2003)
However, these two approaches demand strong competence in teachers for both having command in content knowledge and strong understanding of pedagogical skills to be able to create an environment essential for learning and to become proficient to respond to students’ individual queries time to time. Consequently, the main responsibility lies on teachers’ shoulder in opting for learner’s centred approach or teachers’ centred approach. Within the educational circle, practitioners have been engaged extensively to find the pathway to encourage teachers to reflection on below questions while preparing themselves for 21st century teaching for creating learning environment suitable to learners’ needs.

Reflection time!

- Can children be able to chart out what they wish to learn and achieve in life?
- Do we have qualified professional who allow children to pursue their choice in learning?
- Can we create ample opportunities for early years, primary middle and high school students to experience free learning?
- Will the notion of free or flexible learning be compatible with conventional/ traditional education delivery methods, if yes then how, if no then what could be the alternative to it?
- Whether complete autonomy is possible for students, if no then why not and if yes, then which age or level of learning is permissible for free learning?

It is essential for teachers, educators, school leadership and other practitioners to undertake an inquiry on the notion of flexible learning environment and ways to adapt their teaching and learning environment at least at higher education level comprises from high school/college to universities level. The next section is devoted to unpack the notion of flexible learning environment specifically at the higher education level where learners are making their choices themselves and with the commencement of smart technological equipments partaking in local as well as global initiatives.

2. The notion of Flexible learning environment

“Flexible Learning” according to Vuori (2001) is most important feature of learning, where learners apply his/her prior knowledge, experiences, their perspectives, backgrounds, talents, interests, capacities and heredity(McCombs (1997) to construct new meaning for him or herself. Does ‘traditional classroom’ (Shachar & Neumann 2003) facilitate flexible learning environment to learners? Will flexible learning be possible in the classrooms, then how do we respond to the century old claim that ‘learning takes place “anywhere,” at “anytime,” in “any pace”. (Shachar & Neumann 2003) Supporters and practitioners of Online/ distance learning claim that by Online/ distance learning mode of delivery, students get maximum opportunities of ‘flexible learning’ (Vuori 2001) on their own pace which otherwise is not possible in traditional mode of learning. As in traditional classrooms, the scheduled time table demands from each student to study a particular concept at particular time, or finish the verbal or written task at standard time. On the contrary, in Online/ distance learning mode of delivery, students time their work based on their own pace and capacity which is instrumental in ensuring their efficiency in preparing them as life long learners. Moreover, in Online/ distance learning mode of delivery students are not required to be physically present in the campuses of their colleges/ universities; they are not geographically limited to any location rather through online learning programs they can participate in any course without residential requirements. Though the opponents of Online/ distance learning agree with the notion of ‘flexible learning’ but Fox (1998) argues whether through non-conventional methods students will be able to experience the ‘fullness of learning’ that is cultivated through traditional (Shachar & Neumann, 2003) mode of learning by teachers’ presence. What constitute ‘Flexible Learning”? According to Murdoch University Academic Council (in Vuori 2001:7), ‘Flexible Learning’ aims to ‘provide a teaching and learning environment that supports a range of accessible delivery methods and different learning modes to optimize the learning opportunities of students’. To ensure the ‘Flexible Learning environment’ to learners, Vuori (2001) proposes the following resources to be essential in building the required environment:

a. Infrastructure and resources requirement,
b. ‘Students’ and faculty’ needs, and
c. Day to day management of flexible learning environment
(i) Resources and infrastructure requirement for "Flexible Learning" environment are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources requirement for &quot;Flexible Learning&quot; environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Network infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Telecommunication infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ICT support and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online access to other university resources (library) etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training for users and curriculum developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unit development and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional Academic staff time for communication with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administration support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Resources for flexible learning environment

(ii) Students’ needs consist of how students would like to receive their instructions and study materials, Vuori (2001) proves that students showed variety of options as in one of his research case study, 43.5% out of 100% asked for hard copies of instructional material instead of online instruction manuals. The details are as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred form</th>
<th>Numerical</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy (study guide and readers)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary on-line</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine hard copy + on-line</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good as they are</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like audio tapes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Preferred form of unit materials

(iii) Teaching faculty requires regular support from administrative and ICT staff, as they have to develop quality instructional materials for learners. Effective interactive teaching with heavy assignments is indeed demanding because face-to-face (f2f) teaching is entirely different from on-line classrooms. The most challenging task for faculty is to consider students’ preference for bringing novelty in lectures, updating instructional materials; also seeking support from ‘web authoring experts’ to upload instructional materials on internet and other online software’ structures. Hence, the entire teaching program becomes demanding and time consuming.

(iv) Day to day management to endorse flexible learning environment is also challenging, where a continuous effort is required to update instructional and study materials on web. Uploading the simple word processing format on web format consumes time and technical skills, for instance, Table ‘3’ presents one cycle of information sharing to the target audience, and there are multiple processes of encoding and decoding to it.

Table 3: Typical production cycle for online learning environment

According to Waits & Lewis (2003) all universities in developing countries also plan to offer online programs within few years. However, Vuori (2001) has proposed a list of resources to promote ‘flexible learning environment’, but availability of qualified skilled people in all universities is quite critical because almost all major universities are offering on-lines programs. (Tucker, 2001) As Vuori (2001) argues that all forms of instructional materials should be available for students if university claims that it provides flexible learning environment for higher education; however, it is equally important to discuss who will bear the cost of flexibility. Will all stakeholders including government bodies, education leagues, universities, parents, and students as most of them will be mid career professional and working would agree to contribute their share for the development and initiation of the flexible learning environment at higher education level. Secondly, though at present one is questioning flexible learning environment for higher education in
developed countries, but will developing countries be able to provide such flexible learning environment in near future as they have been struggling to provide the basic infrastructure as their basic needs are yet to be met? More importantly, getting and retaining qualified and skilled people will also be critical issue for the universities, as besides faculty, these web authoring experts are equally essential for endorsing ‘flexible learning environment’.

However, the notion of ‘flexible learning environment’ is sophisticated but certain elements of this environment can be merged into non-conventional/ alternative education delivery methods for higher education.

3. Traditional education delivery method at Higher Education level

The traditional education delivery method in Higher Education has always been in a classroom setting with students taking notes and professor giving a lecture or a talk. These ‘interactions’ between professor and students were viewed as ‘essential learning element within the arrangement’ and recognized as ‘sage on the stage’. (O’Malley and McCraw, 1999)

4. Technological pressure on Higher Education System in present era

“The rapid growth of end-user computing, low-cost communication and the development of the Internet have lead to a surge of online courses. In light of this, many educators still await the promise of technology’s power to improve teaching effectiveness.” (Volery, 2001:77)

According to ‘E-learning essentials’ at the World Wide Web, education delivery method through E-learning has various types, which includes totally on-line instructions with no face-to-face (F2F) meetings, or a blended learning of both online and face-to-face (F2F) or web based study etc. The teaching of E-Learning is possible either by using World Wide Web (WWW) network or by Compact Disks (CD-ROM). Some common web based delivery methods that are used for higher learning/ education systems are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web based delivery methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Streaming video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Video tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Satellite transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Streaming audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audio tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asynchronous communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Threaded discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Web log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Synchronous communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Videoconferencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teleconferencing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Advancement in technology such as printing machines, postal services, telecommunication, telephone, radio, television and recently the internet, mobile technology and virtual environment have been a driving force in promoting alternative methods of learning. (Shachar & Neumann 2003) These new methods have become essential
modes to deliver online learning/ distance learning to all. With regard to developing countries, online/ distance learning through alternative methods will be suitable option to engage underprivileged people in basic literacy, who otherwise cannot afford ‘traditional classrooms’ (Shachar & Neumann 2003) for getting basic or further education.

5. Readiness for Online/ distance learning method for Higher Education (HE)

The term ‘distance education’ used to describe the geographical distance between teacher and learners (Gallagher and McCormick, 1999) or any medium of exchange, where communication between instructor and learners cannot be possible face-to-face (f2f) and they need either print media or other technological tool to communicate among themselves. (Jordan, Algozzine, and Spooner, 1999; Perraton, 1988; Keegan, 1986; Garrison and Shale, 1987, as cited in Sherry, 1996 and also Moore and Thompson, 1997, as cited in Spooner, 1999) Online/ distance learning experts questioned conventional methods of teaching by calling it “Residential based model” of education (Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier, 1999; Drucker, 1997), as cited in O’Malley (1999); where students attend classes at allotted timings and at familiar locations. According to them, the notion of tradition classroom confines learning within school or college’s boundaries where as learning can takes place “anywhere,” at “anytime,” in “any pace” (Shachar & Neumann 2003) which is possible to achieve through the Online/ distance learning delivery method only. On the other hand, Phipps and Merisotis (1999) question the Online/ distance learning delivery method, as they claim, ‘there is a relative paucity of true, original research dedicated to explaining or predicting phenomena related to distance learning’. (Phipps and Merisotis, 1999:2) The notion of Online/ distance learning got acceptance with the commencement of radio, television, telecommunication, print and other technological media; and during the 1990s with the advancement and significant growth of ‘computer mediated learning technology’ i.e. two-way interactive audio and video exchanges, ‘web- based synchronous communication’ and ‘internet web based instructions’ both online and offline interaction was made possible. (Phipps and Merisotis, 1999; Ponzurick et al., 2000; Sherry, 1996; Wernet et al., 2000; Setaro, 2000 and (Alavi, Yoo & Vogel, 1997; Rahm & Reed, 1997; Arbaugh, 2000)

6. The appropriateness of Online/ distance learning method at Higher Education level

‘Students who self-select into online courses tend to be independent learners and prefer conceptual learning styles. Students that prefer traditional classrooms tend to be more dependent, exhibiting a preference for social and applied learning styles’ (Diaz & Cartnal, 1999: 132)

Despite the well-built criticism against Online/ distance learning, as Phipps & Merisotis (1999) state that ‘technology cannot replace the human factor in education’; many educators are reviewing the option of choosing Online/ distance learning method as a common tool for teaching and learning at higher education level. (Mondy, Noe, and Premeaux, 1999; Dessler, 1997; Westwood, 2001) This method of instruction will certainly enable the tutors to reach to the relevant audience including educators, full-time students, part time learners and other stakeholders.

Online/ distance learning has appeared as ‘new delivery method in education’ (Shachar & Neumann 2003) which has changed the physical environment of massive building into virtual environment. In addition, with the increasing accessibility of Distance Education’ curriculum and experts for all types of training and development, not only to students but also to business people and others, that endorses the popularity of this mode around the globe. (Shachar & Neumann 2003);

Now a days, Online/ distance learning method is preferred over traditional way of training the people. (Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier, 1999; Drucker, 1997 as cited in O’Malley, 1999 and lavi, Yoo & Vogel, 1997; Rahm & Reed, 1997; Arbaugh, 2000) ‘Traditional campus classroom instructor system’ was transformed into larger, much bigger, better and flexible interactive technology i.e. World Wide Web using innovative forms of instruction at ‘decentralized’ locations. (Ponzurick et al., 2000; Hall, 2002) ‘Technology mediated learning’ (Webster and Hackley, 1997) facilitates students in many ways such as cost of different courses of higher studies, information that can be shared to multiple stakeholders around the globe in order to seek expertise. Though the notion of Online/ distance learning is a century old phenomenon, (Phipps and Merisotis, 1999; Ponzurick, Russo, and Logar, 2000; Sherry, 1996; Wernet, Olliges, and Delicath, 2000) and this notion was mostly opted for higher education studies including college and university education; thus far it has not transformed college or university level teaching to its fullest even in developed countries. (Phipps and Merisotis, 1999; Ponzurick, Russo, and Logar, 2000; Sherry, 1996; Wernet, Olliges, and Delicath, 2000)
7. Online/ distance learning and quality assurance in Higher Education Studies

Many Online/ distance learning practitioners, educational technologists, and stakeholders including students and their parents questioning about the efficacy of learning using distance learning mode. (Bangert-Drowns and Rudner, 1991) Students who use Online/ distance learning mode are generally older, employed and pay their own tuition fee. Those students who use face-to-face (f2f) mode of learning are either dependent on their parents or caretakers financially. (Fox, 1998)

According to ‘traditional’ school of thought, unlike Online/ distance learning, face-to-face (f2f) method of learning has all its merit where teacher students’ interaction, along with traditional instructional program and assessment has major impact on students’ learning. (Bangert-Drowns and Rudner, 1991)

During 1952 and 1992, extensive researches were conducted on Online/ distance learning to compare and examine its efficacy both in terms of planning, development and implementation with face-to-face (f2f) mode of instruction; but the outcomes from the research study informed not much difference between Online/ distance learning and traditional mode of teaching in classrooms. (DeSantis, 2002)

Noble (1997) is a critic of Online/ distance learning and name this virtual or online learning as “digital diploma mills”; (Phipps & Merisotis, 1999) preferred traditional learning to Online/ distance learning. Phipps and Merisotis” (1999) reported while reviewing the Online/ distance learning programs:

‘With few exceptions, the bulk of these writings suggest that the learning outcomes of students using technology at a distance are similar to the learning outcomes of students who participate in conventional classroom instruction. The attitudes and satisfaction of students using distance education also are characterized as generally positive. Most of these studies conclude that, regardless of the technology used, distance education courses compare favourably with classroom-based instruction and enjoy high student satisfaction’.

Gallagher and McCormick (1999) as cited in Shachar & Neumann (2003:4) focused on four domains to examine the effectiveness of Online/ distance learning initiatives:

1. ‘Student attitude and satisfaction regarding delivery of coursework’;
2. ‘Interactions of students and faculty during delivery of coursework’;
3. ‘Student outcomes in distance education coursework’; and
4. ‘Faculty satisfaction with delivery and coursework’.

In Addition, Spooner et al. (1999) as cited in Shachar & Neumann (2003:4) also analyzed Online/ distance learning studies based on the following two comparative factors as:

1. ‘Cognitive factors, i.e. amount of learning, academic performance, achievement, and examination and assignment grades’; and
2. ‘Other factors i.e. student satisfaction, comfort, convenience, and communication with instructor, interaction and collaboration between students, independence, and perceptions of effectiveness’.

8. Comparison between Online/ distance learning and Face-to-Face(F2F) modes of learning at Higher Education level

Wegner et al., (1999), Dellana, C., and West, (2000) and Russell (2002) examined various studies on Online/ distance learning and concluded ‘no significant difference phenomenon’ between Online/ distance learning as compared to traditional mode of education and teaching & learning. Another research study proved that ‘Students using technology through Online/ distance learning have similar learning outcomes to students in the traditional classroom setting’. (Beare 1989; McCleary & Egan 1989; Sonner 1999)

Though Wegner et al.(1999), Dellana, C., and West, (2000) and Russell (2002) proved that there is ‘no such significant difference phenomenon’ between Online/ distance learning and Face-to-face(F2F) modes of learning. In later years Unal, Z. (2005) conducted a research study to capture the contrast between two modes of learning; his meticulous findings between the two showed the following comparison:

Comparison between Online/ distance learning and Face-to-Face (F2F) modes of learning
The course was a success

Very satisfied from the course and instructor

Course content was appropriate to their major and level

The course improved their computer knowledge and skills

Posting materials online helps them to review

Instructor help is a main factor to success

Step by step instruction helps them learn effectively

They enjoyed online projects especially Web-Quest and Web-lesson

If this course offered online, the students should be informed before enrolling the course to make right decision

Most of them would not take this course, if offered online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom based learning</th>
<th>Online learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional mode of learning</td>
<td>Non-Conventional mode of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course was a success</td>
<td>The course was a success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied from the course and instructor</td>
<td>Very satisfied from the course, instructor and course website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content was appropriate to their major and level</td>
<td>Course content was appropriate to their major and level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course improved their computer knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Discussion board was the main tool for them to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting materials online helps them to review</td>
<td>They did not have any technical problem reaching the course website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor help is a main factor to success</td>
<td>Instructor answered questions promptly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step by step instruction helps them learn effectively</td>
<td>The layout of the course on the course website was very useful and help them to navigate easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They enjoyed online projects especially Web-Quest and Web-lesson</td>
<td>The course handbook was a big help and a must for the future online course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparison between Online/ distance learning and Face-to-Face (F2F) modes of learning (Unal 2005)

Even the tutor belongs to conventional method promoted non-conventional methods of education delivery to attract students towards learning. It is indeed difficult to restrict the learner with traditional mode of learning only especially at the higher education level with such a fast pace moving world along with global pressure in present times.

9. Use of technology in developing and developed countries

The major shift from traditional learning method to distance/ online learning mode is due to increasing use of technology both in developing and developed countries. As Wetzel (2009) pointed out that ‘non traditional’ adults are the driving force of bringing alternative education delivery methods, furthermore, based on April 2001 study of internet hosts and users: a regional representation, almost 17.8% people from Asia only use internet for formal or informal exchanges, which is the second highest after North America. Though the below figures have been restricted to year 2001 and today the numbers must have increased three to four times high, however, it is clearly evident that today online mode of learning is not seen as matter of choice, rather it has become as ‘only choice’ that also complements the traditional classrooms today as illustrated by Unal (2005).

Internet Hosts and Users by Country: A Regional representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Internet host (000)</th>
<th>Internet users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>265 (0.2%)</td>
<td>2,901 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>8,929 (7.86%)</td>
<td>70,073 (17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>20,309 (17.9%)</td>
<td>89,066 (22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>2,062 (1.8%)</td>
<td>17,227 (4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>467 (0.4%)</td>
<td>1,538 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South America & 1,264 (1.1\%) & 16,593 (4.2\%) \\ North America & 80,299 (70.7\%) & 194,556 (49.3\%) \\ Total & 113,595 (100\%) & 394,573 (100\%)

Table 6: Telecordia Internet Sizer Site http://www.netsizer.com/

10. Conclusion:

Wetzel (2009:1) believes that Adults themselves are the driving force of bringing non-conventional education delivery methods in higher education (HE). ‘Adult education is changing to meet student demands by offering flexible schedules, expansion of online degrees, increasing financial opportunities etc’.

In Wetzel’s paper ‘Adults Influence Change in Continuing Education: Higher Education (HE) is being redefined by ‘Non-Traditional Students’, he advocates that students who intend to seek Higher Education and do not want to follow the path of college studies immediately after high school are actually the creator of ‘non-conventional education delivery methods to continue their higher education studies. (Wetzel 2009)

He propagates that all those students who pursue college studies immediate after finishing higher school are actually ‘Traditional’ students, thus ‘traditional’ students support traditional education delivery methods and ‘Non-Traditional’ students promote ‘Non-Conventional Education Delivery Methods to pursue their higher education studies. (Wetzel 2009)
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