Introduction and Attributes of Meaningful Learning Using Technology (MLT)

Sam Eldakak

February 27, 2012

MEANINGFUL LEARNING USING TECHNOLOGY

Meaningful student learning

Computers can help the range of ways learners build up their own perception. Students who collect data from the Internet can be self-directed and independent. They can select sources to study and the connections to follow. Relying on the bounds laid down by teachers, the students may be in full control of their subjects and their studies.

Students can take a computer-based activity at their own pace. Instead of scores of students working together on one activity, technology helps independent execution of work. Those who start to fail to keep up can get an instructor's individualized assistance while others can start to deal with more difficult tasks.

Computer software can combine text, pictures, sound, and motion to offer various choices for students. Multimedia software will not be the only classroom resource, but it can contribute richness and variety to student work.

Students can build on their own understanding by using computers as resource tools, as workstations for individual learning, or as communication means to share their thoughts with other students. Individual perception and experiences must be shared and evaluated to program content. By recognizing students' individual perceptions, teachers can find out the impact of students' past understanding and promote their education through new skill.

Computers can be utilized to help active events collecting information and resources, discussing with colleagues, struggling through a challenging problem or application--or they can help in deliberation. For instance, despite the fact that an on-line discussion through

electronic mail is an active event, such discussions generally induce deliberations. They assist us think about thoughts and check the understanding. In another thoughtful application, teachers can use computers as making tools for students' journals which are outstanding medium for reflective examination of event.

Introducing technology into the learning setting can support cooperative learning and student teamwork. If they are permitted to discuss, the majority of students like to discuss their computer work and share their methods. Classroom activities are planned so that computers support collaboration develops learners' need to converse and share their perception. It takes planning and involvement to create successful cooperative groups with or without computers, however groups that use computers as collaboration tools have a better advantage towards shared work.

Outside the classroom setting, computer networking helps students to converse and collaborate with content professionals and with fellow students all over the world. Communication tools namely electronic mail, listservs, bulletin boards, and chat groups help teachers to exchange lesson plans and teaching methods and create a skilled community.

The utilization of real world tools, appropriate experiences, and important data introduce a sense of purpose to classroom activity. Part of the assignment of educational institutes is to produce workforce-ready scholars who can, among other things, use and study raw data, significantly assess data, and run hardware and software. This technological literacy gives a very important set of occupational skills that will help students well in the working world.

Technology has facilitated schools to offer greater support to conventionally underserved populations. Assistive technology for example voice recognition systems,

dynamic Braille displays, speech synthesizers, and talking books offer learning and communication options for those who have developmental or physical problems. Study (Brooks & Brooks, 1993) has also confirmed that computer-mediated communication can help the social isolation that may be faced by those with disabilities. Computers have shown successful in raising academic motivation and decreasing apprehension amongst low ability students and teaching disabled students, many of whom just learn in a manner different from that followed in a traditional, non-technological classroom environment.

The Role of the Student

Students in technology-supported classrooms are equipped with influential tools to help them collect data, discuss with colleagues, and present their findings. Their independence and confidence rise as they depend less on their teacher and more on their own inventiveness for knowledge-design. Technology helps students to use data in a manner that quickens both understanding and the progression of higher-order reflection abilities. As students collect more real-world information, share their findings with students outside their school, and write their findings to the world, their role widens from researchers of other products to designers, authors, suppliers, and publishers of their own work.

USING TECHNOLOGY

a. Intentionality

Core aspects of the consequential learning model as related in the context of web-based learning comprises of activity, intentionality, constructivism, collaboration, dialogue, reflection and contextuality. First, activity signifies that the point of departure for any learning procedure is that the student involves in the careful processing of data and recognizes his/her

responsibility for learning (Jonassen et al., 2000). Second, the standard of activity suggests that interactivity is helped in a web-based learning setting. This implies that an activity in a web-based setting may be raised through features which support students to make use of search tools, study data, and establish personal working files. Third, learning is intentional when learners vigorously and persistently set cognitive aims and work toward their accomplishment. Web-based learning settings accordingly need to have the tools for the design, summarize and assessment of learning, both for persons and groups, so as to support intentionality (Jonassen, 1995; Jonassen & al. 2000)

Web-based settings were thought to have the characteristics vital to support the learners' intentionality and goal targets. The teachers differentiated between diverse kinds of objectives, i.e. those created by the teacher and founded on the curriculum, and the students' own learning targets. Studying in a web-based setting was considered as being demanding enough, and without personal objectives, the teachers thought that the students would not have the resolve to finish the course. The teachers suggested that dropping out is simpler when the students remain unidentified in the learning setting. The role of the teacher in helping the students to establish their individual learning aims was considered as being vital with the aim of facilitating student self-control. Nevertheless, web-based learning as such was not considered as assuring that the students would show intentionality in their studying

b. Content Centrality

The centrality of contents in Web-supported academic course curriculum can be judged by the studies of the most accessible tools by teachers who used the Internet in their teaching (Bonk, 2001). Results demonstrate that over 70% of the teachers used tools for

uploading files to their websites. An analogous percentage of teachers used websites to offer suggestions, supplements to the lectures, and the course curriculum.

Cummings et al. (2002) thought that presentation of educational contents on the Internet is highly important for students, who take pleasure in visual presentation of data, comments, and supplements to materials educated in instructions. Nevertheless, the authors are apprehensive that presentation of learning materials does not essentially cause their use by students to improve their learning or course understanding. Evidence for this can be seen in Boeglin, Campbell, and Picard (1999) who stated that students required printed copies of learning materials, though the latter were accessible on the course website. In addition, it is difficult to assess the structure of the course content and its efficacy on the learning procedure (Zaiane & Luo, 2001).

Another source of apprehension comes from the fact that the growth of online learning materials needs spending of significant amounts of resources, both monetarily and in time and endeavor (Mason, 1998; Nachmias, 2002). The power of contents in course websites along with the investment in preparing this material and the need of certainty concerning their use and supplementary value for students lays emphasis to the need to study whether and to what extent students utilize these learning materials (Soong, Chan, & Chua, 2001). Nevertheless, there are only a small number of researches concerning this issue (e.g., McKenna, 1999; Rafaeli & Ravid, 1997). Furthermore, these researches have analyzed utilization of contents in particular courses and do not cope with basic questions relating to content usage in course websites.

One of the few studies trying to identify patterns of content usage in course websites was performed by Sasson and Nachmias (1999). The analysts studied the relationship between

classifications of course Web pages, links, and navigation bars and the rate of students visits to the various Web pages of the course. Results showed that seeing of pages in the course website reduces as a function of the location of the online chapter in the learning procedure and the place of the lesson within the chapter. As well, it was found that many information pages in online courses were not being viewed at all. The research conclusion was that content at deeper levels is less likely to be viewed in the learning process.

Pahl (2002) showed the ability of scaffolding tutorials to substitute the teacher in an online course. Pahl studied the potential of scaffolding by studying students' accessibility to various parts of the virtual course and by learning students' standpoints concerning the course content. In accordance with expectation, the interactive lesson was used together with other resources provided by scaffolding. In addition, there was a reduction of scaffold usage in tutorials over time, showing the increased knowledge and skills of students. The study findings showed that scaffolding can be effectively executed in a Web-based course. The results and conclusions of the two researches show the pedagogic knowledge that can be displayed in the process of assessing students' use of contents.

One of the distinctive tools that can be utilized for assessing content use in course websites is the study of the computer log derived at the same time as students access the contents. Just after the introduction of Internet technology as a method of teaching in higher education, it was recommended to use computer logs as a method of assessing the successful of online courses (e.g., Rafaeli & Ravid, 1997). In the literature, one can find many reasons why study of computer log files may be of significant value for teachers (e.g., Pahl & Donnellan, 2002; Zaiane & Luo, 2001). First, such a study can explain how students move in a course website, and draw conclusions from it concerning the organization of its contents.

Secondly, log analysis can help in improving tasks and examinations by studying how students deal with them. As well, one can follow the usage of the course website by observing the use of its various parts (Peled & Rashty, 1999). For a teacher using a Web-based course delivery setting, it could be useful to track the activities occurring in the course website and take out patterns and behaviors prompting requirements to change, improve, or adjust to the course contents (Zaiane, 2001).

c. Authentic work

Authentic learning is a method to teaching and learning that has students working on pragmatic problems, to achieve new knowledge and skills in a framework, rather than listening to instructions and memorizing vast amounts of data to be reproduced on examinations. Students build up their own meanings from their work and produce products and performances that have significance or meaning beyond success in school. It is real work for a real audience.

Authentic learning supports higher-order thinking and the incorporation of knowledge rather than strict subject area limits. It rewards strength of knowledge rather than surface knowledge. Moreover it supports students, working alone or in a collegial team, to create ideas related to the real world.

The concept of authentic learning is comparative as nothing is wholly authentic or totally detached from reality. The majority of teachers already do some authentic teaching, though they are just using word problems from the book and trying to add value to the abstractions that must be commanded over.

In an authentic learning environment, students usually start with an ill-structured problem to study and seek one of many possible solutions. However real-world problems hardly ever have clear solutions and students don't begin with all of the pertinent information to fix them. Whilst they work on the problem, its definition might alter and any judgments will be founded on the best data available. A final step may be presenting the outcomes to an audience of those who will in fact use the data.

Just as in the world outside of school, technology provides as a tool, assisting people solve problems. Technology is applied to collect, classify, and study data. A zoo's personnel might walk around with handy computers to record information on the status of the animals under their charge. Students, similarly, can collect data outside the classroom to bring in for study. A professional making a presentation to colleagues or clients may use multimedia to make her points. Consequently, too, a student reporting on the Depression of the 1930's in history class will bring in visual depictions and information to accompany his presentation to the class. Technology becomes a tool to fulfill the requirements of individuals—students or professional—and help them achieve significant tasks.

Portable technology helps students to involve in advanced information collection outside the classroom. At the same time, the power of multimedia computers in the classroom helps teachers to provide authentic microworlds for problem solving within the limits of the school. For instance, complex science simulation programs help students to influence factors impacting climate and natural science. These programs try to provide the same ill-structured problems seen in the real world.

d. Active Inquiry

Bruce and Levin (1997), look at ways in which the tools, methods, and applications of technology can help integrated, inquiry-based learning to "engage children in exploring, thinking, reading, writing, researching, inventing, problem-solving, and experiencing the world." They proposed the idea of technology as media with 4 different motivations namely: media for inquiry, media for communication, media for construction, and media for expression.

In a study of existing evidence of technology's impact on learning, Marshall (2002) found strong substantiation that educational technology "complements what a great teacher does naturally," extending their scope and increasing their students' experience outside the classroom. "With ever-expanding content and technology choices, from video to multimedia to the Internet," Marshall implies "there's an unprecedented need to understand the recipe for success, which involves the learner, the teacher, the content, and the environment in which technology is used.

Research indicates that computer technology can help support learning and is especially useful in developing the higher-order skills of critical thinking, analysis, and scientific inquiry "by engaging students in authentic, complex tasks within collaborative learning contexts" (Roschelle et al, 2000; Means, et. al., 1993).

e. Construction of mental models

One way of endorsing the students learning processes and encouraging problem solving skills is by means of the provision of metacognitive support for the writing process that can be utilized by students whilst solving problems within an information background.

An instance of this metacognitive support in the form of genre templates has been rooted in an interactive multimedia program. The package explained gives students an occasion to collect, organize and demonstrate their ideas reliant on a set task. In the interactive multimedia program the metacognitive support pattern is distinctive in that it helps students in their thinking, data processing and evaluation of their own learning procedures. Earlier interactive multimedia programs supported learning environments where students emulated conventional views. As well this version helps a setting where learners deduce their own views of reality by understanding how they reach these explanations and viewpoints. It provides support in the form of new plans in the process of accepting mental models.

Instructional technology offers both metacognitive support tools and cognitive tools that are based upon a constructivist epistemology. Constructivism is related with the process of how students construct meaning and knowledge in the world in addition to the results of the constructive process. How they construct knowledge reliant upon what they already know, their previous experiences, how they have organized those experiences into knowledge structures such as plants, mental models, and the beliefs that they as individuals use to interpret their own realities of the objects and events they face within the world.

Norman (1993) states that computers support reflective thinking when they enable clients to create new knowledge by adding new representations, changing old ones and comparing the two.

f. Collaborative work

Generally, teaching centers help teachers expand and enhance their teaching skills, solve teaching problems, develop courses and course materials, assess their instruction, and

support development and growth in their teaching over the span of their professions. There are many domains in which technological matters may impact the work of teaching centers. For instance, teaching center staff require to learn more about the potential for using technology for staff development. They also require identifying the problems to innovations in teaching and the barriers that arise in using technology for teamwork. Lastly, they have a duty to help find out effective applications of technology in instruction.

Computing and information technology centers, and distance learning centers help teachers and students with accessibility to, and training in, the use of instructional technology. They also create useful tools for instruction, course management, and communication. The staff of these centers requires understanding the course development model delineated above and all the factors that should considered in successful course design. This model is far broader and more multifaceted than the data- and artifact-exchange model that appears to prevail on instructional technology. These centers also require learning to provide important advice on the utility and feasibility of serving specific instructional requirements with current services, not generic directives about the use of their tools. Besides, they need to be keen to create new tools or adjust existing tools to fit the requirements defined by instructors and students.

Staff members and students as the creators and beneficiaries of the educational project, must endorse their primacy in it. They need to enunciate what they appreciate about teaching and learning and what they don’t want to quit. Staff requirement to spell out learning results and perform well-designed classroom study to clarify the differences between outcomes of courses educated with technology tools and courses taught using conventional methods. Possibly more notably, instructors and students need to plainly communicate their outlooks,

perceptions and views regarding (1) the usefulness of specific technologies and resources they apply, (2) support workforce and support systems, (3) the usefulness of course and class processes, and 4) their enthusiasm to participate in similar projects in the future.

If teaching centers, technology centers, and staff and students collaborate in this way, it is believed they will be able to identify which technology systems work best for instruction, which of the available tools to employ, what new tools are required, where the best resources are, and what factors promote the work. One can also identify fields that institutional administrators need to take in hand. Collaboratively, they can considerably further the understanding of the utility of many forms of data technology in postsecondary education.

USING TECHNOLOGY AS A YOUNG STUDENT

The last many years have been filled with passionate discussion concerning Web 2.0 technologies and their positive, dynamic advancements to a client's experience on the Internet. This same wave has rather slowly crashed over the domain of online education, and it has been a much-contemplated subject ever since. The reason is for this is plain: The potential positive impact of Web 2.0 tools on the online learning experience is thought to be complex and enormous.

Recent study has proved and identified benefits to the use of Web 2.0 technologies within the online classroom. Such advantages can be mapped to known best practices from the distance education literature to help improve and optimize their potential positive impacts within the online classroom.

Potential Benefits of Web 2.0 Technologies

The advantages of using Web 2.0 tools and technologies in the online classroom reach everywhere.

Undocumented/Presumed Potential Benefits

Ever since their introduction, Web 2.0 tools have generally been thought to produce a number of affirmative impacts:

They offer a constructivist-friendly toolkit. Constructivist theory is usually known and utilized in online education as a useful roadmap towards successful, deep learning consequences for learners. The needs of a successful constructivist approach comprise of encouraging the student's own role in the ongoing process of constructing knowledge and deep learning. Before Web 2.0, one of the important assumptions was that online classrooms would serve well as platforms for developing constructivist learning settings; however they in fact often proved to simply act as transmission models of learning (Allen & Long, 2009) generally as a result of the high proficiency levels needs of past technologies. Of late, the rise in user-friendly Web 2.0 tools such as wikis, blogs, video sharing services, social networks, and other shared tools have given support to a key aspect of constructivist practice: the promotion of collaborative learning, capable of helping to build "an entire constructivist learning environment" (Seitzinger, 2006) within an online class.

They form a connection to today's students' "real world." Web 2.0 has also already proven helpful in different corporate, government, and institutional environments, and its implementation has been quite fast in contrast to other information technologies (Bughin, 2008). Thus, implementing these tools in the learning field can help prepare students to apply them in real-world venues.

They help for authentic assessment. The effects of Web 2.0 simply cannot be overlooked today. It is now an almost necessary aspect within the daily lives of most learners and even some teachers these days. Some have claimed that it must now be justified in creating an authentic assessment of learning aims, and of the formal and informal education going on inside and outside the classroom. Allen (2009) goes so far as to see that "developments in assessment using the Internet will only be authentic if they take account of the way the Internet functions outside of higher education, rather than seeing it as an educational technology divorced from its own authenticity" (p. 1). Allen goes even further to affirm:

Since this kind of knowledge work is becoming the norm, without a social media / Web 2.0 approach to assessment, traditional approaches will begin to appear inauthentic if they do not, to some extent at least, recognize and embrace Internet-enabled knowledge networking (p. 4) .

They can be repurposed for various stakeholder levels in an organization. The same Google Apps for Education tools employed for student collaborations can also be utilized by a teacher to share documents with a colleague, perhaps allowing them to co-author study in a much simpler and resourceful manner than ever before. The administration can also profit from use of such tools for the same reasons.

They are cost efficient. An organization utilizing Web 2.0 tools will see efficiencies of scale as a result of savings in cost and resources spent to develop the tools. These are plenty of savings potentials in contrast to the generally large overheads needed to produce similar proprietary materials. Web 2.0 tools are proving advantageous to organizations looking for affordable, scalable solutions for course content.

A number of institutions are using Web 2.0 technologies for course management (Rienzo & Han, 2009). It would appear such organizations must study these tools now, when taking into account the danger of a truly Web 2.0 style service for example Ududtu.com, which offers a free method of not only creating learning objects however also a method of creating a detached LMS within the confines of Facebook, a popular social networking site. The user can upload interactive content made at Udutu and then follow a student's graded progress within the LMS app. Some of the more hyperbolic enthusiasts of Web 2.0 function such as this have claimed that it brings a "transformation of learning" (Selwyn, 2007). Whilst there is plenty of room for uncertainty of such lofty claims—and some of it well merited—recent study has recognized and noted ultimate benefits to employing Web 2.0 technologies in the online classroom.

Documented Benefits

At the same time as there seems to be a common lack of directly measurable data on the benefits of Web 2.0 technology for online education, there is some rather fresh evidentiary study that can be referenced. A recent study report funded by Becta, a British government organization charged with effective use of innovative technology in learning, lately released a major report on the impact of Web 2.0 technology on secondary schools (Crook et al, 2009). The report is based on data collected from field studies, guided surveys of 2600 students, and interviews and online surveys performed with teachers, technical workforce, administration, and parents.

The report consisted of many interesting findings concerning usage of Web 2.0 technologies, challenges to execution, policy, and more. It also clearly cites 4 potential advantages of Web 2.0 on teaching and learning:

a) It motivates new modes of inquiry.

b) It develops new prospects for shared learning.

c) It facilitates students to involve with new literacy and express themselves in different media.

d) It endorses a proficiency in the publication of content, which establishes a feeling of ownership, audience engagement, peer evaluation, and informal learning.

These documented benefits provide much support to the undocumented advantages being on the right track in terms of how Web 2.0 technologies can definitely impact the teaching and learning process. However how do these advantages play out against the most frequently known and agreed-upon best practices in online education?

USING MOST RECENT TECHNOLOGY

Web 3.0 is based on “intelligent” web applications. Its key features are:

a) It can recognize spoken language.

b) Self Learning programs/browser or Machine-based learning and reasoning.

c) Intelligent applications to understand consumer search habits.

Openness: – Web 3.0 is about openness. This is realized by using APIs, protocols, data formats, open-source software platforms and open data for creating new tools. To save user Identity from thief Web 3.0 utilizes:

a) Open Identity.

b) Open ID.

c) Open Reputation Management.

The possibility to roam with portable device and personal data.

Individual Focus: – Web 3.0 concentrates on individual surfer's data requirements. Data is connected to user rather than user being connected to information. As well, customer can move from one program to another program, one database to another database for more valid data.

3D Web & Beyond: – Web 3.0 employ three dimensional websites by utilizing 3D model and then changes them into a series of 3D spaces. It offers services like Avatars to adapt to the Internet experience. This compensate for an integrated experience for the Internet customers as one can not only utilize it on computers nevertheless also on the mobile devices, cars, microwaves, household security systems and much more.

Web 3.0 takes students beyond the box they utilize for data collection, entertainment or work. It makes their experience so practical that they can feel everything on their finger tips.

Web 2.0 vs. Web 3.0

There has been so much raving for the beginning of Web 3.0. This is with a good reason particularly when the two webs – 2.0 and 3.0 are being pitched against each other. There are also current discussions as to which technology in fact came first, was it the Web 2.0 technology or that of Web 3.0?

The technology of Web 2.0 introduced at the very end of the 90's in which Microsoft created JavaScript to be able to support Microsoft OWA. Web 2.0 has contributed much on the consolidation of chat, electronic mails, and also newsgroups which were very popular

since the 80's. With these going public, the pages are now written on the HTML format rather than just pure text.

Web 2.0 was the very quintessence of hypertext and what were once plain newsgroups are now widespread social systems and unruly blogs. In 1996, XML which was copied from SGML has been labeled as the next language of the Internet. In 1997 up until 1999, the Semantic web has started as a definite model. In spite of the technologies presented by Web 2.0, Tim Berners-Lee tagged it as 'insignificant'.

TBL wanted to have an effect by giving idea to the design of machines that would not only do people's commands however also understand these commands and to think on their own. Web 3.0 is not just about data, machines, and humans—it is the stage where news, entertainment, work, and fundamentally life itself become alive. Humans are now not simply spectators however a part of the web.

These great expectations are the very bases why Web 3.0 has had difficulties in getting grim. The very thought that machines can have minds of their own is a difficult concept to some. Just imagine a world where the main manpower comprises of machines and humans take the backseat.

With Web 3.0, data develop into more than just data—it could become relationships, connectivity, and functionality. Tim Berners-Lee did not spend almost a decade of his life in creating most of the Internet content for nothing. Web 3.0 has to be better than its precursor.

Web 2.0 is the cover for search engines and it still is. However at once, there would be freedom from their influence. The Semantic web will be the world of thousands or, possibly, even millions of webs.

Web 3.0 is already in use and even governments have faith in it. That is a major measure as to the sophisticated features of the Semantic web. Adobe and Yahoo have also done the same and have jumped into the wagon.

In conclusion, even though Web 2.0 may be tagged as outmoded or an old-fashioned, the fact that Web 3.0 developed from it is enough to conclusion that it helped prepare the way for the improved web version. The former isn't completely dead however many are going passionate about the plain mention of Web 3.0. Indeed, many think that Web 2.0 just existed as a bridge between Web 1.0 and Web 3.0. The world has every motive to announce the impending of the third version.

THE PHILOSPHY OF USING TECHNOLOGY

In accordance with Moore's law, technology performance is growing in an exponential manner. Moore's Law, which has judged true for the past few decades, has numerous connotations. This rate of exponential change implies that just about every two years the technological computing capability doubles, and with this fast change in performance capabilities comes both technological and community change. Every day the increase in technological performance and the community recognition of technology can be considered; for instance, mobile technologies have become an almost ubiquitous and well accepted part of typical culture. The technology of at the moment has altered significantly from that of the past, as has the way in which technology is incorporated into every aspect of daily lives. The field of education is not impervious to this technological change.

As said by Smith (2005), "In 1999, about 52 percent of K–12 teachers said they used technology in instruction" (Lanahan, 2002). Nearly 90% of children ages 7 to 17 reported using computers in school, as did 97% of high school students. Whilst a major portion of students and teachers report applying technology, use is not always suggestive of incorporation into the curriculum. The incorporation of technology into the classroom is vital if instructors are to educate the students and authorize them to be successful; not only today's technological world, however well into the future.

Technology can aid teachers to fulfill the requirements of a different student population, better organize the students for lifetime learning, and help to prepare the students for the classrooms and places of work of the future. Over the years, teachers have believed that the classroom experience of their students is improved with technology, and history has shown that technology can be incorporated into the core curriculum in positive ways that facilitate to involve and teach students. Nevertheless, technology incorporation requires alterations in how teachers deliver curriculum as "emerging technologies afford new opportunities as well as responsibilities" (Beldarrain, 2006, p. 149). When taking into account technology incorporation, the question becomes not how technology can develop what people already doing, however rather how these budding technologies can be utilized to improve education in ways that take them further than before.

Emerging technologies in the classroom

Over the years, educational technology has adjusted to changing technologies and community changes, expanding to comprise new technologies as they become known and adopting instructional design models that are suited to the incorporation of technology.

THE PROS AND CONS OF USING TECHNOLOGY

There is an increasing debate the Pros and Cons of Online Adult Education for today's students are constantly studied to establish if this type of education platform can provide predictable and quantifiable results.

Pros of Online Education:

The main advantages of the online education experience are briefly described as followed:

1. Cheaper: Online courses may be more inexpensive than those offered at colleges or trade schools. Students may also save on transport expenses like gas, bus passes, and parking permits since they don't require commuting to school and there are no housing or meals plans to be anxious as they do not need to live on or near a college campus. Housing expenditure and other expenses linked with living cost are generally the most costly features of a college education; therefore by taking an online course they could save quite a lot of money. The greater part of online education is the nonexistence of travel and immigration problems.

2. More Convenient: By taking courses online, students are able to choose when they study and for how long. They are also able to plan their studying around their work or social schedule.

As students are not restricted to a classroom, they may do their work wherever they have accessibility to a computer and the internet. They'll be able to decide their own pace and set exactly how quick they want to go over the material. Take online courses when they require them, not based on some college's yearly or semester schedule. They can learn when they need it.

3. Flexibility: with no set class times, students choose when to finish their assignments and understandings. They decide the pace. In some programs, they can even plan their own degree program. The online students can do their private or official work, together with the online education. They can allocate more time in the topics, which they think rather hard and vice versa. The speed of learning relies mainly upon the students.

4. Technology: With the aid of the scientific technology, students can do their online education at any place. The only binding pre-requisite is the accessibility of computer together with an internet amenity.

5. Availability: distance-learning prospects have increased over the past few years, with many attributed to reputable programs.

6. Accessibility: with an online course, students can work on the course almost anyplace they have computer accessibility. Their learning choices are not constrained by their geographic position. The new virtual classrooms have generated a multitude of learning prospects for global learning and education center. On line education is a new period experience adjusting to the requirements of the world populace.

Cons of Online Education:

Following are some factors that could harmfully affect success with distance learning courses:

1. The Technology

a. Equity and Accessibility to Technology: Prior to any online program can hope to succeed it must have students who are able to access the online learning setting. Lack of accessibility, whether it be for inexpensive or logistics reasons will eliminate otherwise entitled students from the course. This is a major issue in rural and lower socioeconomic

localities and educating the underserved peoples of the world. As far as Internet ease of access is concerned, it is not worldwide, and in some fields of the USA and other countries, Internet access creates a major expenditure to the customer. Some customers pay a fixed monthly rate for their Internet connection, whilst others are charged for the time they pay out online. If the participants' time online is restricted by the amount of Internet accessibility they can pay for, then instruction and participation in the online program will not be evenhanded for all students in the course. This is a drawback of online programs that depend on Internet access. Equity of access to learners of all backgrounds and parts of society

b. Requires New Skills/Technologies: if customers are not computer-savvy or are afraid of change or new technologies, then online education will most likely not work for them. The online students are needed to learn new skills, for example researching and assessing the internet.

c. Computer Literacy: Both students and facilitators must hold a minimum level of computer knowledge with the aim of functioning successfully in an online setting. For instance, they must be able to employ various search engines and be at ease navigating on the Internet, in addition to be familiar with Newsgroups, FTP procedures and electronic mail. If they do not have these technology tools, they will not do well in an online program.

d. Limitations of Technology: Accessibility and reliability technology is vital to a successful online program. Nevertheless, even the most advanced technology is not 100% dependable. Regrettably, it is not an issue of if the equipment used in an online program will be unsuccessful, although when. When everything is working well, technology is projected to be of low profile and is used as a tool in the learning process. In downtime condition of

broken systems the technology is neither flawless nor dependable and it can detract from the learning experience.

2. The Institution: Various online education facilities are rather new with many courses and therefore, lack in modern instructors for instructing the new core curriculum. Estimates indicate that there is still a need for a rise of more than 50% of qualified teachers for online education.

b. The Administration and Faculty: Some environments are troublesome to the successful execution of an online program. Administrators and/or faculty members who are uneasy with change and working with technology or think that online programs cannot present quality education usually hamper the process of completion.

3. The Facilitator: Need of Essential Online Qualities: Successful on-ground instruction does not always translate to successful online instruction. If facilitators are not suitably skilled in online delivery and methodologies, the success of the online program will be bargained. A teacher must be able to converse well in writing and in the language in which the course is presented.

4. Perceptions/Reputation: whilst gradually changing as increasing mainstream colleges and universities espouse distance learning, there still is a dishonor attached to distance education to the student's communication in the online education. Some of the students think that, there are few prospects concerning personal relationships and feedbacks.

5. No Instructor Face Time: If students learning style is one where they like personalized focus from their teachers, then online education will perhaps not work for them.

In conclusion, when assessing the pros and cons of on line adult continuing education the cost of study and flexibility of scheduling tilt the scales of programs learning program on line adult continuing education is becoming a universally recognized form of education.

Nevertheless, as with any circumstances, there are both advantages and disadvantages with the notion of online education and the advantages of the virtual or global classroom. A number of people may want to assess both before they decide on an online education program. By studying the pros and cons, they will be able to make a more learned decision. However, ultimately, online learning is self-regulating learning. Many structures have been put into online programs; however it still comes down to students sitting in front of computers by themselves. The knowledge they get or the advantages it will create either in development of self esteem or increasing earning capacity will depend solely upon the student.

References

Allen, M., & Long, J. (2009, October). *Learning as knowledge networking: Conceptual foundations for revised uses of the Internet in higher education*. Paper presented at the World Congress on Engineering & Computer Science 2009, San Francisco.

Allen, M. (2009, October). *Authentic assessment and the Internet: Contributions within knowledge networks.* Paper presented at the E-Learn 2009 conference of the Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education, Vancouver, Canada.

Beldarrain, Y. (2006). Distance education trends: Integrating new technologies to foster student interaction and collaboration. *Distance Education, 27(2),* 139-153.

Boeglin, J. A., Campbell, K., & Picard, J. (1999). Alternative teaching and learning strategies: lessons from an introductory psychology course. Interactive Multimedia Electronic *Journal of Computer-Enhanced Learning, 1(2)* [On-line].

Brooks, J., & Brooks, M.G. (1993). *In Search of Understanding: The Case for Constructivist Classrooms. Alexandria,* VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bruce, B.C., & Levin, J.A. (1997). *Educational technology: Media for inquiry, communication, construction, and expression.* Journal of Educational Computing Research, 17(1), 79-102. Available online.

Bughin, J. (2008). The rise of enterprise 2.0. Journal of Direct, Data and Digital *Marketing Practice,* 9(3), 251–259.

Crook, C., Fisher, T., Graber, R., Harrison, C., & Lewin, C. (2008, September). *Implementing Web 2.0 in secondary schools: Impacts, barriers and issues.*

Cummings, J. A., Bonk, C. J., & Jacobs, F. R. (2002). Twenty-first century college syllabi options for online communication and interactivity. *Internet and Higher Education, 4,* 1–19.

Jonassen, D. H. (1995). Supporting Communities of Learners with Technology: A Vision for Integrating Technology with Learning in Schools. *Educational Technology 35*, 60-63.

Jonassen, D., Peck, K., & Wilson, B. (2000). *Learning with Technology: A Constructivist Approach.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Marshall, J.M. (2002). *Learning with technology: Evidence that technology can, and does, support learning.* San Diego, CA: Cable in the Classroom.

Mason, R. (1998). Models of online courses. Asynchronous Learning Networks *Magazine,* 2(2) [On-line].

McKenna, P. (1999). *Educational pilot projects* (1996–1999). Final evaluation report.

Means, Barbara et al. (1993). *Using technology to support education reform.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. ERIC DIGEST - ED364220. ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, Syracuse, N.Y.

Nachmias, R. (2002). Research framework for the study of a campus-wide web-based academic instruction project. *Internet and Higher Education, 5(3),* 213–229.

Norman, D. (1993). *Things That Make Us Smart.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Pahl, C. (2002). An evaluation of scaffolding for virtual interactive tutorials. Working Paper odtl-2002-03.

Pahl, C., & Donnellan, D. (2002). *Data mining technology for the evaluation of web-based teaching and learning systems.* Paper presented at AACE E-Learn Conference, Montreal, Canada.

Peled, A., & Rashty, D. (1999). Logging for success: advancing the use of WWW logs to improve computer R. Nachmias, L. Segev / Internet and Higher Education 6 (2003) 145–157.

Rafaeli, S., & Ravid, G. (1997). Online, web-based learning environment for an information systems course: access logs, linearity and performance [On-line].

Rienzo, T., & Han, B. (2009, Summer). Microsoft or Google Web 2.0 tools for course management. Journal of Information Systems Education, 20(2), 123-127.

Roschelle, J.M. Pea, R.D., Hoadley, C.M., Gordin, D.N. & Means, B.M. (2000). Changing how and what children learn in school with computer-based technologies. *The Future of Children, 10:2*, 76-101.

Sasson, E., & Nachmias, R. (1999). *What makes them click? Paper presented at the ED-MEDIA 99.* World conference on educational multimedia, hypermedia and telecommunications, Seattle, WA.

Seitzinger, J. (2006, July 31). Be constructive: Blogs, podcasts, and wikis as constructivist learning tools. Learning Solutions e-Magazine.

Selwyn, N. (2007). *Web 2.0 applications as alternative environments for informal learning - A critical review.* Paper presented at the OECD-KERIS International Expert Meeting on ICT and Educational Performance, Cheju Island, South Korea.

Soong, M. H. B., Chan, H. C., & Chua, B. C. (2001). Critical success factors for on-line course resources. *Computers and Education, 36*, 101–120.

Zaiane, O. R. (2001). *Web usage mining for a better web-based learning environment.*

Zaiane, O. R., & Luo, J. (2001). Towards evaluating learners' behavior in a web-based distance learning environment.