

AN OVERVIEW OF E-LEARNING TOOLS

N. Pratheesh

*Department of Computer Science,
Eastern University, Sri Lanka*

Keywords: E-Learning, Traditional Learning, Collaborative Learning, E-Learning Tools

Introduction

Advances in communication technology since the mid-1990s have made e-learning a viable educational alternative [1-4]. The brainstrom is that a governess can achieve learners in remote locations, which enables learners to study the subjects to which they wouldn't otherwise have access. Not everyone has cuddled this improvement. Detractors blame that it is cold and impersonal, and although there are openings for classroom companionship, it doesn't repeat the experience of a real classroom [1, 5, 7-10]. Historically, e-learning has tended to be a petite dry, relying mainly on text and graphs to convey information. Evolves in computing power and communication networks are altering this, but multimedia-learning familiarities linger wealthier and easier in a traditional classroom setting. E-learning almost undoubtedly entails more learner idea than traditional classroom learning [10-14]. E-learning necessitates comparatively sophisticated technology and knowledge [6, 14-17]. This may be further than the scope of some folks, though it probably isn't an issue for a school or organization of any size. Web-based learning tolerates learners to evolution at their own swiftness [5, 7, 9, 11, 13]. However, many web-based learning packages are offered in modules, which learners work through individually, at their own pace. Moreover, an electronic forum permits learners to gather with educators in one-on-one sittings. The capability to work through the material at the learner's own pace is a theatrical benefit over traditional teaching methods [8].

Methodology

Presently there are number of e-learning tools available for the learners but it doesn't fulfill the needs which they expect. This research compares the characteristics of the e-learning tools which especially used for the computing studies. Researcher compare the existing literatures as well as the performance of the tool and categorized into the group where the similarity of the character. Form the collections of the literature and the function of the e-learning tools characterized as its characteristics and the nature. Characteristics of the e-learning tools as,

- The nature of relations between learners, as make easy by the tool;
- The number of learners involvement in the sharing activity;
- The nature of relic shaped;
- The scope to which the use of the tool has been appraised;
- Whether the tool is coupled to the teaching of a single topic, or wider use.

The nature of the e-learning tools as:

- Peer Assessment: learners seem at other learners' work, and give observations;
- Conversation and Discussion: the contribution comes about in the swap over of communications between learners;
- Annotation: Learners remark on existing materials and share their observations with other learners;

- Content Edifice: learners generate new learning materials exemplifying factual course content, for other learners to gain knowledge;
- Solution Distribution: learners share their own solutions to problems with other learners;
- Bustle Construction: learner create learning activities for other learners to engage in;
- Making Links: learners making connections between known concepts, or learners searching for external resources that relate to the content.

Discussion and Conclusion

This is despite many e-learning tools being web-based and easily adaptable to different conditions, with minor modifications, many existing e-learning tools could be easy to get to a wider community of instructors and the degree to which they support collaborative activities widened. More inventive use of existing e-learning tools and, in particular, social networking technologies could enable collaborative learning behaviors to become easier to put into practice in the classroom than might be projected. Finally, the worth of e-learning tools desires to be verified in a clear and translucent method; doing so may give confidence further use by otherwise averse instructors.

References

- [1]. Denny, P., A. Luxton-Reilly, and J. Hamer "The PeerWise system of student contributed assessment questions", 10th Australasian Computing Education conference 2008, Wollongong, Australia: Australian Computer Society, Inc.
- [2]. Luxton-Reilly, A., et al. "StudySieve: Supporting student-generated free-response", 23rd Annual Conference of the National Advisory Committee on Computing Qualifications (NACCQ 2010), 2010 Dunedin, New Zealand.
- [3]. Hamer, J., et al. "Quality of peer assessment in CS1", 5th International Computing Education Research workshop, 2009, Berkley, CA, USA: ACM.
- [4]. De Raadt, M., D. Lai, and R. Watson, "An evaluation of electronic individual peer assessment in an introductory programming course", 7th Baltic Sea Conference on Computing Education Research (Koli Calling 2007), 2008, Koli National Park, Finland.
- [5]. Sondergaard, H. "Learning from and with peers: The different roles of student peer reviewing", 14th Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education, 2009, Paris, France: ACM.
- [6]. Dooley, J.F. "Peer assessments using the Moodle Workshop tool", 14th Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education. 2009, Paris, France, ACM.
- [7]. Hundhausen, C., A. Agrawal, and K. Ryan, "The design of an online environment to support pedagogical code reviews", 41st SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education, 2010, Milwaukee, WI, USA: ACM.
- [8]. Gotel, O., C. Scharff, and Wildenberg, "Teaching software quality assurance by encouraging student contributions to an open source web-based system for the assessment of programming assignments", 13th Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education, 2008, Madrid, Spain, ACM.
- [9]. Lutteroth, C. and A. Luxton-Reilly, "Flexible Learning in CS2: A Case Study", 21st Annual Conference of the National Advisory Committee on Computing Qualifications (NACCQ 2008), 2008, Auckland, New Zealand.
- [10]. Luxton-Reilly, A. and P. Denny, "Constructive evaluation: A pedagogy of student-contributed assessment", *Computer Science Education*, 2010. 20(2): p. 145-167.

- [11]. Purchase, H., et al. "The quality of a PeerWise MCQ repository", 12th Australasian Computing Education conference, 2010, Brisbane, Australia.
- [12]. Gehringer, E.F., L.M. Ehresman, and D.J. Skrien, Expertiza, "Students Helping to Write an OOD Text", OOPSLA 2006, 2006, Portland, OR, USA.
- [13]. Gehringer, E.F. and C.S. Miller, "Student-generated active-learning exercises", 40th SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education, 2009, Chattanooga, TN, USA, ACM.
- [14]. Coelho, W. and G. Murphy, "ClassCompass: A software design mentoring system", ACM Journal Educational Resources in Computing, 2007. 7(1).
- [15]. Cutts, Q., "Essay writing with peer reviewing and marking", REAP International Online Conference on Assessment Design for Learner Responsibility, 2007.
- [16]. Choy, S.O. and K.C. Ng, "Implementing wiki software for supplementing online learning", Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 2007. 23(2): p. 209-226.
- [17]. Anderson, N. and C.-C. Lin, "Exploring technologies for building collaborative learning communities among diverse student populations", 14th Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education, 2009, Paris, France, ACM.