ADA-4799

# EVALUATION OF EDUCATION SYSTEM DESIGN USING THE SOCIO-CONSTRUCTIVIST AND SOFTWARE HEURISTIC APPROACHES

SARINDER KAUR A/P KASHMIR SINGH

Master of Computer Science

University of Malaya

2002

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya
A511140142

# EVALUATION OF EDUCATION SYSTEM DESIGN USING THE SOCIO-CONSTRUCTIVIST AND SOFTWARE HEURISTIC APPROACHES

by

SARINDER KAUR A/P KASHMIR SINGH

A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology of University of Malaya in fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Computer Science

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

2002

# ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to convey her appreciation to her supervisor, Puan Raja Jamilah Raja Yusof for her guidance and continuous supervision. The author would like to specially thank her parents, sister, Baljit Kaur and her brothers for their encouragement and moral support through out the course of this research.

This research was made possible by all the evaluators who contributed their time and effort to give their feedback through the questionnaires. The author appreciates their support.

The author want to thank her friends for their continuous support and encouragement to keep her going through the hard times : Mr. Hamzah Yahya, Ms. Christina, Mrs. Preet Kaur.

Last but not the least, a special thank to Ms Mangalam for all the help provided to complete this research.

*August, 2002*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT ..... III
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... IV
LIST OF TABLES ..... IX
LIST OF GRAPHS ..... X
LIST OF FIGURES ..... XII
ABSTRACT ..... XIII

**CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION ..... 1**
1.1 Introduction ..... 1
1.2 Objectives ..... 1
1.3 Scope ..... 2
1.4 Problem statement ..... 2
1.5 Significance of research ..... 3
1.6 Methodology ..... 3
1.7 Report Summary ..... 5

**CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW ..... 7**
2.1 Purpose ..... 7
2.2 Approach ..... 7
2.3 Analysis ..... 7
2.3.1 Pedagogical Issues in Learning ..... 7
2.3.1.1 Introduction ..... 7
2.3.1.2 Behaviorist learning theory ..... 8
2.3.1.3 Constructivist learning theory ..... 10
2.3.1.3.1 Characteristics of Constructivist Learning ..... 18
2.3.1.4 Socio-constructivist view of learning ..... 22
2.3.1.4.1 Characteristics of socio-constructivism ..... 23
2.3.1.4.1.1 Multiple Perspectives ..... 23
2.3.1.4.1.2 Goals and Objectives ..... 24
2.3.1.4.1.3 Teacher's role ..... 24
2.3.1.4.1.4 Metacognition ..... 25
2.3.1.4.1.5 Learner Control ..... 25
2.3.1.4.1.6 Authentic activities and contexts/Primary sources of data ..... 26
2.3.1.4.1.7 Knowledge Construction ..... 26
2.3.1.4.1.8 Knowledge Collaboration ..... 27
2.3.1.4.1.9 Previous knowledge construction ..... 28
2.3.1.4.1.10 Problem solving ..... 28
2.3.1.4.1.11 Consideration of errors ..... 28
2.3.1.4.1.12 Exploration ..... 29
2.3.1.4.1.13 Apprenticeship learning ..... 29
2.3.1.4.1.14 Authentic Assessment ..... 29
2.3.2 Evaluation Methods In Human Computer Interaction. ..... 30
2.3.2.1 Observing and Monitoring ..... 31
2.3.2.2 Experiments and benchmarks ..... 32
2.3.2.3 Interpretive ..... 33

2.3.2.4 Predictive Evaluation—Software Heuristics ..... 34
2.3.2.5 Users Opinion ..... 39
2.4 Software heuristics and socio-constructivist view of learning ..... 40
2.5 Learning theory in Malaysian schools ..... 41
2.6 Conclusion ..... 43

**CHAPTER 3 DESCRIPTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES: REQUIREMENTS GATHERING FOR DESIGNING EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS ..... 49**
3.1 Introduction ..... 49
3.2 User Characteristics ..... 51
3.2.1 User's level of experience ..... 51
3.2.2 Computer skills ..... 51
3.2.3 Proficiency in English ..... 52
3.3 Goal/ Task Characteristics ..... 52
3.4 Social Acceptability ..... 53
3.5 Practical Acceptability ..... 53
3.5.1 Traditional category ..... 54
3.5.1.1 Reliability ..... 54
3.5.2 Usability category ..... 54
3.5.2.1 Easy to learn ..... 54
3.5.2.2 Efficient to Use ..... 55
3.5.2.3 Easy to Remember ..... 56
3.5.2.4 Few Errors ..... 56
3.5.2.5 Pleasant to use ..... 57
3.6 Appropriateness ..... 57
3.7 Method of Delivery ..... 58
3.8 Functionality ..... 58
3.9 Communication ..... 59
3.9.1 No onscreen instructions ..... 59
3.9.2 States that appear impossible to exit ..... 59
3.9.3 Wrong, misleading, confusing information ..... 60
3.9.4 Spelling errors ..... 60
3.9.5 Invalid metaphors ..... 60
3.9.6 Confusing feature names ..... 60
3.9.7 Information overload ..... 61
3.9.8 Help text and error messages ..... 61
3.10 Display Layout ..... 62
3.10.1 Organization of screen ..... 62
3.10.2 Screen layout ..... 62
3.10.3 Usage of colour ..... 62
3.10.4 Menu Navigation ..... 63
3.11 Program rigidity ..... 64
3.12 Navigational issues ..... 64
3.13 Lesson Structure ..... 65
3.14 Conclusion ..... 66

**CHAPTER 4 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS OF EVALUATION ..... 67**
4.1 Introduction ..... 67
4.2 Descriptions of Educational Systems ..... 68
4.2.1 Educational System (1): University Malaya Online Course-C programming ..... 68
4.2.2 Educational System (2): CosToc-Relational Database Courseware ..... 69
4.2.3 Educational System (3): Learning Microsoft Word 2000 ..... 69
4.2.4 Educational System (4): Introduction to the Internet ..... 70
4.2.5 Educational System (5): Hardware Systems ..... 70
4.2.6 Educational System (6): Operating Systems Introduction ..... 71
4.3 Evaluation of Computer Systems ..... 71
4.3.1 Evaluation of University Malaya Online Course (C Programming) ..... 71
4.3.2 Evaluation for Costoc Relational Database ..... 71
4.3.3 Evaluation of Learning Microsoft Word 2000 ..... 72
4.3.4 Evaluation of Introduction to the Internet ..... 72
4.3.5 Evaluation of Hardware Systems Courseware ..... 73
4.3.6 Evaluation of Operating Systems Introduction Courseware ..... 73
4.4 Statistical Analysis and Discussion of Survey Results ..... 74
4.4.1 User Characteristics ..... 75
4.4.1.1 Results ..... 75
4.4.1.2 Analysis ..... 76
4.4.1.2.1 User's level of experience ..... 76
4.4.1.2.2 User's skill in using computers ..... 77
4.4.1.2.3 User's fluency in English ..... 77
4.4.1.3 Discussion ..... 77
4.4.2 Goal/Task Characteristics ..... 80
4.4.2.1 Results ..... 80
4.4.2.2 Analysis ..... 80
4.4.2.3 Discussion ..... 82
4.4.3 Social Acceptability, Program Rigidity and Appropriateness of Navigation ..... 83
4.4.3.1 Results ..... 83
4.4.3.2 Analysis ..... 83
4.4.3.3 Discussion ..... 85
4.4.4 Practical Acceptability ..... 86
4.4.4.1 Results ..... 86
4.4.4.2 Analysis ..... 87
4.4.4.3 Discussion ..... 91
4.4.5 Appropriateness ..... 97
4.4.5.1 Results ..... 97
4.4.5.2 Analysis ..... 97
4.4.5.3 Discussion ..... 99
4.4.6 Method of Delivery ..... 99
4.4.6.1 Results ..... 99
4.4.6.2 Analysis ..... 100
4.4.6.3 Discussion ..... 102
4.4.7 Functionality ..... 104
4.4.7.1 Results ..... 104
4.4.7.2 Analysis ..... 104

4.4.7.3 Discussion ..... 105
4.4.8 Communication ..... 106
4.4.8.1 Results ..... 106
4.4.8.2 Analysis ..... 106
4.4.8.3 Discussion ..... 108
4.4.9 Display layout ..... 111
4.4.9.1 Results ..... 111
4.4.9.2 Analysis ..... 112
4.4.9.3 Discussion ..... 114
4.4.10 Lesson structure ..... 115
4.4.10.1 Results ..... 115
4.4.10.2 Analysis ..... 116
4.4.10.3 Discussion ..... 118
4.5 Critical Analysis of Survey Results ..... 119
4.5.1 Relationship of social acceptability with user characteristics, goal & task characteristics, appropriateness of educational systems, rigidity of educational systems and method of delivery issues ..... 119
4.5.2 Relationship of practical acceptability with appropriateness of navigation, functionality, communication, lesson structure and layout issues in educational systems ..... 122
4.5.3 Relationship between lesson structure and method of delivery ..... 124
4.6 Conclusion ..... 125

**CHAPTER 5 PROTOTYPE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT .. ..... 128**

5.1 Introduction ..... 128
5.2 Development stages ..... 128
5.2.1 Requirements Specification ..... 129
5.2.2 System Design ..... 130
5.2.2.1 Conceptual Design ..... 130
5.2.2.2 Physical Design ..... 132
5.2.2.2.1 System Architecture ..... 132
5.2.2.3 Hierarchical Representation ..... 133
5.2.2.4 Screen Sketches ..... 134
5.2.3 System Development ..... 139
5.3 Conclusion ..... 159

**CHAPTER 6 PROTOTYPE EVALUATION ..... 160**

6.1 Introduction ..... 160
6.2 Statistical Analysis and Discussion of Evaluation Results ..... 161
6.2.1 User Characteristics ..... 161
6.2.1.1 Results ..... 161
6.2.1.2 Analysis ..... 161
6.2.1.3 Discussion ..... 161
6.2.2 Goal/Task Characteristics ..... 162
6.2.2.1 Results ..... 162
6.2.2.2 Analysis ..... 162
6.2.2.3 Discussion ..... 162
6.2.3 Social Acceptability, Program Rigidity and Appropriateness of Navigation ..... 163

6.2.3.1 Results ..... 163
6.2.3.2 Analysis ..... 163
6.2.3.3 Discussion ..... 163
6.2.4 Practical Acceptability ..... 164
6.2.4.1 Results ..... 164
6.2.4.2 Analysis ..... 165
6.2.4.3 Discussion ..... 165
6.2.5 Appropriateness and Method of Delivery ..... 166
6.2.5.1 Results ..... 166
6.2.5.2 Analysis ..... 166
6.2.5.3 Discussion ..... 167
6.2.6 Functionality ..... 168
6.2.6.1 Results ..... 168
6.2.6.2 Analysis ..... 168
6.2.6.3 Discussion ..... 169
6.2.7 Display Layout ..... 170
6.2.7.1 Results ..... 170
6.2.7.2 Analysis ..... 170
6.2.7.3 Discussion ..... 170
6.2.8 Lesson Structure ..... 171
6.2.8.1 Results ..... 171
6.2.8.2 Analysis ..... 171
6.2.8.3 Discussion ..... 172
6.2.9 Socio-constructivist learning strategy ..... 172
6.2.9.1 Results ..... 172
6.2.9.2 Analysis ..... 172
6.2.9.3 Discussion ..... 173
6.2.10 Students Overall Test Results In Windows 2000 Professional Courseware ..... 173
6.2.10.1 Results ..... 173
6.2.10.2 Analysis ..... 174
6.2.10.3 Discussion ..... 175
6.3 Conclusion ..... 175

**CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION ..... 176**
7.1 Introduction ..... 176
7.2 Critical Analysis ..... 176
7.2.1 Comparison of Social Acceptability ..... 176
7.2.2 Comparison of Practical Acceptability ..... 178
7.2.3 Comparison of Lesson Structure and Method of Delivery ..... 179
7.2.4 Comparison of Socio Constructivist Learning Strategy Results and Students' Test Results in Windows 2000 Professional ..... 180
7.2.5 Possibilities of why students could not accept socio-constructivism ..... 181
7.3 Conclusion ..... 182

REFERENCE ..... 183

6.2.3.1 Results ..... 163
6.2.3.2 Analysis ..... 163
6.2.3.3 Discussion ..... 163
6.2.4 Practical Acceptability ..... 164
6.2.4.1 Results ..... 164
6.2.4.2 Analysis ..... 165
6.2.4.3 Discussion ..... 165
6.2.5 Appropriateness and Method of Delivery ..... 166
6.2.5.1 Results ..... 166
6.2.5.2 Analysis ..... 166
6.2.5.3 Discussion ..... 167
6.2.6 Functionality ..... 168
6.2.6.1 Results ..... 168
6.2.6.2 Analysis ..... 168
6.2.6.3 Discussion ..... 169
6.2.7 Display Layout ..... 170
6.2.7.1 Results ..... 170
6.2.7.2 Analysis ..... 170
6.2.7.3 Discussion ..... 170
6.2.8 Lesson Structure ..... 171
6.2.8.1 Results ..... 171
6.2.8.2 Analysis ..... 171
6.2.8.3 Discussion ..... 172
6.2.9 Socio-constructivist learning strategy ..... 172
6.2.9.1 Results ..... 172
6.2.9.2 Analysis ..... 172
6.2.9.3 Discussion ..... 173
6.2.10 Students Overall Test Results In Windows 2000 Professional Courseware ..... 173
6.2.10.1 Results ..... 173
6.2.10.2 Analysis ..... 174
6.2.10.3 Discussion ..... 175
6.3 Conclusion ..... 175

**CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION ..... 176**
7.1 Introduction ..... 176
7.2 Critical Analysis ..... 176
7.2.1 Comparison of Social Acceptability ..... 176
7.2.2 Comparison of Practical Acceptability ..... 178
7.2.3 Comparison of Lesson Structure and Method of Delivery ..... 179
7.2.4 Comparison of Socio Constructivist Learning Strategy Results and Students' Test Results in Windows 2000 Professional ..... 180
7.3 Conclusion ..... 182

REFERENCE ..... 183

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 - Summarization of Evaluation Results ..... 126
Table 6.1 - Questions for evaluation of prototype ..... 160
Table 6.2 - Students Test Results ..... 174

# LIST OF GRAPHS

Graph 4.1 - Experience level in using educational systems ..... 75
Graph 4.2 - Users' Computer Skills ..... 75
Graph 4.3 - Users English Proficiency ..... 76
Graph 4.4 - Goal and Task Characteristics of using Educational Systems ..... 80
Graph 4.5 - Social Acceptability, Program Rigidity and Appropriateness of navigation in Educational Systems ..... 83
Graph 4.6 - Easy to learn ..... 86
Graph 4.7 - Learning Speed faster than printed materials ..... 86
Graph 4.8 - Easy to remember ..... 86
Graph 4.9 - Pleasant to use ..... 87
Graph 4.10 - Errors in educational systems ..... 87
Graph 4.11 -Ease of error recovery ..... 87
Graph 4.12 - Experiencing system failure ..... 87
Graph 4.13 - Appropriateness of Educational Systems with Curriculum ..... 97
Graph 4.14 - Preference of material in computer form instead of printed form ..... 99
Graph 4.15 - Are the systems teacher-directed? ..... 100
Graph 4.16 - Acceptance of functionality of educational systems ..... 104
Graph 4.17 - Communication problems in educational systems ..... 106
Graph 4.18 - Appropriateness of Display Layout ..... 111
Graph 4.19 - Lesson structure in educational systems ..... 115
Graph 4.20 - Relationship of social acceptability with user characteristics ..... 119
Graph 4.21 - Relationship of social acceptability with goal/task characteristics, method of delivery, program rigidity and appropriateness of menu navigation ..... 120
Graph 4.22 - Relationship between practical acceptability and functional, communication and navigation problems and the appropriateness of display layout in the educational systems ..... 122
Graph 4.23 - Relationship between lesson structure and method of delivery of educational systems ..... 124
Graph 6.1 - User Characteristics ..... 161
Graph 6.2 - Goal/Task Characteristics ..... 162
Graph 6.3 - Social Acceptability, Program Rigidity and Appropriateness of Navigation ..... 163
Graph 6.4a - Practical Acceptability ..... 164
Graph 0.4b - Practical Acceptability ..... 165
Graph 6.5 - Appropriateness and Method of Delivery ..... 166
Graph 6.6 - Functionality and Communication Problems ..... 168
Graph 6.7 - Display Layout ..... 170
Graph 6.8 - Lesson Structure ..... 171
Graph 6.9 - Acceptance of Socio-constructivist learning strategy ..... 172
Graph 7.1 - Social Acceptability of Windows 2000 Professional compared to other Educational Systems ..... 176
Graph 7.2 - Social Acceptability, Goal/Task Characteristics, Method of Delivery, Program Rigidity and Appropriateness of Menu Navigation of Windows 2000 Professional compared to other educational systems ..... 177
Graph 7.3 - Practical acceptability of Windows 2000 Professional compared to other educational systems ..... 178

Graph 7.4 - Lesson Structure and the Method of delivery of Windows 2000 Professional compared to other educational systems ..... 179
Graph 7.5 - Acceptance of Socio-constructivist learning strategy of Windows 2000 Professional ..... 180

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 - Hierarchical Representation of the categories in questionnaires ..... 43
Figure 5.1 – Development Stages ..... 128
Figure 5.2 -Data Flow Diagram ..... 131
Figure 5.3 -System Architecture ..... 132
Figure 5.4 - Hierarchical Representation of Screens ..... 133
Figure 5.5 - Mainpage ..... 134
Figure 5.6 - Notes Mainpage ..... 134
Figure 5.7 - Chapter 1 ..... 135
Figure 5.8 - Topic 1 ..... 135
Figure 5.9 - Test 1 ..... 136
Figure 5.10 - Evaluator Login Page ..... 136
Figure 5.11 - Student Evaluation Form ..... 137
Figure 5.12 - Student's Profile Page ..... 137
Figure 5.13 - Student's Final Results Page ..... 138
Figure 5.14 – Mainpage ..... 139
Figure 5.15 – Notes ..... 140
Figure 5.16 - Chapter 1 ..... 140
Figure 5.17 - Topic 1 ..... 141
Figure 5.18 - Topic 2 ..... 142
Figure 5.19 - Topic 3 ..... 143
Figure 5.20 - Topic 4 ..... 144
Figure 5.21 - Exercise ..... 145
Figure 5.22 - Exercise 1 ..... 146
Figure 5.23 - Exercise 1 Answers ..... 147
Figure 5.24 - Test ..... 148
Figure 5.25 - Test Reply Page ..... 149
Figure 5.26 - Evaluator login ..... 149
Figure 5.27 - Test Selection Page ..... 150
Figure 5.28 - Evaluate test page ..... 150
Figure 5.29 - Student's Final Marks ..... 151
Figure 5.30 - Student's Profile ..... 152
Figure 5.31 - Self-Assessment Quiz ..... 153
Figure 5.32 - Self-Assessment Results ..... 154
Figure 5.33 - Student Login Page ..... 154
Figure 5.34 - Student's Final Results ..... 155
Figure 5.35 – Error Page ..... 156

# ABSTRACT

This thesis is focused on designing a usable educational system for tertiary level students in Selangor and Klang Valley. To achieve this, the author has come up with a set of questions for testing the usability of existing educational systems used in University of Malaya and in some of the colleges around Klang Valley and Selangor. The questions in the questionnaires are prepared based on the socio-constructivist way of learning in the social context of Malaysian students and also the software heuristics. The results of the survey was analyzed statistically and discussed to serve as requirements for the design of a usable educational system for these students. A prototype is developed to test this new design with a group of students from University of Malaya. Results of the test are also analyzed and discussed to compare this new design with the existing educational systems used by the students. The results show that the new design is more accepted by the students. It is 100% socially accepted and 50% practically accepted by the evaluators. 80% of the students could agree to the lesson structure in the courseware and 100% agree that it is not teacher-directed. However, students are still not able to accept the socio-constructivist view of learning as the results of the test attempted in the courseware (34.25%) and also the results of survey (49.5%) showed a rather low acceptance.