

**Construction Of An Evaluation Instrument For A Web-Based Learning
Environment (WBLE) And Validation Of Its Causal Structure**

ABDULLATIF ISMAIL

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Faculty of Education
University Of Malaya
2011**

**Construction Of An Evaluation Instrument For A Web-Based Learning
Environment (WBLE) And Validation Of Its Causal Structure**

ABDULLATIF ISMAIL

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

2011

Acknowledgment

I dedicate this work in memory of my parents Hamdan and Hasna.

This research effort represents a conclusion of advice and great support of many people to whom I am deeply grateful. I wish to express my utmost appreciation and deepest gratitude to the following individuals.

First of all, I wish to thank my wife Bronia, who stood beside me and helped me every step of the way. She took care of our kids and home in Latakia during those countless evenings I was away “doing research”. Next, I want to thank my sons Nawar and Homam, for their absolute support and encouragement with patience and love. Without them this paper would have died, never to be resurrected.

I would especially like to thank my supervisor, Professor Dr. Raja Maznah Raja Husain, and my Co-Supervisor Dr. Shahrir Jamaluddin whose encouragement, enthusiasm, guidance, and insight were very useful in the creation and completion of this research. This thesis could not have been written without their great support. I am thanking them for giving me independence and responsibility, as well as support and guidance during this work. They always sought to bring out the best in me and taught me what it takes to be a good researcher.

I would like to express my gratitude to the pre-examiners of the evaluation instrument, Prof. Dr. Siow Heng Loke, Department of Mathematics and Science Education, Faculty of Education University of Malaya; Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ananda Kumar Palaniappan, Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, Faculty of Education, University of Malaya; Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rohaida Binti Mohd Saad, Department of Mathematics and Science Education, Faculty of Education, University of Malaya; Prof. Dr. Zoraini Wati Abas (Institute of Quality, Research and Innovation, Open University Malaysia); Dr. Khalil Ajami and Dr. Ramez Hajislam from the Department of Information Technology, Syrian

Virtual University. I would like to thank all of them for their help, time and for the valuable comments throughout the revision of the questionnaire.

Special thanks and gratitude to Prof. Dr. Hasan El-Sayed, consultant in the Syrian Virtual University for his support and encouragement.

I would like to record my appreciation to all participants and students in the Syrian Virtual University for their full cooperation and enthusiasm throughout the data collection.

My thanks also to Dr. Lucio Paul Siragusa from Curtin University, for granting me permission to adopt, translate and adapt several items from his instrument toward identification of effective instructional design principles and learning strategies for students studying in Web-based learning environments in higher education.

To all the translators, Mr. Abdullah Fadel and Miss Qerheli from Syria, and Miss Lina from the Faculty of Education who willingly helped me to improve the credibility of the research instrument.

I would also to thank the administrative staff at the department of Curriculum and Information technology and at the Faculty of Education as well for their help in many stages of my work.

I wish to thank my colleagues and friends, Ammar, Naser, Marwan, Riza, Ismail, Zohre, Lam, Ambica and others for their moral support, concern and generous assistance in various ways throughout the study. They made this a pleasant working environment.

To Professor Dr. Norhanom Abdulwahab, the head of the Institute of Postgraduate Studies for the financial aid. Without this financial support; this research would not have been completed.

Finally, I wish to warmly thank my brothers and my brothers-in-law for always supporting me in my studies.

Synopsis

This research is aimed at constructing an evaluation instrument for a Web based learning environment and furthermore to validate its causal structure. The evaluation instrument assumes that there are five principal factors in evaluating a WBLE: the Usability, Pedagogy, Accessibility, Information quality, and Added value. A questionnaire with five point Likert-scale has been developed for such a purpose. A priori model was developed to depict the possible causal effect of Usability, Pedagogy, Accessibility and Information quality on Added value. The quantitative research method was used to collect data from 650 students at the Syrian virtual University (SVU).

The process of data collection was conducted through two stages. The first data set (300) was subjected to an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and the second data set (350) was subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, factor analysis, and correlative analyses between factor score estimates. The descriptive statistics estimated the item means and deviations. The EFA was conducted to determine the items for each specific factor as well as factorial structure of the instrument. Factors were then assessed for their levels of internal reliability. Conducting EFA on the first data set resulted in seven factors for Usability; thirteen factors for Pedagogy; four factors for Accessibility; four factors for Information quality; and four factors for Added value.

Confirmatory factor analysis using a structural equation modeling approach and the AMOS software was employed to measure the goodness-of-fit indices and to construct reliability of the instrument. The priori model was confirmed. The findings indicated that the priori model fits with data. Furthermore, the findings indicated that the constructs Usability, Pedagogy, Accessibility, and Information quality affect the Added value. Finally, correlations among factor scores were measured and reported.

Pembinaan Instrumen Penilaian Untuk *Web-based Learning Environment* (WBLE) dan
Pengesahan Struktur Kausalnya

Sinopsis

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk membina instrumen penilaian untuk persekitaran pembelajaran berasaskan web (WBLE) dan mengesahkan struktur kausalnya. Instrumen penilaian bersasaskan andaian bahawa terdapat lima faktor asas untuk menilai WBLE, iaitu Kebolehgunaan (Usability), Pedagogi, Aksesibiliti, Kualiti Maklumat, dan Nilai Ditambah (*Added value*). Satu soal selidik berdasarkan skala Likert lima poin telah dibentuk untuk tujuan itu. Model priori dibangunkan untuk menggambarkan potensi kesan Kebolehgunaan, Pedagogi, Aksesibiliti, dan Kualiti Maklumat ke atas *Added value*. Kaedah kuantitatif digunakan untuk pengumpulan data dari 650 pelajar Syrian Virtual University (SVU). Proses pengumpulan data melibatkan dua tahap. Pada tahap pertama data set (300) mengalami analisis faktor eksploratori (*exploratory factor analysis, EFA*), dan data set kedua (350) menjalani analisis faktor pengesahan (*confirmatory factor analysis, CFA*). Data dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif, analisis faktor, dan analisis korelatif antara *factor score estimates*. Statistik deskriptif merangkumi min item dan sisihan piawai. EFA dijalankan untuk menentukan item-item bagi setiap faktor spesifik dan juga struktur faktorial untuk instrumen. Faktor kemudian dinilai dari segi tahap reliabiliti dalaman. Penggunaan EFA ke atas data set pertama menjanakan tujuh faktor bagi Kebolehgunaan; tiga belas faktor bagi Pedagogi; empat faktor bagi Aksesibiliti; empat faktor bagi Kualiti Maklumat; dan empat faktor bagi *Added value*. Analisis faktor pengesahan melalui kaedah model persamaan struktural (*structural equation modeling*) dan perisian AMOS digunakan untuk mengukur indeks keselarasan (*goodness-of-fit indices*) dan memastikan reliabiliti instrumen tersebut. Model priori telah disahkan; dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa model priori bersesuaian dengan data. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan bahawa konstruk- konstruk Kebolehgunaan, Pedagogi, Aksesibiliti, dan Kualiti Maklumat mempengaruhi *Added value*. Akhir sekali, korelasi antara skor faktor diukur dan dilaporkan.

List of Contents

Statement of Original Authorship	i
Title page	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Synopsis	v
Sinopsis	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	5
An Overview of the SVU	10
Academic programs	10
SVU Programs	11
Learning Model	11
Problem Statement	11
Interview	13
Purpose of Research	14
Research Objectives	14
Research Questions	15
Definitions of Parameters and Terms	16
Computer-Based Learning Environment (CBLE)	16
Class Web site	16
Online Learning	17
Web Page	17
Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)	17
Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)	17

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)	18
The AMOS Program	18
Theoretical Instrument	18
Conceptual Instrument	22
Significance of the Study	26
Scope of the Study	27
Delimitations and Limitations	28
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	30
Section One: Introduction to Developmental Research	31
Types of Developmental Research	32
The Methodology of Developmental Research	33
Collecting, Analyzing, and Reporting Data in Developmental Research	34
Section Two: General Review of WBLE, Evaluation Instruments and Criteria	35
WBLE Overview	35
Learning Environments That Directly Influence Web-Based Learning	35
Evaluation Tools and Instruments	38
An evaluation instrument for hypermedia courseware	38
The Web-based learning environment instrument (WEBLEI)	40
The Web-based evaluation tool	40
Usability Overview	42
ISO standard	42
Usability-basic attributes	43
The importance of usability	44

Universal Usability	44
Challenges to universal usability	45
Principles of universal usability design	45
Usability in context of WBLE	46
Pedagogy Overview	46
Pedagogical usability	46
The importance of pedagogy	47
Pedagogy and learning theories	47
Behaviorism theories	48
The key concepts of behaviorism	48
Cognitive theories	48
The key concepts of cognitive theory	49
Constructivism theories	49
The key concepts of constructivism	50
Learning theories and instructional design theories and models	50
Instructional design theories	50
Instructional Design Models	51
Systems approach to instructional design	52
Information-processing model	52
Web-based instructional design (WBID) Model	53
The Impact of Learning Theories on Instructional Design	54
The models of Behaviorism	54
The models of Cognitivism	55
The models of Constructivism	55

Learning theories and their impact on Instructional Designs and Models of Web-based learning	56
Accessibility Overview	59
General paradigm of difficulties with learners with disabilities in WBLE	59
The importance of accessibility	61
Universal accessibility	61
Information Quality Overview	61
Defining informational quality	62
Dimensions of information quality	62
The importance of information quality	62
Added Value Overview	63
Categories of added value	64
The importance of added value	64
Section Three: Evaluation Methods and Criteria	64
Usability Evaluation Methods (UEMs)	64
What is usability evaluation?	64
Evaluating the Usability of WBLE	67
Technical usability	67
Evaluating the Universal Usability of WBLE	70
Pedagogy Evaluation Methods	71
The effective dimensions of interactive learning on the WWW	71
Pedagogical usability criteria	72
Empirical evaluation of the criteria	78
Pedagogical usability criteria based on learning theories	78
Accessibility Evaluation Methods	80

Universal Accessibility	82
Information Quality Evaluation Methods	83
Added Values Evaluation Methods	85
Evaluation of the added value in WBLEs	85
Section Four: The Use of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) in the	87
Construction and Validation Process of the Evaluation Instrument	
Structural Equation Modelling	87
Justification for using SEM.	87
Basic composition	87
Statistical Software Programs that Assist with SEM	87
Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS)	87
Factor Analysis	88
Exploratory factor analysis	88
Extraction methods	88
Principal components extraction (PCE)	89
Rotation	89
Factor loading	89
Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)	90
Model fit	90
Model modification	92
Normality in SEM	92
<i>p</i> -Value	93
Sample size	93
Instrument Reliability and Validity	94
Instrument Reliability	94

The test-retest	94
The equivalent form	94
Internal consistency	94
Instrument Validity	95
Content validity	95
Criterion validity	95
Construct validity	95
Section Five: Conclusion	96
Case of Usability	96
Case of Pedagogical Usability	97
Case of Accessibility	98
Case of Informational Quality	99
Case of Added Value	99
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	
Introduction	100
Quantitative Research Paradigms	101
Rationale for the Design	102
Research Design	105
Design of Survey Quantitative Instruments	106
Definitions of UPAAIv	109
Well accepted criteria in the Evaluation Processes of WBLE	109
Evaluation tools & instruments	110
Identification of essential criteria for WBLE	110

Statement of Dimensions and development and organization of the questions	111
Usability	111
Pedagogy	111
Accessibility	112
Information quality	112
Added value	112
Learners' Survey Dimensions	113
Dimensions of generic usability	113
Dimensions of technical usability	114
Dimensions of Pedagogical Usability	115
Dimensions of Accessibility	116
Dimensions of Informational quality	117
Dimensions of Added values	118
Survey instrument layout and design	119
Student questionnaire Layout	119
Questionnaire Format and Design	120
Data Source	121
Data sample	122
Data Collection	122
Quantitative Data	123
Pilot Test	123
Data Analysis	124
Factor analysis	124
Reliability and Validity	125

Reliability	125
Validity	126
Conclusion	126
CHAPTER FOUR: QUANTITATIVE SURVEY ANALYSIS	
Introduction	127
Research Question One	127
Participants	127
Factor Analysis	129
Exploratory factor analysis	129
Assumptions underlying EFA	129
Extraction Methods	131
Exploratory factor analysis of Usability	132
Deleted items	136
Exploratory factor analysis of Pedagogical Usability	137
Exploratory factor analysis of Accessibility	142
Exploratory factor analysis of Information quality	143
Exploratory factor analysis of Added value	145
Summary	147
Reliability of the Obtained Factors	148
Confirmatory factor analysis	151
Participants	151
Research Question Two	154
Model Fit Indexes	154
Measurement Models	157

Usability first-order factor model	158
Indices	158
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	158
Regression Weights	160
Correlations	161
Usability second-order factor model	164
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	164
Regression Weights	164
Squared Multiple Correlations	165
Pedagogical usability first-order factor model	167
Indices	167
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	168
Regression Weights	171
Correlations	172
Pedagogical usability second-order factor model	176
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	176
Regression Weights	177
Squared Multiple Correlations	178
Accessibility first-order factor model	180
Indices	180
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	180
Regression Weights	181
Correlations	182
Accessibility second-order factor model	184
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	184

Regression Weights	184
Squared Multiple Correlations	185
Information Quality first-order factor model	187
Indices	187
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	187
Regression Weights	188
Correlations	189
Information Quality second-order factor model	191
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	191
Regression Weights	191
Squared Multiple Correlations	192
Added value first-order factor model	194
Indices	194
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	194
Regression Weights	195
Correlations	196
Added value second-order factor model	198
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	198
Regression Weights	198
Squared Multiple Correlations	199
The Measurement Model for the Constructs UPAIAv (Usability, Pedagogical usability, Accessibility, Information quality and the Added values).	201
Indices	201
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	201

Regression Weights	203
Correlations	203
Research Question Three	206
The Causal Structural Model for UPAIAv for a WBLE	206
Indices	207
Standardized Regression Weights	207
Regression Weights	207
Squared multiple correlations	208
Research Question Four	210
The Direct and Indirect Effects	210
The Direct Effects	211
The Indirect Effects	211
The Total Effects	212
The Total Effects- Lower Bounds- Upper Bounds	213
The Total Effects – Two Tailed Significance	213
 CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS, DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS	
Introduction	215
Theoretical Background and Hypothesis	217
Research Model and Instrument Construction	217
Results and Discussions	219
Exploratory Stage	219
Exploratory factor analysis	219
Confirmatory Stage	220
Fit indices	221

Confirmatory factor analysis	221
Usability first-order factor model	222
Indices	222
Standardized regression weights (Factor loading)	222
Regression weight	223
Correlation	223
Usability second-order factor model	224
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	224
Regression weights	224
Squared multiple correlations	225
Pedagogical Usability first-order factor model	225
Indices	225
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	225
Regression weight	228
Correlation	228
Pedagogical Usability second-order factor model	228
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	229
Regression weights	229
Squared multiple correlations	229
Accessibility first-order factor model	229
Indices	230
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	230
Regression weight	231
Correlation	231
Accessibility second-order factor model	231

Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	232
Regression weights	232
Squared multiple correlations	232
Information quality first-order factor model	232
Indices	233
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	233
Regression weight	234
Correlation	234
Information quality second-order factor model	234
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	235
Regression weights	235
Squared multiple correlations	235
Added value first-order factor model	235
Indices	235
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	236
Regression weight	237
Correlation	237
Added value second-order factor model	237
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	238
Regression weights	238
Squared multiple correlations	238
The measurement model for the constructs UPAIAv (Usability, Pedagogical usability, Accessibility, Information quality and the Added values)	238
Indices	239

Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	239
Regression weight	240
Correlation	240
The causal structural model for UPAIAv for a WBLE	240
Indices	241
Standardized Regression Weights (Factor loading)	241
Regression weight	241
The Direct and Indirect Effect of the UPAI on the Av.	241
The Direct Effects	241
The Indirect Effects	242
The Total Effects	242
The Total Effects – Lower Bounds- Upper Bounds	242
The Total Effects – Two Tailed Significance	242
Recommendations	243
Usability	244
Accessibility	245
Universal Usability and Accessibility	246
Pedagogical Usability	247
Information quality	250
Added value	251
The effect of Usability, pedagogical usability, information quality and Accessibility on the Added value	252
The correlations among the Usability, Pedagogical usability, Accessibility, Information quality and the Added value.	252
Further research	253

References	254
List of Figures	
Figure 1.1	Conceptual mapping of the technical and pedagogical usability 7
Figure 1.2	The Development Research Design 24
Figure 1.3	The Priori Model 25
Figure 2.1	The systematic design of the Literature Review 31
Figure 2.2	Diagram of the Evaluation Instrument 39
Figure 2.3	A Multidisciplinary Tool for the Evaluation of Usability, Pedagogical Usability, Accessibility and Information Quality of Web-Based Courses 41
Figure 2.4	Model for Designing Instruction 52
Figure 2.5	Information-Processing Model 53
Figure 2.6	Web-Based Instructional Design Model (WBID) 54
Figure 2.7	Continuum of Knowledge Acquisition Model 58
Figure 2.8	Design Framework for Online Learning Environment 58
Figure 2.9	The Ten Continuum of Reeves' Model for Effective Interactive Learning 72
Figure 3.1	The systematic design of the Methodology chapter 101
Figure 3.2	The Research Design Paradigm 105
Figure 3.3	The Process of Construct and Validation of the Survey Instruments 106
Figure 3.4	Design and development of the survey instruments 108
Figure 3.5	Survey procedure 121
Figure 4.1	The Usability Measurement Model/ First-order 163

Figure 4.2	The Usability Measurement Model/ Second-order	166
Figure 4.3	The Pedagogical Usability Measurement Model/First order	175
Figure 4.4	The Pedagogical Usability Measurement Model/Second order	179
Figure 4.5	Accessibility measurement model/First order	183
Figure 4.6	Accessibility measurement model/Second order	186
Figure 4.7	Information quality measurement model/First order	190
Figure 4.8	Information quality measurement model/Second order	193
Figure 4.9	Added value measurement model/ First order	197
Figure 4.10	Added value measurement model/ Second order	200
Figure 4.11	The Measurement Model of the Usability, Pedagogical usability, Accessibility, Information quality & Added value	205
Figure 4.12	The just identified priori structural model for UPAIAv for a WBLE	209
Figure 4.13	The just reduced priori structural model for UPAIAv for a WBLE	210
Figure 5.1	The Priori Model	218

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Some Examples of Problems at the SVU	12
Table 2.1	The Scope of Development in a Research Context	32
Table 2.2	Summary of the Two Types of Developmental Research	33
Table 2.3	Common Research Methods Employed in Developmental Research	34
Table 2.4	The Learning Environment Dimensions	36
Table 2.5	The Usability Five Quality Attributes	43
Table 2.6	Principles of Constructivist Design	51
Table 2.7	Types of Accessibility Difficulties for Users with Disabilities	60
Table 2.8	General Descriptions of Usability Evaluation Methods	66
Table 2.9	The Web Design Guidelines	69
Table 2.10	Pedagogical Usability Criteria	73
Table 2.11	Criteria for Pedagogical Usability for Evaluating the Digital Learning Material	76
Table 2.12	Pedagogical Usability Criteria Based on Learning Theories	79
Table 2.13	Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0	81
Table 2.14	Informational Quality Criteria	84
Table 2.15	Added Values Criteria	86
Table 2.16	Goodness of Fit Measures Standards in SEM	92
Table 3.1	Blueprint of the Quantitative Methods Being Applied in the Research	104
Table 3.2	Dimensions of Generic Usability	113
Table 3.3	Dimensions of Technical Usability	114
Table 3.4	Dimensions of Pedagogical Usability	115

Table 3.5	Dimensions of Accessibility	116
Table 3.6	Dimensions of Informational Quality	117
Table 3.7	Dimensions of Added Value	118
Table 3.8	Student Questionnaire Layout	119
Table 4.1	Demographic Profile and Descriptive Statistics of Surveyed Students (First data set)	128
Table 4.2	KMO and Bartlett's Test	130
Table 4.3	Usability Rotated Component Matrix	133
Table 4.4	Pedagogical Usability Rotated Component Matrix	138
Table 4.5	Accessibility Rotated Component Matrix	143
Table 4.6	Information Quality Rotated Component Matrix	144
Table 4.7	Added Value Rotated Component Matrix	145
Table 4.8	Reliability, Eigenvalues and Variance Explained	147
Table 4.9	Scale Reliability and Frequencies from Initial Student Questionnaire Analysis (UPAIA)	149
Table 4.10	Descriptive Statistics of the Second Data Set Respondents' Demographic Profile	151
Table 4.11	Scale Reliability and Frequencies from the Second Student Questionnaire Analysis (UPAIA)	155
Table 4.12	Standardized Regression Weights- Usability First-Order	159
Table 4.13	The Highest and Lowest Predicting Items for the Usability Construct	160
Table 4.14	The Regression Weights - Usability First-Order	161
Table 4.15	Correlation – Usability First-Order	162
Table 4.16	Standardized Regression Weights- Usability Second-Order	164

Table 4.17	Regression Weights- Usability Second-Order	165
Table 4.18	Squared Multiple Correlations - Usability Second-Order	165
Table 4.19	Standardized Regression Weights- Pedagogical Usability First-Order	168
Table 4.20	The Highest and Lowest Predicting Items for the Pedagogical Usability Construct	169
Table 4.21	The Regression Weights- Pedagogical Usability First-Order	171
Table 4.22	Correlation- Pedagogical Usability First-Order	173
Table 4.23	Standardized Regression Weights- Pedagogical usability Second-Order	176
Table 4.24	Regression Weights- Pedagogical Usability Second-Order	177
Table 4.25	Squared Multiple Correlations - Pedagogical Usability Second-Order	178
Table 4.26	Standardized Regression Weights-Accessibility First-Order	180
Table 4.27	The Highest and Lowest Predicting Items for the Accessibility Construct	181
Table 4.28	The Regression Weights - Accessibility First-Order	182
Table 4.29	Correlation- Accessibility First-Order	182
Table 4.30	Standardized Regression Weights-Accessibility Second-Order	184
Table 4.31	Regression Weights- Accessibility Second-Order	185
Table 4.32	Squared Multiple Correlations- Accessibility Second-Order	185
Table 4.33	Standardized Regression Weights- Information Quality First-Order	187

Table 4.34	The Highest and Lowest Predicting items for the Information Quality Construct	188
Table 4.35	The Regression Weights - Information Quality First-Order	188
Table 4.36	Correlations - Information Quality First-Order	189
Table 4.37	Standardized Regression Weights-information Quality Second-Order	191
Table 4.38	Regression Weights -Information Quality Second-Order	192
Table 4.39	Squared Multiple Correlations: Information quality Second-Order	192
Table 4.40	Standardized Regression Weights- Added Values First-Order	194
Table 4.41	The Highest and Lowest Predicting Items for the Added Values Construct	195
Table 4.42	The Regression Weights - Added Values First-Order	196
Table 4.43	Correlation - Added Values First-Order	196
Table 4.44	Standardized Regression Weights- Added Values Second-Order	198
Table 4.45	Regression Weights- Added Values Second-Order	199
Table 4.46	Squared Multiple Correlations- Added Values Second-Order	199
Table 4.47	Standardized Regression Weights for the UPAIAv Model	201
Table 4.48	The Highest and Lowest Predicting Factor for the UPAIAv	202
Table 4.49	The Regression Weights for the UPAIAv Model	203
Table 4.50	Correlation among Constructs UPAIAv	204
Table 4.51	Causal Structural: Regression Weights-Default Model	206
Table 4.52	Causal Structural: Standardized Regression Weights– Modified Model	207
Table 4.53	Causal Structural: Regression Weights – Modified Model	208

Table 4.54	Causal Structural: Squared Multiple Correlations- Modified Model	208
Table 4.55	The Direct Effects - Standard Errors – Priori Model	211
Table 4.56	The Indirect Effects - Standard Errors - Priori Model	212
Table 4.57	The Total Effects - Standard Errors- Priori Model	212
Table 4.58	The Total Effects - Lower Bounds (BC) – Priori Model	213
Table 4.59	The Total Effects - Upper Bounds (BC) - Priori Model	213
Table 4.60	The Total Effects – Two Tailed Significance (BC) – Priori Model	214

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Student Questionnaire Schedule	271
Appendix B: Bibliography of Experts	283