DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A WEB-BASED LEARNING SYSTEM BASED ON LEARNING OBJECT DESIGN AND GENERATIVE LEARNING TO IMPROVE HIGHER-ORDER THINKING SKILLS AND LEARNING

TAN WEE CHUEN

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A WEB-BASED LEARNING SYSTEM BASED ON LEARNING OBJECT DESIGN AND GENERATIVE LEARNING TO IMPROVE HIGHER-ORDER THINKING SKILLS AND LEARNING

TAN WEE CHUEN

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Education

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MAY 2006

To my beloved parents, sisters, brothers and husband

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In preparing this thesis, I was in contact with many people, researchers, academicians, and practitioners. They have contributed towards my understanding and thoughts. In particular, I wish to express my deepest appreciation to my thesis supervisors, Associate Professor Dr. Baharuddin Aris and Professor Dr. Mohd Salleh Abu for guidance, encouragement, critics and friendship. My sincere appreciation also extends to the experts and researchers whom I was contacted during my research. Their views and suggestions are useful indeed.

I am also indebted to Southern College and Lee Foundations for funding my Ph.D. study. I am also very thankful the librarians at UTM, National Institute of Education Singapore and National University of Singapore for their assistance in supplying the relevant literatures.

I am also very thankful to my colleagues in Southern College for their suggestions, assistance and motivation. Last but not least, I am grateful to all my family members.

ABSTRACT

This research aims to design, develop and evaluate the effectiveness of a Web-based learning system prototype called Generative Object Oriented Design (GOOD) learning system. Result from the preliminary study conducted showed most of the students were at lower order thinking skills (LOTS) compared to higher order thinking skills (HOTS) based on Bloom's Taxonomy. Based on such concern, GOOD learning system was designed and developed based on learning object design and generative learning to improve HOTS and learning. A conceptual model design of GOOD learning system, called Generative Learning Object Organizer and Thinking Tasks (GLOOTT) model, has been proposed from the theoretical framework of this research. The topic selected for this research was Computer System (CS) which focused on the hardware concepts from the first year Diploma of Computer Science subjects. GOOD learning system acts as a mindtool to improve HOTS and learning in CS. A pre-experimental research design of one group pretest and posttest was used in this research. The samples of this research were 30 students and 12 lecturers. Data was collected from the pretest, posttest, portfolio, interview and Web-based learning system evaluation form. The paired-samples T test analysis was used to analyze the achievement of the pretest and posttest and the result showed that there was significance difference between the mean scores of pretest and posttest at the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ ($p=0.000$). In addition, the paired-samples T test analysis of the cognitive operations from Bloom's Taxonomy showed that there was significance difference for each of the cognitive operation of the students before and after using GOOD learning system. Results from the study showed improvement of HOTS and learning among the students. Besides, analysis of portfolio showed that the students engaged HOTS during the use of the system. Most of the students and lecturers gave positive comments about the effectiveness of the system in improving HOTS and learning in CS. From the findings in this research, GOOD learning system has the potential to improve students' HOTS and learning.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk merekabentuk, membina dan menilai keberkesanan prototaip sistem pembelajaran melalui web, iaitu sistem pembelajaran *Generative Object Oriented Design* (GOOD). Hasil daripada kajian awal yang dijalankan menunjukan bahawa kebanyakkan pelajar mempunyai aras kemahiran rendah (LOTS) berbanding dengan aras kemahiran tinggi (HOTS) berdasarkan taksonomi Bloom. Sistem pembelajaran GOOD dibinakan berasaskan reka bentuk objek pembelajaran (*learning object design*) dan pembelajaran generatif untuk meningkatkan HOTS dan pembelajaran. Model GLOOTT, iaitu model reka bentuk konsep dicadangkan berdasarkan kerangka teori dalam kajian ini. Tajuk pembelajaran adalah subjek untuk Diploma Sains Komputer iaitu Sistem Komputer (SK) dengan tumpuan kepada topik perkakasan komputer. Sistem pembelajaran GOOD bertindak sebagai *mindtool* untuk meningkatkan HOTS dan pembelajaran dalam SK. Pendekatan kajian pra-eksperimen dengan reka bentuk satu kumpulan ujian pra- ujian pos digunakan dalam kajian ini. Sampel kajian merupakan 30 orang pelajar dan 12 orang pensyarah. Data diperolehi menerusi ujian pra dan ujian pos, portfolio, temu bual dan borang penilaian pembelajaran berasaskan Web. Hasil analisis ujian *paired-samples T test* menunjukkan wujudnya perbezaan signifikan di antara min ujian pra dan min ujian pos dalam ujian pada aras signifikan $\alpha = 0.05$ (p=0.000). Bagi setiap aras operasi kognitif taksonomi Bloom, analisis ujian *paired-samples T test* juga menunjukkan wujudnya perbezaan signifikan di antara setiap aras operasi kognitif pelajar sebelum dan selepas menggunakan sistem pembelajaran GOOD. Hasil kajian telah menunjukan peningkatan HOTS dan pembelajaran di kalangan pelajar. Hasil analisis dalam portfolio menunjukkan penglibatan pelajar dalam HOTS semasa menggunakan system tersebut. Kebanyakkan pelajar dan pensyarah memberi komen yang positif terhadap keberkesanan sistem tersebut dalam peningkatan HOTS dan pembelajaran dalam SK. Hasil kajian telah menunjukkan bahawa sistem tersebut berpotensi untuk meningkatkan HOTS dan pembelajaran.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	i
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	ix
	LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xx
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xxi
1	**INTRODUCTION**	
	1.0 Introduction	1
	1.1 Research Background	2
	1.1.1 Higher Order Thinking Skills	3
	1.1.2 HOTS and Computer Science	4
	1.1.3 Generative Learning and HOTS	6
	1.1.4 Learning Object Design	9
	1.1.5 Generative Learning, HOTS, Learning Object Design and Web Technology	11
	1.1.6 Instructional Design Model	13
	1.2 Problem Statements	14
	1.3 Research Rationale	16

1.4	Research Objectives	20
1.5	Research Questions	20
1.6	Research Theoretical Framework	21
1.7	The Framework of Instructional Design Model	27
1.8	Research Importance	29
1.9	Research Scope and Limitation	30
1.10	Operational Definition	31
1.11	Summary	35

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0	Introduction	36
2.1	Higher Order Thinking Skills Learning Object	37
2.1.1	Higher-Order Thinking Skills Teaching Programs and Practice	38
2.1.2	Definitions of HOTS Attributes of Learning Object	42
2.1.3	Instructional Strategies for HOTS Granularity of Learning Object	48
2.1.4	Technology and HOTS Metadata of Learning Object	51
2.1.5	Research Studies on HOTS	53
2.1.6	Research Studies of Using Technology to Improve HOTS	54
2.1.7	HOTS in Computer Science Learning	57
2.2	Learning Object	59
2.2.1	What is Learning Object Design?	60
2.2.2	Attributes of Learning Object	62
2.2.3	Granularity of Learning Object	63
2.2.4	Metadata of Learning Object	65
2.2.5	Learning Object Design in Learning	67

	2.2.6 Research Studies on Learning Object Design	67
2.3	Generative Learning and Learning Object Design	69
2.4	Generative Learning, HOTS and Learning Object Design	75
2.5	Web-Based Learning	76
	2.5.1 Web-Based Learning and Learning Object Design	78
2.6	Learning of Computer System	80
	2.6.1 Learning Problems of Computer System	80
	2.6.2 How to Teach and Learn Computer System	83
2.7	Instructional Design Model	86
2.8	Summary	87

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0	Introduction	89
3.1	An Overview of the HOTS Assessment	89
3.2	Research Framework	95
	3.2.1 Phase I: Analysis	97
	3.2.2 Phase II: Design	100
	3.2.3 Phase III: Development	101
	3.2.4 Phase IV: Implementation	102
	3.2.5 Phase V: Evaluation	102
	3.2.5.1 Formative Evaluation	103
	3.2.5.2 Summative Evaluation	106
3.3	Sampling	109
	3.3.1 Learners Sampling	109
	3.3.2 Expert Sampling	111
	3.3.3 Lecturers Sampling	112
3.4	Research Instruments	112
	3.4.1 Evaluation Form	112

	3.4.2	Pre-test and Post-test	114
	3.4.3	Rubric	115
	3.4.4	Electronic Portfolio	116
	3.4.5	Interview	117
3.5	Data Analysis		117
	3.5.1	Analysis of Students' Current Level of HOTS From the Conventional Teaching and Learning of Computer System (CS)	118
	3.5.2	Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Web-based Learning System in the Improvement of Students' Learning	119
	3.5.3	Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Web-based Learning System in the Improvement of HOTS	120
	3.5.4	Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Web-based Learning System in HOTS Engagement	121
	3.5.5	Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Web-based learning system as Perceived by the Lecturers and Students	121
3.6	Summary		122

4	**SYSTEM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT**		
4.0	Introduction		123
4.1	Web-Based Learning in Southern College		123
4.2	Design and Development of the Web-based Learning System		125
4.3	A Pedagogical Design Learning Conceptual Model: GLOOTT		127
4.4	GOOD Learning System		131
4.5	Structure of Learning Object Design		132

	4.5.1	The Metadata Elements	136
4.6	The Design and Development of GOOD Learning System		138
	4.6.1	Students Log In	141
		4.6.1.1 Upload Learning Objects	142
		4.6.1.2 Design Learning	143
		4.6.1.2.1 Implementation of GLOOTT Model in Learning Tasks of GOOD Learning System	143
		4.6.1.3 Forum	154
		4.6.1.4 Message from the Instructor	154
		4.6.1.5 Others Feature That Support Learning	155
	4.6.2	Instructor Log In	156
		4.6.2.1 Uploading Tasks	157
4.7	GOOD Learning System as Mindtool to Engage Learners in HOTS		159
4.8	Summary		161

5 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.0	Introduction	162
5.1	Data Analysis of Students' Current Level of HOTS From the Conventional Teaching and Learning of Computer System	162
5.2	Analysis of the Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in the Improvement of Students' Learning	165
5.3	Analysis of the Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in the Improvement of HOTS	167
5.4	Analysis of the Effectiveness of GOOD Learning	169

		System in the Students' HOTS Engagement	
	5.5	Analysis of the Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System as Perceived by Instructors	177
	5.6	Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Web-based Learning System as Perceived by Students	186
	5.7	Summary	198
6	**DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION**		
	6.0	Introduction	199
	6.1	Research Summary	199
	6.2	Discussion	201
		6.2.1 Current Level of HOTS of Students from the Conventional Teaching and Learning of Computer System (CS)	202
		6.2.2 Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in the Improvement of Students' Learning	202
		6.2.3 Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in Improving HOTS	203
		6.2.4 Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in HOTS Engagement	204
		6.2.5 Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System as Perceived by the Lecturers	205
		6.2.6 Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System as Perceived by the Students	206
	6.3	Implications of the Research	208
	6.4	Limitations of the Research	210
	6.5	Suggestions for Further Research	211
	6.6	Conclusion	213

6.7 Summary 214

REFERENCES 215

Appendices A - R 255-295

LIST OF TABLES

NUMBER OF TABLE	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Bloom Taxonomy of Thinking	32
2.1	Transitioning Learning Design	67
3.1	Data to be Collected and Research Design	96
3.2	The System Implementation Plan	102
3.3	Evaluation Plan	103
3.4	Number of Students and the Number of Lesson Maps They Had Designed	110
3.5	The Sections and Items in the WEF for Lecturer or Expert	113
3.6	The Sections and Items in the WEF for Students	114
3.7	Table for Record of Mean Score of Cognitive Operations of HOTS for Each Question	118
3.8	Table for Record of the Sum of the Students' Scores and Percentage of Cognitive Operations for All Questions	119
3.9	Table for the Comparison of Mean Score of Each Cognitive Operation between Pre-Test and Post-Test	120
4.1	The Metadata Elements	136
5.1	Division of Questions According to the Bloom Taxonomy of Thinking	163

5.2	Mean Score of Each Taxonomy of Thinking for Each Question	163
5.3	The Students' Scores and Percentage in the Taxonomy of Thinking of All Questions	164
5.4	Score of Pre-Test and Post-Test	166
5.5	Mean Scores of Pre-Test and Post-Test	166
5.6	T-Test Analysis for Mean Scores of Pre-Test and Post-Test	167
5.7	T-Test Analysis of Mean Scores for Each Cognitive Operation in Pre-Test and Post-Test	168
5.8	The HOTS Engagement of Students from Different Groups	170
5.9	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section A	178
5.10	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section B	178
5.11	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section C	179
5.12	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section D	179
5.13	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section E	180
5.14	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section E	180
5.15	Means and Standard Deviations of Each Item in WEF for the Lecturers	181
5.16	Aspects They Like in GOOD Learning System	183
5.17	Aspects They Don't Like GOOD Learning System	183
5.18	Suggestions to Improve GOOD Learning System	184
5.19	The Suitability of GOOD Learning System in	184

	Improving HOTS	
5.20	The Suitability of GOOD Learning System in the Teaching and Learning of Computer System	185
5.21	The Suitability of GOOD Learning System the Teaching and Learning of Other Subjects	185
5.22	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section A	186
5.23	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section B	187
5.24	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item for WEF Student in Section C	187
5.25	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section D	188
5.26	Mean and Standard Deviation of Each Item in Section E	188
5.27	Means and Standard Deviations of Each Item in WEF for the Students	189
5.28	Comments from the Students About GOOD Learning System	190
5.29	Suggestions from the Students About GOOD Learning System	191
5.30	GOOD Learning System in Improving HOTS	192
5.31	GOOD Learning System in Developing Problem Solving Skills	192
5.32	Parts of GOOD Learning System that Engages Students in HOTS	193
5.33	Cognitive Operations of HOTS They Aware of in GOOD Learning System	194
5.34	The Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in Improving CS	194

5.35	The Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in the Understanding of the Vocabulary Used In Computer	195
5.36	The Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in Developing the Concept of Computer	195
5.37	The Effectiveness of GOOD Learning System in Improving Your Problem Solving Skills in CS	196
5.38	Feedbacks from the Students about the Importance of HOTS in Learning CS	196
5.39	The Importance of HOTS Improvement in Learning Others Computer Science Subject	197
5.40	The Use of HOTS in the Posttest	197
5.41	Outcome of the Use of HOTS in the Posttest	197
5.42	GOOD Learning System in Helping Students in Learning CS	198

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Conceptual Model Derived from the Research Theoretical Framework	25
1.2	The Framework of ID Model Modified from ISDMELO (Baruque and Melo, 2003)	28
3.1	The Design Framework of HOTS Assessment (Adapted from Costa and Kallick, 2000)	92
3.2	Pre-Experimental Design, One-Group Pretest-Posttest Design	106
3.3	The Distribution of Lesson Maps of the Students	111
4.1	An Example of Interactive Learning Objects	133
4.2	An Example of Web Page Learning Objects	134
4.3	An Example of Learning Objects Designed as Table	134
4.4	An Example of Learning Objects Designed as Graphic	135
4.5	The Suggested Flow of Learning Activities in GOOD Learning System	139
4.6	The Main Page of GOOD Learning System	140
4.7	The Introduction to GOOD Learning System	140
4.8	Home Page of Student Log In	141
4.9	Mr. TQ	141
4.10	Uploading Learning Objects of Students	142
4.11	Subject and Subtopic Selection in Learning Tasks	143

4.12	GLOO Design in GOOD Learning system	144
4.13	Search Engine and Learning Objects in Library	145
4.14	Lesson Mapping in Learning Object Organizer	146
4.15	Course Map	149
4.16	Try It Out	150
4.17	Apply It	151
4.18	“How Am I Doing” Checklist	152
4.19	Chart of How Am I Doing Checklist	152
4.20	Reflection Worksheet	153
4.21	Forum	154
4.22	The Messages from the Instructor	155
4.23	Mr. TQ, the Information Agent in GOOD Learning System	156
4.24	Mr. TQ Helps Students to Reflect Their Learning Tasks	156
4.25	Upload Subject and Subtopics	157
4.26	Message to the Student	158
4.27	Thinking Task Generator	159
5.1	Chart of the Mean Score in the Taxonomy of Thinking for Each Question	164
5.2	Percentage of the Total Score for the Taxonomy of Thinking of All Questions	165
5.3	Mean Scores of Cognitive Operations for Pre-Test and Post-Test	169
5.4	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P12	172
5.5	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student	173

	P29	
5.6	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P2	173
5.7	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P9	174
5.8	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P21	174
5.9	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P24	175
5.10	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P27	175
5.11	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P18	176
5.12	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P19	176
5.13	The Engagement of HOTS from Each Chapter for Student P30	177

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

HOTS	-	Higher Order Thinking Skills
LOTS	-	Lower Order Thinking Skills
CS	-	Computer System
ICT	-	Information Communication Technology
MOE	-	Ministry of Education
GLOOTT	-	Generative Learning Organizer and Thinking Task
GLOO	-	Generative Learning Organizer
TT	-	Thinking Tasks
LOO	-	Learning Object Organizer
LOR	-	Learning Object Repository
LOs	-	Learning Objects
LMS	-	Learning Management System
LORI	-	Learning Object Review Instrument
WEF	-	Web-based Learning System Evaluation Form
ISDMELO	-	Instructional System Design Methodology based on e-Learning Object
ADDIE	-	Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, Evaluation
DFD	-	Data Flow Diagram
ID	-	Instructional Design
ISD	-	Instructional Systems Development
IMS	-	Instructional Management System
MOODLE	-	Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment
SCORM	-	Sharable Content Object Reference Model
GOOD	-	Generative Object-Oriented Design

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Rubric of Higher Order Thinking Skills Evaluation	255
B	"How Am I Doing" Checklist	257
C	System Data Flow (DFD) diagram	258
D1	Web-Based Learning Evaluation Form : Expert/Lecturer	266
D2	Web-Based Learning Evaluation Form: Student	272
E	Pre-Test And Post-Test Questions	275
F	Interview	278
G	Research Instrument Validation (GOOD Learning System Evaluation Form)	279
H	Research Instrument Validation (GOOD Learning System Evaluation Form for Students)	281
I	Research Instrument Validation (Pre-Test and Post-Test)	283
J	Research Instrument Validation (Pre-Test and Post-Test)	284
K	Research Instrument Validation (Rubric of HOTS)	285
L	Research Instrument Validation ("How am I Doing" Checklist)	286
M	Expert Validation: Content of Learning Object	287

N	Expert Validation: Design of the Web-based Learning System	288
O	List of Papers Publication	289
P	Content of Computer Hardware	290
Q	Score of LOTS And HOTS For Pretest And Posttest	292
R	Analysis of The Distribution of Students' Scores In Pretest and Posttest	294

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The emergence of World Wide Web has caused a lot of changes and innovations in the way people communicate, work, and learn. It has mesmerized educators for over a decade with its potential of distributed learning and universal educational resources delivery. An educational revolution is gradually taking place, which includes changes in the development and delivery of instruction. The changes provide an opportunity to improve the learning with the appropriate use of learning theories that are coupled with technologies.

With the rapid development of Information Communication Technology (ICT) in teaching and learning, the school is no longer essential as an information supplier. The amount of information channeled through the Internet has outstripped people's abilities to process and utilize the information. They are not only required to learn, but also need to analyze and evaluate the validity and reliability of the information received. The education system now should emphasize the students as producers but not simply consumers of information. Hence, it is increasingly important for students have to possess higher order thinking skills in order to process and to apply the information.

While a lot of people are eagerly developing the Web-based learning environment, there are question marks on how to keep the online learners captivated and self-motivated to achieve the learning objectives and able to use higher order thinking skills (HOTS). One of the solutions is to identify the learners' needs, and economically customize the individual learning in order to promote the successful learning (Wiley, 2000). This has brought to the transition from the one-size-fits-all approach to customization with the growing use of the learning object design (LTSC, 2000). Learning object is an instructional technology currently used by the educational technologists and instructional designers for the choice of the instructional design, development and delivery (Hodgins, 2001; Wiley, 2000).

This chapter provides a background study for the research project by providing an overview of learning objects and generative learning, higher order thinking skills (HOTS) and the instructional design model. Besides, the statements of problem, suggestions of problem solving, objectives of research, questions of research, suggested framework of instructional design model, framework of research theory, rational of research, importance of research, scope and limitation of research, and the definition of terminology used in research are discussed in this chapter.

1.1 Research Background

Modern life requires people to face various experiences and environments (Tal and Hochberg, 2003). However, for many years, contemporary education is paying more focus on the "transmission of information" from teachers and books. In reality, students should be equipped with higher order thinking skills (HOTS) in their learning process (Dunlap and Grabinger, 1996a; Osborne and Wittrock, 1983; Hollingworth and McLoughlin, 2003; Jonassen *et al*., 1993). The learning process requires the students to construct their understanding meaningfully and to search for innovative solution in problem solving.

1.1.1 Higher Order Thinking Skills

Higher order thinking skills (HOTS) represent multi-faceted and complex cognitive processes that develop and improve the processing and construction of information (Resnick, 1987; Swartz, 2001). The term HOTS used in this research refers to the analysis, synthesis and evaluation according to Bloom's Taxonomy of thinking (Bloom *et al*., 1956). Thus, the recall of knowledge, comprehension and application are classified as lower order thinking skills (LOTS) (Dori, Tal and Tsaushu, 2003; Bloom *et al*., 1956; Morgan, 1996). Skills such as analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating information in the learning process are important in order to develop HOTS (Bloom *et al*., 1956; Bloom, Hasting and Madaus, 1971; Ennis, 1987; Zohar, Weinberger and Tamir, 1994; Jonassen, 1992; Tal and Hochberg, 2003; Morgan, 1996). A lot of researchers have pointed out the increasing importance of HOTS in the teaching and learning process.

Problem solving requires the use of HOTS such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation. This is in line with the argument from Kallick (2001a) that the cognitive operations such as analyzing, inferring and evaluating are necessary in problem solving. According to Jonassen (1992), argumentation is an appropriate outcome for problem solving where students generate arguments and make reasoning to defend their solutions. This encourages them in using HOTS. Besides, reflective thinking is also often related to HOTS (Quellmalz, 1987; Vockell, and van Deusen, 1989; Fogarty and McTighe, 1993; Wai and Hirakawa, 2001; Fogarty, 2002; Harrigan and Vincenti, 2004). Reflective thinking helps students to be aware of their thinking as they perform tasks or learning and this engages them in HOTS. Hence, the reflective thinking was used as an important cognitive operation for scaffolding the encouragement of HOTS in this research.

From the above description, it is apparent that HOTS requires students to manipulate information and ideas in ways that transform their meaning and implication. This occurs when students combine facts and ideas in order to analyze, synthesize, and

evaluate in generating knowledge. The manipulation of information and ideas through these processes allows students to solve problem, generate knowledge and promote understanding.

1.1.2 HOTS and Computer Science

As technology changes at an ever-increasing speed, the students must have the ability to adapt to changes and become lifelong learners. This is especially true in the computing field. The students have to be good in both thinking and problem solving skills. However, most of the colleges focus more on rote lecturing, assignments and tests (Tan Wee Chuen, Baharuddin Aris and Mohd Salleh Abu, 2005). They rarely promote HOTS among the students in order to understand and apply problem solving and logical reasoning skills in the learning of Computer Science (Parham, 2003; Arup, 2004).

Harrigan and Vincenti (2004) noted that HOTS are important in college teaching and learning. A lot of studies have been conducted to study the teaching and learning process in Computer Science domain in higher education. Empirical results from the studies show that many students can not demonstrate HOTS in their learning (Chmura, 1998; Henderson, 1986; Arup, 2004). Most of the students resort to trial and error, and memorizing facts from their learning, rather than learning problem solving skills. However, these HOTS such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation thinking skills are found important in the learning of Computer Science. This was demonstrated by Parham (2003) in which there is a direct correlation between the students' HOTS and their performance in their learning.

Hadjerrouit (1999) noted that the conventional predominant teaching model viewed learning as the passive transmission on knowledge and this cause serious misconception and lack of conceptual understanding in Computer Science learning. This is further supported by Arup (2004) that the existing learning in computer system

tends to regurgitate what the instructors have taught and does not imply the ability to use HOTS among the students. This is also proven by the studies from Maj, Veal, and Charlesworth (2000); Holmboe (1999) and Mirmotahari, Holmboe and Kaasboll (2003) that the college students are lacking of knowledge of computer technology and the basic skills to operate computer systems.

Another main problem of Computer Science students is the lack of deep understanding of the relationships in the facts they have learned (Scragg, Baldwin and Koomen, 1994; Mirmotahari, Holmboe and Kaasboll, 2003). Students are better in the practical skills than theoretical questions. In computer education, the prior knowledge of students is the foundation for further knowledge construction (Holmboe, 1999; White, 2001; Mirmotahari, Holmboe and Kaasboll, 2003; Scragg, 1991). New information must be linked to information already understood (Rosenberg, 1976; Hamza, Alhalabi and Marcovitz, 2000). Learners would generate and test ideas that either have been created from their prior knowledge.

The content of the computer has to stay abreast of the rapidly developing computer technology. HOTS are essential to the students in this rapidly changing technological society (Morgan, 1996). The growth of knowledge in computer needs more timeliness in teaching resources, expertise and preparation time (Wolffe *et al.*, 2002). This leads to a large amount of information being drained to the students. Instructors and students have been burdened with the task of communicating massive and rapidly changing computer content. Consequently, the overemphasis on content has resulted in the lack of attention on the HOTS that are necessary for the students to successfully solve the complex scenarios (Arup, 2004).

Researchers in the education field are progressing toward the teaching and learning with technology to develop HOTS. Studies of *HOTS* program from Pogrow (1988a, 1988b), Herrington and Oliver (1999), Tay (2002) and Tal and Hochberg (2003) showed encouraging results. Technology can be used as a mindtool for conceptual development (Reeves, 1998; Jonassen, 2000) and to enable higher order learning (Ting,

2003; Reeves, 1998; Pogrow, 1988a, 1988b). In this context, the learner acts as a designer in the learning process (Jonassen, 1994; Jonassen and Reeves, 1996). Jonassen, Mayes and McAleese (1993) found that individual learns the most from the design of instructional materials. Therefore, if the students were given opportunity to construct or design their own learning, it creates an active learning environment. This process requires the students to think more meaningfully and therefore helps to develop their HOTS.

1.1.3 Generative Learning and HOTS

A lot of instructional strategies have been proposed to develop the HOTS. One of the most frequent proposals is generative learning. Generative learning is an important constructivist learning environment (Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000; Dunlap and Grabinger, 1996a; Duffy and Jonassen, 1992; Morrison and Collins, 1996; Grabowski, 1996; Bonn, and Grabowski, 2001; Jonassen, Mayes and McAleese, 1993; McLoughlin, 1998). According to Bonn, and Grabowski (2001), generative learning provides the necessary theoretical framework for research in a constructivist perspective. As described by CTGV (1993), the generative learning is the first key element of constructivism learning environment. In generative learning environment, learning is generative; learners focus on the construction of their own learning. In this research, the Web-based learning system used the generative learning to design the constructive learning environment.

Originally, generative learning is conceived under the cognitive information processing proposed by Wittrock (1974). The focus of generative learning model is that, learner is an active participant who works to construct meaningful understanding by generating relationships between the information. The cognitive psychologists and educationists usually refer the skills associated with this kind of thinking activities as HOTS. These activities are completely in contrast to those which simply copy down information and memorize them, where the students passively receive information and

respond to the exercises or examinations that require only facts recalling and simple understanding. Dunlap and Grabinger (1996b) pointed out that generative learning is a higher-level thinking activity. HOTS depict the dynamic role of learners in which they act as thinkers actively participate in constructing knowledge. Such a view of learning fits well with the empirical evidence from the studies of technology and Computer Science learning and teaching (refer Chapter 2 for further discussion).

Learning that emphasizes on the connection between the new and old concepts, and among the concepts is important to enhance understanding (Nickerson, 1995). The connection among the concepts is also important in learning Computer Science (Rosenberg, 1976; Hamza, Alhalabi and Marcovitz, 2000). However, the conventional teaching models in Computer Science often view learning as a passive transmission on knowledge. This results in misconception, lack of conceptual understanding and the poor understanding of the relationships in the concepts that the students learned (Hadjerrouit, 1999; Maj, Veal, and Charlesworth, 2000; Holmboe, 1999; Mirmotahari, Holmboe and Kaasboll, 2003; Scragg, Baldwin and Koomen, 1994). In contrast, generative learning provides a learning environment that enhances the learning through actively construct meaningful understanding by generating relationships among the concepts.

According to Dunlap and Grabinger (1996a), content is often presented to the learners in the format that promotes memorization rather than higher order thinking. Most of the schools are still examination-oriented. The teaching and learning often focus in answering specific questions in the examinations. With the generative learning, it promotes active processing in the linkage of the concepts and supportive environment that encourages them to think and construct knowledge from their understanding. Higher education institute is the most appropriate venue for this learning approach because their goals are to promote advanced knowledge acquisition and HOTS (Jonassen, Mayes and McAleese, 1993).

Concept map provides an important tool in generative learning environment (Osborne and Wittrock, 1983; Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000). Concept

map functions as a tool to engage learners to generate and to organize the ideas in the content being studied. According to Jonassen (2000), concept map engages learners in the reorganization of knowledge, explicit description of concept and their interrelationships, deep processing of knowledge that promotes better remembering, retrieval and application of knowledge; and relating new concepts to existing ones that improves understanding. This is consistent with the theoretical perspective of generative learning.

The concept map used in this research is called as lesson map. It is an outline form of concept map as suggested by Alpert and Grueneberg (2000), and Dabbagh (2001). The lesson map used in this research enables the construction of concepts require HOTS when students organize the lesson map, select important and relevant concepts to add to the map, search the crosslink and indicate the relationships between concepts. These activities engage students in HOTS that are analysis thinking while they are organizing the concepts in hierarchical structure, synthesis thinking while they are searching crosslink and indicating the relationships between the concepts and evaluating while they are searching and judging the important and relevant of the concepts (Jonassen, 2000; Dabbagh, 2001; Alpert and Grueneberg, 2000).

Jonassen, Mayes and McAleese (1993) pointed out that the generative learning results deeper levels of knowledge processing and construction, and these necessitate the HOTS. They further pointed out that constructivist learning environments aim to engage students in higher order and meaningful learning. Besides that, Jonassen (1992), Jonassen, Mayes and McAleese (1993) noted that the outcomes of constructivist learning environments should assess HOTS in order to reflect the intellectual processes of knowledge construction. Studies show that generative learning and teaching provoked learners' thinking skills and developed their understanding (Laney, 1990; Schaverien, 2000; McLoughlin, 1998; Dunlap and Grabinger, 1996a, 1996b; McGriff, 2002; Osborne and Wittrock, 1983; McLoughlin, 1998). The process of generative learning engages student in HOTS (Grabowski, 1995; Grabowski, 1996; McLoughlin, 1998). From this perspective, the generative learning is strongly related to the HOTS.

Gao and Lehman (2003) noted that most of the researches in generative learning emphasize in the facts and concepts-level learning and deal little with HOTS. Therefore, further research on generative learning that focuses on HOTS is necessary.

1.1.4 Learning Object Design

Nowadays, most of the instructional designers understood the importance of pedagogical perspectives in the design and development of Web learning environments. According to Snow (1989), instructions differ in structure and completeness and highly structured instructions (linear sequence, restricted and high external control) seem to help those with low ability but hinder those with high ability. The concept of one-size-fits-all design is no longer suitable in the design and development in e-learning. The learning environment should be highly flexible in structures and hands control out of the hands of the systems or instructors to the learners. Therefore, the concept of learning object design fits this very well as it provides flexible paths to the users' exploration in the teaching and learning process. The non-linearity of the learning object design allows students to access information in different patterns and to take control in their own action and learning.

A learning object is a small, reusable digital component that can be selectively applied alone or in combination by computer software, learning facilitators or learners themselves, to meet individual needs for learning or performance support (Shepherd, 2000). There are three interdependent components in the learning object design model: the learning object itself; metatagging (a standardized way to describe the content in code); a Learning Content Management System (LCMS) that stores, tracks, and delivers content.

Learning object design is the design of instructions into small learning contents that can be reused in different context and combined to form learning that are appropriate to the individual (Wiley, 2000; Hodgins, 2001; Wagner, 2002; Mills, 2002;

Longmire, 2000a, 2000b; Robbins, 2002; Lau, 2002; Gibbons, Nelson and Richards, 2000; Hanaffin, Hill and McCarthy, 2000; South and Monson, 2000; Collis and Strijker, 2003). The design of instructions into learning objects can be deployed into multiple setting and learning goals. It is a current trend of computer-based instructions and learning that are grounded in the object-oriented paradigm of Computer Science.

The idea of information in small chunks which are reusable and flexible in a learning environment has received a lot of compliments from the educators and instructional designers of e-learning environment. According to Reigeluth and Nelson (1997), when teachers first gain access to instructional materials, they often break the materials down into their constituting parts and then reassemble these parts in ways that support their instructional goals. Thus, the notion of small and reusable units of learning content, learning components, and learning object design have the potential to provide the flexibility and reusability by simplifying the assembly and disassembly of instructional design and development.

E-learning industry has anticipated the day where learners could personalize, assemble, and access e-learning on demand for years (Mortimer, 2002). Most electronic learning content is currently developed for specific purposes. How does a learner select only a small part of content that suit their learning needs? The educational software development is an extremely expensive process in terms of cost and time (Wiley, 2000; Downes, 2000; Longmire, 2000a). With the learning object design, the learning objects can be reused and shared. Molenda and Sullivan (2002) noted that there is a critical need for more efficient design and production of the digital learning materials. Thus, learning object design had become more practical now especially with the essential features of the World Wide Web.

1.1.5 Relationships between Generative Learning, HOTS, Learning Object Design and Web Technology

The current design and development of learning objects has overlooked the use of learning objects in supporting learning (Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000; Shi *et al*., 2004). Most of the discussions and researches in learning objects concentrate on the standards, metadata and others technical issues related to the development of the learning object system design. The evidence of the dynamic attributes of learning object design in learning is still not well addressed (Shi *et al*., 2004). The unique attributes of the learning objects lies in providing a customized, individualized and flexible learning environment. The required approach can be grounded in constructivist principles of learner centered, learner-controlled and learner-constructed learning. Thus, there is a need for research and development works to study the pedagogical issues of the learning object.

According to Wagner (2002), the development of learning objects involves a significant shift from behavioral to cognitive perspectives and from objectivist to constructivist perspectives. One of the principles of constructivism is that learners are active participants in the learning process (Jonassen, 1994; Reeves, 1998; Friesen, 2001; Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000). In addition, Collis and Strijker (2003) mentioned that the learning object design makes a pedagogical shift from the emphasis on learning as acquisition of predetermined content, towards the emphasis of learning as participating and contributing to the learning experience. Therefore, learners construct their own understanding from experiencing objects, activities and processes by exploring, analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating knowledge in self-directed or collaborative fashions rather than in a predetermined structure. These processes involve learners in HOTS.

From the theoretical perspective of the generative learning, learning object design can be configured as generative learning environments (Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000). The attributes and nature of learning object design match

well with a generative learning. Learning object design offers the flexible, reusable and generative learning environment by allowing learners to participate more actively in the construction of knowledge and understanding. Learners are able to generate the relationships between the learning objects that are flexible and reusable, and this engages them in HOTS.

Toh (2004) indicated that the learning object design has the potential to deal with the expanding growth of knowledge and skills. The attributes of the learning object that allow learner-centered, generative-oriented activities have not yet been fully explored and may reveal significant implications for the development of the educational technology. As the amount of information about the computer system is growing parallelly with the fast changing technology, learning object design can help to reduce the cost and time of the e-learning system development where it allows the reusable content between the courses that teaching in the same concept.

It is apparent that the learning object design with generative learning environment engages students in HOTS. This learning environment encourages and requires students to manipulate the content which is designed as small chunks of learning object. The HOTS occur when students analyze, synthesize, and evaluate to design their learning by connecting and generating the relationships between the learning objects with the use of concept mapping. This enables students to generate, to evaluate their ideas and to construct their learning actively.

The Web provides an excellent environment for generative learning, especially with the use of learning object design. The advent of the WWW technology tools and features, and the growing of learner –centered instruction have provoked the Web-based learning (Bonk and Reynolds, 1997). Web-based learning environment is able to support student-centered learning and learning by doing (Lim, 2000; Jonassen and Reeves, 1996). The Web-based learning designed with appropriate instructional theoretical models can act as mindtool to promote HOTS (Jonassen and Reeves, 1996; Reeves, 1997; Bonk and Reynolds, 1997). The Web-based learning design that based on

generative learning can provoke learners' thinking skills and developed their understanding (Schaverian and Cosgrove, 2000; Shepherd, Clendinning and Schaverian, 2002). The dynamic attributes of learning object design support the reuse of resources on the Web (Mohan and Brooks, 2003). In addition, the use of hypermedia that allows extensive links between learning objects supports learning (Dodds and Fletcher, 2003; Zhu, 1999). Hence, Web-based technologies are able to support the use of learning object design in learning. These reveal the great potential of the development of Web-based learning objects that incorporates with the generative learning to improve HOTS and learning.

1.1.6 Instructional Design Model

Instructional design (ID) theories are very important for the development of high quality instructional program that meets the users' needs. According to Reigeluth (1996), instructional design is concerned with differentiating the methods of instruction that are suitable for different situations. ID plays an important role in the application of learning object design if it is to succeed (Wiley, 2000). The ID model of the design and development of this research is modified from the ISDMELO (Instructional System Design Methodology based on e-Learning Object) which is based on ADDIE model (Baruque and Melo, 2003). The ISDMELO methodology which is built on the fundamental of learning object-based instructional design has been developed for the design and development of Web-based educational content.

From the research background outlined above, it is thus necessary to concretize a conceptual framework by designing and developing suitable learning models for computer-based learning environments, which ultimately lead to effective learning.

1.2 Problem Statements

In the information age, HOTS are important to facilitate people to cope with rapidly changing world. Learning to think is necessary in promoting life-long learning. The education system should nurture the productive growth by paying more emphasis on teaching for HOTS (Onosko, 1990). In addition, Morrison and Lowther (2001) pointed out that the school can no longer focus on a body of knowledge that a student needs to master. The emphasis of helping students to master in content should be shifted to a focus on thinking. When students develop their HOTS, they are more equipped to control their learning and to develop deep understanding of the content. Students need to have the ability to think so that they can learn instead of pure memorization of facts. HOTS are emphasized by Resnick (1987) as a different learning process as compared to rote learning and information withdrawal. This is of utmost important in view of the massive growth of knowledge in the ICT world.

Researchers in Computer Science education have noted that the predominant model of instruction that views learning the passive transmission has caused the lack of conceptual understanding in Computer Science (Arup, 2004; Scragg, Baldwin and Koomen, 1994; Tan Wee Chuen, Baharuddin Aris, and Mohd Salleh Abu, 2005). Some of the researchers even demonstrated that the problems are due to the inability of HOTS (Parham, 2003; Arup, 2004; Tan Wee Chuen, Baharuddin Aris, and Mohd Salleh Abu, 2005). Details about the problems of the learning of Computer System will be discussed in chapter 2.

As the learning object design is new in the instructional design, it is challenging to design and develop a Web-based learning environment that is based on this design. It is difficult to implement the learning object design in the traditional learning environment. The inherent strength of World Wide Web technology is the distribution and sharing of information in hyper-space. However, most of the Web-based content materials nowadays are actually similar to the approach of linear mode delivery of the learning materials found in traditional lecture presentations. This conventional “one-

size-fits-all" learning environment is no longer suitable and satisfactory for the needs of the learners. Converting these to a digital deliverables through the Internet would not make any change to these passive learning materials and does not promise in fostering understanding as well as HOTS. Furthermore, Beaver and Moore (2004) noted that there is a wide range of educational software but most of them are not designed to encourage HOTS.

Numerous studies have documented the effectiveness of the incorporation of drill and practice computer programs into teaching and learning. However, Morgan (1996) highlighted that many drill and practice computer programs engage students only at lower levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Knowledge, Comprehension, Application). Morgan (1996) also pointed out that the use of technology in education must ensure that the technology is being used to engage students to HOTS. Thus, the shift of teaching and learning now is not to be a process of regurgitating and reproducing information but a process of constructing knowledge and learning environment that involves learners in HOTS. It is essential to understand that the design of e-learning is a design for promoting HOTS and not a design for teaching or delivering information.

As reviewed in literature study, limited research has been done on the learning object design and it's effectiveness in learning. Current research and development of the learning object design are primarily focusing on establishment of technical issues (Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000; Tan Wee Chuen, Baharuddin Aris and Mohd Salleh Abu, 2004). There is little research on the pedagogical based learning objects in the design of Web-based learning, especially in Malaysia. To improve learning, the learning object design and the generative learning in instructional design based on ISDMELO was adapted as the elements of design and development of the Web-based learning system in this research.

The prototype of Web-based learning system focused on one of the subjects offered in Diploma of Computer Science, which is selected in conjunction with the

implementation of the subject in the first year of Diploma in Computer Science. This research aims to design and develop a prototype of Web-based learning system in Computer Science that incorporates the learning object design and generative learning to improve the HOTS as well as the understanding of the students in their learning.

1.3 Research Rationale

As citizens in the information age, students need to have strong problem solving skill and thinking skill (Morgan, 1996). Hence, experiences that encourage and improve students in HOTS should become a common practice in education. This is important as the development of information technology has become ubiquitous in schools and colleges. The Malaysian Education Ministry has taken appropriate steps to ensure the students to be good thinkers. The curriculum design has focused in the development of HOTS.

The Malaysian Education Ministry has introduced Information Technology (IT) (Teknologi Maklumat) from the Form 1 to Form 6 in the secondary schools. One of the purposes is to develop HOTS such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Besides, it also aims to promote the problem solving skill that involves thinking skills as mentioned earlier (Zanariah Abdullah and Rosmayuzie Ab. Satar, 2001). This reveals the effort of the Malaysian Education Ministry in promoting HOTS through the teaching and learning of IT. It also shows the importance of HOTS in learning IT.

The attention to thinking skills is explicit with the extensive research in this field. Peck and Dorricot (1994) noted that the students must be able to access, evaluate, communicate information and solve complex problems. According to Kallick (2001b), when the computer is used with full potential, it is able to enhance thinking skills and create new knowledge. In this context, technology can be harnessed to support and encourage the students learning and HOTS (Morgan, 1996; Peck and Dorricot, 1994).

A lot of learning problems and issues have been identified and discussed from the research conducted in Computer Science domains (see Scragg, Baldwin and Koomen, 1994; Miron, O'Sullivan, and McLoughlin, 2000; Parham, 2003; Henderson, 1986; Maj, Veal and Charlesworth, 2000; Yurcik and Osborne, 2001; Holmboe, 1999; Magagnosc, 1994; Yehezkel *et al.*, 2002; Skrien, 2001; Ivanov, 2003; Makkonen, 1997; Mirmotahari, Holmboe and Kaasboll, 2003). The learning problems are mainly due to the inability of students in HOTS and the lack of inter-relatedness among the concepts they have learned. Empirical evidence obtained by Parham (2003) demonstrated that the inability of students' HOTS will affect their performance in Computer Science. Details of the learning problems were discussed in 2.6.

The students' problem solving skills are essential in computer subject such as Computer System, in which they are required to analyze, synthesize and evaluate the complex scenarios. All these activities involve HOTS. Timely resources in the content of Computer System are needed due to the high pace of computer technology development. Students have been burdened with the task of communicating a large amount of the fast changing content. This has brought to the overemphasis on the content and has resulted in the lack of emphasis on the HOTS that is necessary for students to successfully deal with complex scenarios (Arup, 2004).

The literature and research findings clearly show the need to promote HOTS among the Computer Science students. In this research, Computer System subject has been chosen as a topic of study for the effectiveness of the Web-based learning system based on the result found in the preliminary study. This subject is taken by the Computer Science students as fundamental knowledge of computer technology.

The issues of the flexibility and pedagogical perspective in the development of e-learning have brought to the concept of learning object design in the development of educational software. The traditional courseware that comprises the instructional content and a navigation scheme to move around the content no longer meets the expanding growth of knowledge (Toh, 2004). The learning object design features are

engaged with the design and development of a more flexible and generative learning environment. The delivery of the learning materials in the form of chunks of lesson, organization and customization of the materials based on the learning objectives can now be realized with the use of learning object design. However, the current development on the learning object design in e-learning tends to overlook the use of learning object design in supporting learning (Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000; Shi *et al*., 2004). The pedagogical perspective in the design and development of learning object has been left behind and put in a less important place compared to the standard, metadata and technical issues.

Van Zele *et al*. (2003) pointed out that very little is known about the educational pitfalls or benefits of the learning object design, and the reports on its implementation and evaluation in higher education are lacking. In addition, Agostinho *et al*. (2003) noted that there is little research on how learning object design should be incorporated into constructivist and learner-centered approaches to learning. At present, the discussion of learning object design is commonly related to the concerns content, its values and management (Tan Wee Chuen, Baharuddin Aris and Mohd Salleh Abu, 2004). Currently most of the studies conducted in the use of learning object design emphasize more on the technical issues and the design for the use of instructors and trainers. Besides, the learning object design is still focusing on the potential in gaining profit and incentive from the e-learning industry, leaving behind the emphasis on the impact of the learning object design to learning. Thus, the pedagogical intent in learning design has to be addressed as the important issue in supporting and enhancing the learning process (Ramsay *et al*., 2004; Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000; Shi *et al*., 2004; Toh, 2004; Bradley and Boyle, 2004; Agostinho *et al*., 2003).

As reviewed earlier, it is important to conceptualize and design the Web learning based on pedagogical perspectives. However, most of the educational software tends to emphasize the sophisticated multimedia display (Cohen, 1983; Campoy, 1992; Koper, 1998). According to Jonassen (1991), instructional designers should focus more on the thinking technologies rather than developing a sophisticated multimedia delivery

technology. Mere multimedia does not turn students into active participants during the lectures (Van Zele *et al.*, 2003). The learning system should be designed towards a more student-driven and student-oriented interactive learning. Merely providing pre-determined structure of content will not aid significantly in learning. The one-size-fits-all traditional courseware no longer meets the requirement of personal knowledge construction. Learning object design and generative learning provide the environment that allows students to construct their own learning. This learning environment enables the students to be active participant in their learning and most importantly, engages them in HOTS.

Currently, common Web-based learning systems are more to enrich access to course materials, search course materials, post project or assignment, provide tutorials and learning support, and enable the Web discussion. There is lack of integration of Web technologies into actual teaching and learning (Reeve, 1996). The promise of the Web technologies must be accompanied with pedagogical perspective (McLoughlin, 1998). The use of communication technologies to support learners' centered learning is well documented in the literature and research (eg. McLoughlin, 1998; Reeve, 1996).

A lot of literatures highlight the need for learner-controlled learning in the design of technological learning environment (eg. McLoughlin, 1998; Jonassen and Reeves, 1996). Web technology is conceived as enabling the students-centered learning. Web-based technologies are able and suitable to support the use of learning object design in learning (Hawryszkiewyez, 2002). The interactivity and flexibility of the Web enable the design of a Web-based learning tool that leverages the learning object design and generative learning. It provides an environment that enables students to explore and manipulate the learning objects so that students can continuously reconfigure to construct their knowledge.

For the reasons discussed above, this research focuses on the development and design of a Web-based learning system, using the learning objects in the design approach of learning content and generative learning in the design of learning strategy to

assist the learning in Computer System as well as to improve the HOTS. A conceptual model is suggested, namely **G**enerative **L**earning **O**bject **O**rganizer and **T**hinking **T**asks (GLOOTT). This model incorporates the three important components, namely the learning object design, generative learning and HOTS in a technologically-supported learning environment. The model aims to facilitate the students to engage themselves in HOTS as well as to **promote understanding** in the Computer System.

A comprehensive study was conducted in this research to evaluate the effectiveness of GLOOTT model in improving learning and HOTS. Besides, the researcher hopes that this study will contribute to the framework of instructional design and development based on the learning object design and generative learning in the Web-based learning environment to improve the students' HOTS.

1.4 Research Objectives

This research aims to achieve two main objectives:

(i) To design and develop a prototype of Web-based learning system that based on the learning object design and generative learning.

(ii) To evaluate the Web-based learning system in the aspects of:
   (a) The improvement of learning through test.
   (b) The improvement of HOTS based on Bloom's taxonomy.
   (c) The engagement of HOTS.
   (d) The effectiveness of the Web-based learning system as perceived by the instructors and students.

1.5 Research Questions

Based on the research objectives discussed earlier, the research is carried out to answer the following questions:

(i) What levels of HOTS are exhibited by the Computer Science students after the conventional teaching and learning of Computer System in the first year of Diploma of Computer Science course?

(ii) Is there any significant difference between the students' score in the test before and after the use of the Web-based learning system?

(iii) Is there any significant difference between the students' HOTS before and after the use of the Web-based learning system?

(iv) How do the students' HOTS engagement change when they use the Web-based learning system?

(v) How effective is the Web-based learning system as perceived by the instructors?

(vi) How effective is the Web-based learning system as perceived by the students?

1.6 Research Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this research incorporates a few important components from different perspectives. Learning object design was adapted for the instructional design structure, while the pedagogical perspective, the generative learning and HOTS were incorporated into the design of the Web-based learning system. The Web was used as a delivery medium for the system. All these aspects had been studied in detailed in order to meet the objectives of this research.

The Web-based learning environment in the system design is based on the generative learning from constructivism learning from Bonn and Grabowski (2001), Grabowski (1996), Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy (2000), Dunlap and Grabinger (1996a, 1996b), Duffy and Jonassen (1992), Morrison and Collins (1996), and Wittrock (1974; 1991; 1986). The features of the generative learning include:

(i) Provide a learning environment that enables the active process of knowledge construction.

(ii) Provide a learning environment that supports the construction of knowledge.

(iii) Learners are active participants in constructing their knowledge.

(iv) Design a learning environment that emphasizes on the construction of knowledge and allows learners to interpret their learning and build the mental model to represent the knowledge.

(v) Provide a learning environment that requires students to participate actively in the learning process and construct the knowledge meaningfully rather than in a predetermined structure.

(vi) Provide a generative learning environment that enables learners to construct and design their own learning.

(vii) Design learning activities that engage learners in HOTS.

(viii) Design the learning environment that allows students to generate organizational relationships between different components of the knowledge through learning aids such as concept mapping that engages students in HOTS. The generative learning environment also includes the activities for knowledge integration and elaboration such as problem solving.

(ix) Design activities to encourage students to actively participate in constructing meaningful understanding by generating relationships among the information received and apply it to support problem solving.

From the descriptions above, it is apparent that generative learning requires students to construct their learning in a meaningful way and this will engage them in HOTS. The generative learning environment encourages students to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate facts and ideas in the process of knowledge generation. Such learning environment engages students in HOTS.

The cognitive operations of HOTS emphasized in the system are analysis, synthesis and evaluation. These cognitive operations are based on the works from the taxonomy of Bloom *et al.* (1956), Bloom, Hasting and Madaus (1971), Tal and

Hochberg (2003), Parham (2003) and Swatrz (2001) with consideration on the curriculum of the Computer Science course for college students.

According to Dede (1990), learning environment that contains a highly developed information-gathering tool to stimulate the learners to actively construct knowledge will engage students in HOTS. Besides, the organization of information into an integrated system to show relationships among the information through concept mapping will encourage and assist students in HOTS (Ivie, 1998; Hollingworth and McLoughlin, 2002; Hobgood, 2002).

In addition to the HOTS activities mentioned above, reflection and thinking tasks were integrated into the system to provide a more comprehensive generative learning environment. Reflection was designed to scaffold the students so that they are conscious in applying the HOTS and aware of their learning. Quellmalz (1987), Fogarty (2002) and Harrigan and Vincenti (2004) pointed out that reflection will foster HOTS because it enables students to reflect on their learning. In addition, finding from Harrigan and Vincenti (2004) demonstrated the reflection engages students in HOTS.

According to Costa and Kallick (2001), thinking tasks such as problem solving, scenario generation and exercise are important to engage students in HOTS. In this research, the thinking tasks are scenario-based problem solving and multiple-choice question exercise to reinforce the students' HOTS as well as to test their understanding. This aligns with the generative learning that advocates the inclusion of concept mapping and scenarios-based problem solving as generative learning activities.

The strategy of learning environment in the system that based on the generative learning and HOTS aligns with the features of learning object design. According to Ip and Morrison (2001), learning object has the potential to be integrated into different learning paradigms. This is further elaborated by Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy (2000). They pointed out that the premise underlying the features of a learning object that support flexibility and reusability is aligned and heavily related to generative

learning from constructivism learning. This is further supported by Agostinho *et al*. (2003) that research should be conducted about the incorporation of the learning object design with the constructivism learning environment.

Figure 1.1 depicts the theoretical framework about the incorporation of the generative learning, learning object design and HOTS in the research. Based on this, a conceptual model of Web-based learning system, GLOOTT is proposed and applied in the design of the learning environment in the system development.



Figure 1.1: Conceptual Model of the System Design and Development

Jonassen and Reeves (1996) stated that technology can be used as a mindtool that enables learners to act as designers to design and construct their learning, rather than as passive recipients in the learning process. Computer and information technology can stimulate students to become active learners and provide tools to manipulate their learning (Morgan, 1996). The GLOOTT model incorporates three important components, namely the learning object design, the generative learning based on Grabowski (1996) and HOTS based on Bloom Taxonomy of thinking (Bloom *et al*., 1956) in technology-supported learning environment. The Web-based environment is a promising technology that enables the designers to create flexible and powerful learning systems that support the design of GLOOTT model.

The GLOOTT model provides a pedagogically-enriched learning environment to engage students in HOTS and to promote their understanding. The GLOOTT model consists of Generative Learning Object Organizer (GLOO) and Thinking Task (TT) as depicted in Figure 1.1. TT consists of Try it Out that contains multiple-choice questions and Apply it that contains scenario-based problems. Details about the design and development of Web learning system would be discussed in Chapter 4.

To the best of the researcher's literature study, a learning object design system that is based on theoretical learning approaches which pervades in constructivism and focuses on learner-centered learning and HOTS has not yet been developed. Most of the learning object design systems focus mainly in the designs of teaching materials for trainer and instructor. Besides, minimal research has been done to demonstrate the effects of learning object design on learning (Bannan-Ritland, Dabbagh and Murphy, 2000), and the researcher has not found substantial research showing the effects of the learning object design with pedagogical design on academic achievement and HOTS. The suggested conceptual model (GLOOTT model) incorporates the theoretical, pedagogical and technological perspectives from generative learning, learning object and essential cognitive operations of HOTS in the Web-based learning environment.

1.7 The Framework of Instructional Design Model

The instructional design (ID) model used in the research is modified from the ISDMELO (Instructional System Design Methodology based on e-Learning Object) (Baruque and Melo, 2003). Figure 1.2 illustrates the proposed framework of the instructional design model used in this research.

The ID model of the research incorporates learning object design principles, generative learning design principles, and Web-based learning design principles in order to promote understanding and improve HOTS of the students in the learning process. The prototype of the Web-based learning system is designed, developed and evaluated to determine its effectiveness in a college. The modified ISDMELO model is used because it was developed for the design and development of Web-based educational content that was built on the fundamental of instruction design based on learning object. The ISDMELO model is modified from the ADDIE model (Molenda, Pershing and Reigeluth, 1996) that provides systematically instruction plan. In addition, the ISDMELO is grounded on pedagogical principles and supports the adoption of learning theories such as constructivism, cognitive and behaviourism. The details about each phase of the ISDMELO were discussed in Chapter 3.



Figure 1.2: The Framework of ID Model (Modified from ISDMELO, Baruque and Melo, 2003)

1.8 Research Importance

This research proposes a theoretical framework of Web-based learning system that provides the instructor with the flexible and reusable learning content in Computer System (CS). The Web-based learning system helps the instructor to identify students' engagement of HOTS and their understanding. The findings will help the instructors, especially Computer Science instructors in planning the teaching and learning of CS using the Web.

This research also proposes a unique framework of instructional design model that provides an alternative of instructional design based on the learning object design and generative learning. The findings from this research would demonstrate the effectiveness of technology in improving students' learning and HOTS. In addition, it also contributes in the design and development of the Web-based learning especially with the use of learning objects. Results from this study are important to show the effectiveness of the learning objects in learning as most of the current researches in learning object design mainly focus in technical and standard issues. Besides, the findings from this study would contribute to the existing evaluations of Web-based learning and learning object design. The results would also suggest that an empowered learning can be achieved by putting more emphasis on the pedagogical design learning environment rather than the technological aspects in order to develop a system that is able to encourage students to learn actively and improve their HOTS.

The proposed system conceptual model from the research theoretical framework, namely GLOOTT model, the Web-based instructional design framework, research methodology and findings may be used as guide or reference besides provoking ideas for other researchers who are interested in learning object design, generative learning, HOTS and Web-based learning. On the other hand, it also can be used as a guide in helping the higher education institutes, educational technology and other relevant parties in the design and development of e-learning system to engage students in HOTS.

1.9 Research Scope and Limitation

This research aims to design and develop a Web-based learning system that incorporates the generative learning strategies and learning object design to provide a learning environment that engage students in HOTS. The cognitive operations of HOTS in this research are Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation. The features and rationales of generative learning, learning object design and HOTS have been discussed previously in the rationale and theoretical framework of study.

The activities of generative learning used in this research are concept mapping and scenarios-based problems solving. These generative learning activities are well documented in the literature as discussed in the research background and research rationale. The use of learning object design in teaching and learning has received increasing attention in the recent years. The main advantages of the learning objects are flexibility and reusability. However, it is a widely belief that the learning object design does not add significant value to the learning if there is an overemphasis on the technical aspect rather than supporting learning. In this research, the learning object design was focused on how its application to support learning. The HOTS are widely discussed in the literature and research. The Bloom's Taxonomy of Thinking is used to identify the students' HOTS in this research because it is well documented in the literature and research in determining the level of HOTS.

This research focuses on learning of Computer System for the college students from Computer Science Department in Southern College. The subtopics of the subject studied in this research were Introduction to Computer System, System Unit, Input, Output and Storage. The Web-based learning system designed in this research is a learning tool that can be used for other subjects. However, in studying its effectiveness in learning Computer System, the research was limited to Computer Science students in a college. The content of the learning had been validated by the lecturers who had taught the subject. The effectiveness of the system was studied from the aspects of engagement of HOTS, improvement of HOTS and learning of the students. This

research did not consider the interest and learning styles of the students that could affect their performance and learning. Moreover, the findings of this research should not be generalized to other students. It is important to point out that the main purpose of this research is to conceptualize and to design Web-based learning objects based on the pedagogical perspectives. The emphasis of this research is to study the effectiveness of the proposed design in learning rather than the technical issues relating to the learning object design.

1.10 Operational Definition

The following are definitions of some terminologies used in this dissertation for clearer comprehension of the issues in this research.

(i) Learning Object

A learning object is an object or set of resources that can be used to facilitate the learning of certain subject (Mills, 2002). It is flexible and reusable. It is stored and accessed using meta-data attributes. A learning object is a self-contained, reusable chunk of instruction that can be assembled with other objects. A learning object can teach facts, concepts, principles, procedures and processes.

(ii) Granularity

The meaning of granularity in this research is the size (content) of the learning objects (Wiley, 2002a; Wiley, 2002b). It is the amount of information and content to be included into a learning object.

(iii) HOTS

HOTS is the abbreviation of Higher Order Thinking Skills. The cognitive operations of HOTS in this research are Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation (see Johnson, 1999; Jonassen, 1992; Parham, 2003; Swatrz, 2001; Marzano, *et al*. 1988; Bloom *et al.*, 1956; Bloom, Hasting and

Madaus, 1971) with the consideration of the curriculum in learning Computer System.

(iv) Bloom's Taxonomy of Thinking

Table 1 describes the features of the Bloom Taxonomy of Thinking used in this research (Bloom *et al*., 1956).

Table 1.1: Bloom Taxonomy of Thinking (from Bloom, *et al*., 1956; Bloom, Hasting and Madaus, 1971)

Bloom Taxonomy of Thinking	**Features**
Knowledge	Knowledge is defined as the remembering of previously learned material. This involves the recall of specific elements in a subject matter. Knowledge represents the lowest level of learning outcomes.
Comprehension	Comprehension is the ability to grasp the meaning of material. It is described in three different operations: translating material from one form to another, interpreting material and estimating future trends. These learning outcomes represent the lowest level of understanding.
Application	Application is the ability to use learned material to new problems and situations. For examples, the application of rules, methods, principles and theories. The learning outcomes represent the higher level of understanding than knowledge and comprehension.
Analysis	Analysis is the ability to break down material into its constituent parts into the relative hierarchy of ideas with the relations between the ideas. This includes the identification of parts and the hierarchical organization, and analysis of the relationships between the parts. Learning outcomes are higher than knowledge, comprehension and application. Analysis is recognized as an element in HOTS.

Synthesis	Synthesis is the ability to put parts together to form a whole. This involves the process of arranging, combining and working with parts them in such a way as to constitute a new pattern or structure. The learning outcomes emphasize on the formation of new patterns or structures and creative behavior. Synthesis is recognized as an element in HOTS.
Evaluation	Evaluation is defined as the ability to judge the values of materials for some purposes or solutions. The judgments are based on definite criteria either those determined by the students or those given to them. The learning outcomes are at the highest cognitive hierarchy. Evaluation is recognized as a cognitive operation in HOTS.

(v) Learning improvement

In this study, the improvement of learning is defined as the improvement of the score in the test that was designed based on the learning goals of Computer System.

(vi) Effectiveness

In this study, the evaluation of the Web-based system effectiveness is focused on the improvement of students' learning and HOTS before and after the use of the system through the one group pretest and posttest.

(vii) Generative Learning

Constructivist design provides learning environment that enables students to synthesize, analyze and evaluate as well as to create and contribute resources (McLoughlin, 1998). Generative learning is a type of instruction developed by constructivists that is widely documented. The generative learning activities involve the creation of relationships and meanings of the learning. In the generative learning, students are active in the knowledge construction. Experts and researchers advocate that concept mapping and problem solving are activities of generative learning. Concept mapping and problem solving will engage students in

analysis, synthesis, and evaluation skills. Thus, it is important to integrate these skills into learning in order to promote HOTS. In the generative learning environment, students are active in constructing meaningful understanding of information found and generating relationships among the information.

(viii) GLOOTT Model

GLOOTT refers to Generative Learning Object and Thinking Tasks. It is a pedagogically-enriched conceptual model that was designed based on learning object, generative learning and HOTS.

(ix) GOOD Learning System

GOOD learning system refers to Generative Object-Oriented Design Learning System. It is the Web-based learning system designed based on the system conceptual model, namely GLOOTT Model in this research.

(x) Computer System (CS)

CS is a core subject of the first year Diploma in Computer Science course in Southern College.

(xi) Lesson Mapping

Lesson mapping is the mapping of concepts in the learning of CS based on the design of concept mapping. It is the generative learning activity designed in the Web-based learning system that aims to engage students in HOTS. It is an outline form of concept map suggested by Alpert and Grueneberg (2000), and Dabbagh (2001).

(xii) Electronic Portfolio

Electronic portfolio is the portfolio that is saved in electronic format (Lankes, 1995). The electronic portfolio used in this research contains only the record of "How am I doing" checklist list in the Web-based system. The checklist is used to record the students' engagement of HOTS when they use the Web-based learning system.

(xiii) Learning Object Design

Learning object design is an application of object-oriented thinking to the world of learning. It is a term used to describe the design of leaning into

flexible pieces of learning content that could be assembled and reassembled as needed. Learning objects are small reusable components such as video, tutorials, procedures, stories, animations, simulations and so on.

1.11 Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the background and rationale for this research. Chapter 2 will present a detailed analysis of the literature relevant to this research, which is a key part of the theoretical framework and the framework of instructional design model used in this research. Chapter 2 will also present the instructional design and the learning object design, generative learning, HOTS, the learning of computer and literature that pertinent to this research.

Reference:

Adey, P. (1991). Cognitive Acceleration through Science Education. In: Marcure, S, and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon. 79-94.

Agostinho, S., Bennett, S., Lockyer, L., and Harper, B. (2003). Integrating Learning Objects with Learning Designs. In: Crisp, G., Thiele, D., Scholten, I., Barker, S., Baron, J. eds. *Interact, Integrate, Impact: Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE)*. December 7-10. Adelaide, Australia: Ascilite.

Alpert, S. R., and Grueneberg, K. (2000). Concept Mapping with Multimedia on the Web. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*. 9(4): 313-331.

Anderson, T. A. (2003). I Object! Moving Beyond Learning Objects to Learning Components. *Educational Technology*. 43(4): 19-24.

Andrade, H. G. (2000). Using Rubrics to Promote Thinking and Learning. *Educational Leadership*. 57(5): 13-18.

Arup, M. (2004). Promoting Higher Order Thinking in MIS/CIS Students Using Class Exercise. *Journal of Information Systems Education*. Summer 2004. [On-line] Available: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4041/is_200407/ai_n9437401/pg_1 Retrieved on: 9 March 2005

Ash, L. E. (2000). *Electronic Student Portfolios*. Illinois: Skylight.

Asp, E (2001). To Think or Not to Think: Thinking as Measured on State and National Assessments. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for*

Teaching Thinking, 3rd Edition. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 497-510

Atkins, M. J. (1993). Evaluating Interactive Technologies for Learning. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 26(4): 333-342.

Ausubel, D. (1963). *The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning*. New York: Gruna & Stratton.

Baharuddin Aris. (1999). *The Use Of Information Technology In Education: Using An Interactive Multimedia Courseware Package To Upgrade Teachers' Knowledge And Change Their Attitudes.* The Robert Gordon University: Ph.D. Thesis.

Bannan-Ritland, B., Dabbagh, N., and Murphy, K. (2000). Learning Object Systems as Constructivist Learning Environments: Related Assumptions, Theories and Application. In: Wiley, D. A. ed. *The Instructional Use of Learning Objects: Online Version*. [On-line] Available: http://reusability.org/read/ Retrieved on: 3 October 2002

Barab, S. A., Young, M. F., and Wang, Jian Juan (1999). The Effects of Navigational and Generative Activities in Hypertext Learning on Problem Solving and Comprehension. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, [On-line] Available: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3756/is_1999901/ai_n8839530/pg_1 Retrieved on: 15 January 2005

Barba, R. H., and Merchant, L. J. (1990). The Effects of Embedding Generative Cognitive Strategies in Science Software. *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*. 10(1): 59-65.

Baruque, L. B., and Melo, R. N. (2003). *Learning Theory and Instructional Design Using Learning Object*. [On-line] Available: http://www.cs.kuleuven.ac.be/~erikd/PRES/2003/Baruque.pdf Retrieved on: 10 Jan 2004.

Baron, J. (1985). Assessing Higher Order Thinking Skills in Connecticut: Lesson from Connecticut. In: Kearney, C. P., Kean, M. H., Roeber,E. D., Stevens, B. L., Boron, J. B., Fremer, J. and M. Daniel eds. *Assessing Higher Order Thinking Skills*. NJ: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation. Educational Testing Service. 31-45

Bass, G. M., and Perkins, H. W. (1984). Teaching Critical Thinking Skills with CAI. *Electronic Learning*. 14(2): 32- 34.

Baum, R. (1990). Finishing Touches. *Educational Leadership*. 18(6). 51-55.

Baylor, A. L., and Ritchie, D. (2002). What Factors Facilitate Teacher Skill, Teacher Morale, and Perceived Student Learning In Technology-Using Classrooms? *Computers and Education.* 39 (2002): 395–414

Beaver, R., and Moore, J. (2004). Curriculum Design and Technology Integration: A Model To Use Technology In Support Of Knowledge Generation And Higher-Order Thinking Skills. *Learning & Leading with Technology*. 32(1): 42-45.

Bell, E., Allen, R., and Brennan, P. (2001). *Assessment of Higher Order Thinking Skills: A Discussion of the Data from the 2001 Random Sampling Exercise and a Workshop for Teachers*. Queensland: Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies.

Bem, E. Z. (2002). Experiment-Based Project in Undergraduate Computer Architecture. *Proceedings of the 33rd SIGSCE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. 34(1): 171-175.

Ben-Ari, M. (1998). Constructivism in Computer Science Education. *Proceedings of the 29th SIGSCE Technical Symposium on Computer Science*. 257-261.

Beyer, B. K. (1988). *Developing a thinking Skills Program*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Beyer, B. K. (2001). A Format for Assessing Thinking. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking, 3rd Edition*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 533- 540

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., and Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: the Classification of Educational Goals*. New York: David McKay Company.

Bloom, B. S., Hasting, J. T., and Madaus, G. F. (1971). *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning*. New York: David McKay Company.

Bonk, C. J., and Reynolds, T, H. (1997). Learner-Centered Web Instruction for Higher-Order Thinking, Teamwork, and Apprenticeship. In: Khan, B. H. ed. *Web-based Instruction*. New Jersey: Educational Technology. 167-178

Bonn, K. L., Grabowski, B. L. (2001, January). *Generative Learning Theory: A Practical Cousin to Constructivism*. Paper Presented at the Joint Meeting of Mathematics. New Orleans, LA.

Boron, J. B. (1986). Evaluating Thinking in the Classroom. In: Boron, J. B. and Sternberg, R. J. eds. *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory and Practice.* NY: W. H. Freeman. Inc. 221-248.

Boyle, T. (2003). Design Principles for Authoring Dynamic, Reusable Learning Objects. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*. 19(1): 46-58.

Bradley, C., and Boyle, T. (2004). Students' Use of Learning Objects. *Interactive Multimedia Electronic Journal of Computer-Enhanced Learning*. 6(2): [Online] Available: http://imej.wfu.edu/articles/2004/2/index.asp Retrieved on: 11 April 2005

Brandt, D. S. (1997). Constructivism: Teaching for Understanding of the Internet. *Communications of the ACM*. 40(10): 112-117.

Bransford, J. D., Burns, M. S., Delclos, V. R., and Vye, N. J. (1986). Teaching Thinking: Evaluating Evaluations and Broadening the Data Base. *Educational Leadership*. 44(2): 68-70.

Buschman, L. (1994). Sometimes Less is More. *Arithmetic Teacher*. 41(7): 378-381.

Butler, J., and Brockman, J. B., (2001). A Web-Based Learning Tool that Simulates a Simple Computer Architecture. *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin*. 33(2): 47-50.

Caillot, M. (1991). Learning Thinking Through the New Technologies. In: Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon. 95-102

Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston: Houghton

Campoy, R. (1992). The Role of Technology in the School Reform Movement. *Educational Technology*. 32(8): 17-22.

Chapman, E. (2003). Assessing Student Engagement Rates. *ERIC Digest*. (ED482269). [On-line] Available: http://www.ericdigests.org/2005-2/engagement.htm Retrieved on: 3 Oct 2005.

Cher, Ping Lim and David Hang (2003). An Activity Theory Approach To Research Of ICT Integration In Singapore Schools. *Computers & Education*. 41(2003): 49–63.

Chmura, G. A., (1998). What Abilities Are Necessary for Success in Computer Science? *ACM SIGCSE*. 30(4): 55-59.

Christopher, M. M., Thomas, J. A., and Tallent-Runnels, M. K. Raising the Bar: Encouraging High Level Thinking in Online Discussion Forums. *Roeper Review*. 26(3):166-172

Cole, J. (2005). *Using Moodle*. Cambridge: O'Reilly Media.

Cognitive Technology Group at Vanderbilt (CTGV), (1993). Designing Learning Environments that Support Thinking. In: Lowyck, J., Jonassen, D. H. and Duffy, T. M. eds. *Designing Environments for Constructive Learning*. New York: Springer.

Cohen, V. B (1983). Criteria for the Evaluation of Microcomputer Courseware. *Educational Technology*. 23(1): 9-14.

Collis, B., and Strijker, A. (2003). Re-usable Learning Objects in Context. *International Journal on E-Learning*. 2(4): 5-17.

Copeland, P. (1988). Interactive Video – What the Research Says. *Media in Education and Development*. June: 60-63.

Costa, A. L. (2001). Habits of Mind. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking, 3rd Edition*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 80-86

Costa, A. L., and Kallick, B. (2001). Building a System for Assessing Thinking. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking, 3rd Edition*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 517- 527

Cousins, J. B., and Ross, J. A. (1993). Improving Higher Order Thinking Skill by Teaching with the Computer: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*. 26(1): 94-115.

Cradler, J. (1985). CompuThink and Criteria for Selecting Software. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 256-265

Cradler, J., McNabb, M., Freeman, M., and Burche, R. (2002). How Does Technology Influence Student Learning? *Learning and Leading with Technology*. 29(8): 46-49.

Crawford, K. (1996). Vygotskian Approaches to Human Development in the Information Era. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*. 31(1-2): 43-62.

Cochrane, T. (2005). Interactive QuickTime: Developing and Evaluating Multimedia Learning Objects to Enhance Both Face-to-Face and Distance E-Learning Environments. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Knowledge and Learning Objects*. 1:33-54. [Online] Available: http://ijklo.org/Volume1/v1p033-054Cochrane.pdf Retrieved on: 5 January 2004.

Crump, W. D. Schlichter, C. L. and Palk, B. E. (1988). Teaching HOTS in the Middle and High School: A District-Level Initiative in Developing higher Order Thinking Skills. *Roeper Review*. 10(4): 205-211.

Dabbagh, N. (2001). Concept Mapping as a Mindtool for Critical Thinking. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Educatio*n. 17(2): 16-24.

Dalgarno, B (1998). Choosing learner Activities for specific Learning outcomes: A Tool for Constructivist Computer Assisted Learning Design. In McBeath, C. and Atkinson, R. eds. *Planning for Progress, Partnership and Profit*. *Proceedings EdTech'98*. Perth: Australian Society for Educational Technology. [On-line] Available: www.aset.org.ayu/confs/edtech98/pubs/articles/dalgarno.html Retrieved on: 27 April 2006

De Bono, E (1991). The Direct Teaching of Thinking in Education and the CoRT Method. In: Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon, 3-14

Debray, R. (1991). Reviving Thought Processes in Pre-Adolescents. In: Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon, 49-61

Dede, C. (1990). Imaging Technology's Role in Restructuring for Learning. In: Sheingold, K. and Tucker, M. S.ed. *Restructuring for Learning with Technology*. New York: Center for Technology in Education. 49-72

Deubel, P. (2003). Learning from Reflections – Issues in Building Quality Online Courses. Online Journal of Distance Leanring Administration. 6(3). [On-line] Available: http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall63/deubel63.htm Retrieved on: 1 May 2006

Dick, W and Carey, L. (1996). *The Systematic Design of Instruction. 4th. edition*. New York: HarperCollins College.

Dodds, P. and Fletcher, J. D. (2003). Opportunities for New Smart Learning Environments Enabled by Next Generation Web Capabilities. *Learning Object 2003 Symposium: Lesson Learned, Questions Asked*. [On-line] Available: http://www.cs.kuleuven.ac.be/~erikd/PRES/2003/LO2003/Kabel.pdf Retrieved on: 15 Jan 2004

Dori, Y. J., Tal, R. T., and Tsaushu, M. (2003). Teaching Biotechnology Through Case Studies- Can We Improved Higher Order Thinking Skills of Nonscience Majors? *Science Education.* 87(6): 767

Downes, S. (2000). *Learning Objects*. University of Alberta. [On-line]. Available: http://www.atl.ualberta.ca/downes/naweb/Learning_Objects.doc Retrieved on: 9 December 2002.

Duffy, T. M., and Jonassen, D. H. (1992). Constructivism: New Implications for Instructional Technology. In: Duffy, T.M. and Jonassen, D. H. eds. *Constructivism and the Technology of Instruction: A Conversation*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 1-16.

Duffy, T. M., and Cunningham, D. J. (1996). Constructivism: Implications for the Design and Delivery of Instruction. In: Jonassen, D. H. ed. *Handbook of Educational Communications and Technology.* New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan. 170-198

Dunlap, J. C., and Grabinger, R. S., (1996a). Rich Environment for Active Learning in the higher Education Classroom. In: Wilson, B. G. ed. *Constructivist Learning Environments: Case Studies in Instructional Design*. NJ: Educational Technology. 65- 82

Dunlap, J. C., and Grabinger, S. (1996b). Make Learning Meaningful. In: Kommers, P. A. M., Grabinger, S. and Dunlap, J. C. *Hypermedia Learning Environments: Instructional Design and Integration*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Association. 227- 254

Edwards, J. (1991). Research Work on the CoRT Method. In: Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon, 19-30

Eken, Ali Nihat (2002). The Third Eye: Critical Literacy and Higher Order Thinking Skills are Improved Through a Film Studies Class. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 46(3): 220-231.

Elissavet, G., and Economides, A. A (2003). An Evaluation Instrument for Hypermedia Courseware. *Educational Technology & Society*. 6(2): 31-44.

El Saddik, A., Fischer, S., Ipsi, G., and Steinmetz, R. (2001). Reusability and Adaptability of Interactive Resources In Web-Based Educational System. *ACM Journal of Educational Resources in Computing*. 1(1): 1-19.

El Saddik, A., Ghavam, A, Fischer, S., and Steinmetz, R. (2000). Metadata for Smart Multimedia Learning Object. *Proceedings of the Australasian Conference on Computing Education*. New York: ACM Press, 87-94.

Engel, B. (1994). Portfolio Assessment and the New Paradigm: New Instruments and New Places. *The Educational Forum*. 59(1): 22-27.

Ennis, R. H. (1987). A Taxonomy of Critical Thinking Dispositions and Abilities. In: Baron, J. B. and Sternberg, R. J. eds. *Teaching Thinking Skills- Theory and Practice*. New York: W. H. Freeman. 9-26.

Fredericksen, N. (1984). The Real Test Bias. *American Psychologist*. 39(1): 1-10.

Fremer, J., and Daniel, M. (1985). The Assessment of Higher-Order Thinking Skills: Recent Development. In: Kearney, C. P., Kean, M. H., Roeber, E. D., Stevens, B. L., Boron, J. B., Fremer, J., and Daniel, M. eds. *Assessing Higher Order Thinking Skills*. NJ: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation, Educational Testing Service. 48-61

Friesen, N. (2001). What are Educational Objects? *Interactive Learning Environments*. 9(3). [On-line] Available: http://www.careo.org/documents/objects.html. Retrieved on 9 Dec 2002.

Fogarty, R. (2002). *Brain Compatible Classroom, 2nd Edition*. IL: Skylight Professional Development.

Fogarty, R., and McTighe, J. (1993). Educating Teachers for Higher Order Thinking: The Three-Story Intellect. *Theory into Practice*. 32(3): 161-167.

Galambos, D. (2001). Transforming Online Discussions: Getting the H.O.T.S.! Paper presented at the 2001 WebCT Users Conference, June 23-27, 2001. [On-line] Available: http://boobooo.webct.com/2001/papers/Galambos.pdf Retrieved on: 31 Dec 2003

Gao, T., and Lehman, J. D. (2003). The Effects of Different Levels of Interaction on **the** Achievement and Motivational Perceptions of College Students in a Web-Based Learning Environment. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*. 14(4): 367-387.

Gibbons, A. S., Nelson, J., and Richards, R. (2000). The Nature and Origin of Instructional Objects. In: Wiley, D. A. ed. *The Instructional Use of Learning Objects: Online Version*. [On-line] Available: http://reusability.org/read/chapters/gibbons.doc Retrieved on: 9 Dec 2002.

Goodrich, H. (1997). Understanding Rubrics. *Educational Leadership*. 54(5): 14-17.

Gotschi, T., Sanders, I., and Galpin, V. (2003). Mental Models of Recursion. *Proceedings of the 34th SIGSCE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. 35(1), 346-350.

Grabinger, R. S. (1996). Rich Environments for Active Learning. In: Jonassen, D. H. ed. *Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology*. New York: Simon Schuster McMillan.

Grabowski, B. L. (1995). Mathemagenic and Generative Learning: A Comparison and Implications for Designers. In: Rmszowski, A. J. and Dills, C. eds. *Instructional Developments: State of the Art. Vol. 3: The Paradigm*. NJ: Educational Technology.

Grabowski, B. L. (1996). Generative Learning: Past, Present, and Future. In Jonassen, D. H. ed. *Handbook of Research for Educational Communication and Technology*. NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan. 897- 918.

Grace, C. (1992). The Portfolio and Its Use: Developmentally Appropraite Assessment of Young Children. *ERIC Digest*. (ED351150). [On-line] Available: http://ericae.net/db/edo/ED351150.htm Retrieved on: 28 Dec 2003.

Greene, M. (1991). The Passion of Thoughtfulness: Arts, Humanities and the Life of the Mind. In: Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon. 65-78

Hadjerrouit, S. (1999). A Constructivist Approach to Objwct-Oriented DSesign and Programming. *Proceedings of the 4th Annual SIGSCE/SIGCUE ITiCSE Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*. 31(3), 171-174.

Haladyna, T. M. (1997). *Writing Test Items to Evaluate Higher Order Thinking*. Boston: Allyn an Bacon.

Haller, E. P., Child, D. A., and Walberg, H. J. (1988). Can Comprehension to be Taught? A Quantitative Synthesis of Metacognitive Studies. *Educational Researcher*. 17(9): 5-8.

Hamel, C. J., and Ryan-Jones, D. (2002). Designing Instruction with Learning Objects. *IJET*. 3(1). [On-line] Available: http://www.ao.uiuc.edu/ijet/v3n1/hamel/index.html Retrieved on 24 February 2004.

Hamza M. Khalid, Alhalabi Bassem, and Marcovitz, D. M. (2000). Creative Pedagogy for Computer Learning: Eight Effective Tactics. *SIGCSE Bulletin.* 32(4), 70-73.

Hannafin, M. J., Hill, J. R., and McCarthy, J. E. (2000). Designing Resource-Based Learning and Performance Support Systems. In: Wiley, D. A. ed. *The Instructional Use of Learning Objects: Online Version*. [On-line] Available: http://reusability.org/read/chapters/hannafin.doc Retrieved on: 9 Dec 2002

Hansen, D. (2001). *Effective Practices for Gifted Education in Kansas*. [Online] Available: http://www.kansped.org/ Retrieved on: October 1, 2001.

Harrigan, A., and Vincenti, V. (2004). Developing Higher-Order Thinking through an Intercultural Assignment. *College Teaching*. 52(3): 113-120.

Harmon, S. W., and Reeves, T. C. (1998). *Educational WWW Sites Evaluation Instrument*. [On-line] Available: http://it.coe.uga.edu/~treeves/edit8350/wwweval.html Retrieved on: 21 November 2003.

Hawkins, J. (1993). Technology and The Organization of Schooling. *Communications of the ACM*. 36(5): 30-35.

Hawryszkiewyez, I. T. (2002). Designing Learning Activities from Learning Objects. *ASCILITE 2002 Conference Proceedings*. [Online] Available: http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland02/proceedings/papers/067.pdf Retrieved on: 5 January 2004.

Henderson, P. B. (1986). Anatomy of An Introductory to Computer Science Course. *Proceedings of the 17th SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. 18(1), 257-263.

Henderson, P., and Romero, F. (1989). Teaching Recursion as a Problem-Solving Tool Using Standard ML. *Proceedings of the 20th SigCSE Technical Symposium*, 27-31.

Herrington, J., and Oliver, R. (1999). Using Situated Learning and Multimedia to Investigate Higher-Order Thinking. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*. 8(4): 401-421.

Hewson, P. W., and Hewson, M. G. A. B. (1988). An Appropriate Conception of Teaching Science: A View from Studies of Science Learning. *Science Education*. 72(5): 597-614.

Hobgood, B. (2002). *Concept Maps*. [On-line] Available: http://www.learnnc.org/index.nsf/ Retrieved on: 31 Dec 2003.

Hodgins, H. W. (2001). The Future of Learning Objects. In: Wiley, D. A. ed. *The Instructional Use of Learning Objects: Online Version*. [On-line] Available: http://reusability.org/read/chapters/gibbons.doc Retrieved on: 9 Dec 2002.

Hoepfl, M. C. (1997). Choosing Qualitative Research: A Primer for Technology Education Researchers. *Journal of Technology Education*. 9(1). [On-line] Available: http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v9n1/hoepfl.htm Retrieved on: 27 April 2006.

Hogan, K., Nastasi, B. K., and Pressley, M. (2000). Discourse Patterns and Collaborative Scientific Reasoning in Peer and Teacher-Guided Discussions. *Cognition and Instructional*. 17(4): 379-432.

Hollingworth, R. W., and McLoughlin, C. (2003). Even Foundation Level Students Can Get the HOTS for Science! 7th Pacific Rim, First Year in Higher Education Conference, 9-11 July 2003. Australia: Queensland University of Technology. [On-line] Available: www.qut.edu.au/talss/fye/papers03/Refereed%20Papers/Full%20papers/McLoughlin&Hollingworth_final.doc Retrieved on: 12 Feb 2004.

Holmboe, C. (1999). A Cognitive Framework for Knowledge in Informatics: The Case of Object-Orientation. *ITiCSE' 0.* 31(3): 17-20.

Hong, Kian-Sam, Lai Kwok-Wing, and Holton, D. (2001). Web Based Learning Environments: Observation from a Web Based Course in a Malaysian Context. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*. 17(3): 223-243.

Hopson, M. H. (1998). *Effects of Technology Enriched Learning Environment on Student Development of Higher Order Thinking Skills*. University of North Texas: Doctoral Dissertation

Hopson, M. H., Simms, R. L., and Knezek, G. A. (2001). Using a Technology-Enriched Learning Environment to Improve Higher Order Thinking Skills. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*. 34(2): 109-119.

Hudgins, B., and Edelman, S. (1986). Teaching critical Thinking Skills to Fourth and Fifth Graders Through Teacher-Led Small Group Discussions. *Journal of Educational Research*. **79**(6): 333-342.

Hyerle, D. (1991). Expand Your Thinking. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Programs for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 2: 16-26

Ibrahim Ahmad (2005). *Pembangunan Prototaip Perisian Multimedia Interktif System Komputer dan Aplikasinya Berasaskan Pendekatan Pembelajaran Bersaskan Masalah*. University Technology Malaysia: Master Dissertation

IMS (2001). *IMS Learning Resource Meta-Data Inofmration Model*. [On-line] Available: http://www.imsglobal.org/metadata/imsmd_infovlp2pl.html Retrieved on: 13 March 2004

Ip, A., and Morrison, I. (2001). Learning Objects in Different Pedagogical Paradigms. *Conference Proceedings of ASCILITE 2001*. 289-298. [On-line]. Available: http://www.medfac.unimelb.edu.au/ascilite2001/pdf/papers Retrieved on: 15 Jan 2004

Ivie, S. D. (1998). Ausubel's Learning Theory: An Approach to Teaching Higher Order Thinking Skills. *High School Journal*. 82(1): 35-47.

Ivanov, L. (2003). A Hardware Lab for the Computer Organization Course at Small Colleges. *The Journal of Computing in Small Colleges*. 19(2): 185-190.

JMP (2006). *JMP Academic*. [On-line] Available: http://www.jmp.com/academic/ Retrieved on: 4 May 2006

Jakovljevic, M. (2003). Concept Mapping and Appropriate Instructional Strategies in Promoting Programming Skills of Holistic Learners. *Proceedings of SAICSIT 2003*. New York: ACM Press, 308-315.

Jamalludin Harun (2005). Pembinaan dan Penilaian Keberkesanan Sistem Pembelajaran Berasaskan Masalah Menerusi Web. University Technology of Malaysia: PhD. Dissertation.

Jensen, K. (1995). Effective Rubric Design: Making the Most of This Powerful Assessment Tool. *The Science Teacher*. 62(5): 34-37.

Johnson, C. R. (1999). Synthesizing Information: A Model That Works for Everyone, *Presentation, ISETA (International Society for Exploring Teaching Alternatives),* Tempe, Arizona, Oct 1999. [On-line] Available: http://www.west.asu.edu/johnso/synthesis/background.html#objective. Retrieved on: 20 January 2004

Jonassen, D., H. (1991). What are Cognitive Tools. In Kommers, P.A.M., Jonassen, D. H., and Mates, J. T. eds. *Cognitive Tools for Learning*. Germany: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. 81: 1-6.

Jonassen, D., H. (1992). Evaluating Constructivist Learning. In Duffy, T. M. and Jonassen, D. H. eds. *Constructivism and the Technology of Instruction: A Conversation*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 137-148.

Jonassen, D. H. (1994). Technology as Cognitive Tools: Learners as Designer. *IT Forum, 1994*. #1.

Jonassen, D. H. (1996). *Computers in the Classroom: Mind Tools for Critical Thinking*. Columbus: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Jonassen, D. H. (2000). *Computers as Mindtools for Schools*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Jonassen, D., Mayes, T., and McAleese, R. (1993). A Manifesto for a Constructivist Approach to Uses of Technology in Higher Education. In Duffy, T. M., Lowyck, J., Jonassen, D. H. and Welsh, T. M. eds. *Designing Environments for Constructive Learning*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. 231-247

Jonassen, D. H., Peck, K. L., and Wilson, B. G. (1999). *Learning with Technology: A Constructivist Perspective*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Merrill, Prentice Hall.

Jonassen, D. H., and Reeves, T. C. (1996). Learning with Technology: Using Computers as Cognitive Tools. In Jonassen, D. H. ed. *Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology*. New York: Macmillan. 693-719

Jonassen, D. H., Reeves, T. C., Hong, N., Harvey, D., and Peters, K. (1997). Concept Map as Cognitive Learning and Assessment Tools. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*. 8(3/4): 289-308.

Jonassen, D. H., and Wang, S (1993). Acquiring Structural Knowledge from Semantically Structured Hypertext. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*. 20(1): 1-8.

Jonassen, D. H., Wilson, B. G., Wang, S., and Grabinger, R. S. (1993). Constructivist Uses of Expert Systems to Support Learning. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*. 20(3): 86-94.

Juell, P., Smith, E., Daniels, L., and Shanmugasundaram, V. (2002). Learning Objects – Pedagogy Based Structuring of Course Materials. *Conference on Advances in Infrastructure for Electronic Business, Science, and Education on the Internet*, [On-line] Available:

http://webdb.cs.ndsu.nodak.edu/~shanmuga/vijay'sListofPub.html. Retrieved on: 15 March 2003.

Juliana, M. (2001). Science Concept, Technology, and Higher Order Thinking Skills-What's the Connection? *Society for Information Teaching and Teacher Education International Conference*, 2001(1), 2344-2344.

Kallick, B (2001a). Introduction. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking 3rd Edition*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 472-473

Kallick, B (2001b). Introduction. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A* ***Resource*** *Book for Teaching Thinking 3rd Edition*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 496

Kean, M. H. (1985). Assessing Higher Order Thinking Skills: An Overview of the Issues. In: Kearney, C. P., Kean,M. H., Roeber, E. D., Stevens,B. L., Baron, J. B., Fremer, J. and Daniel, M. *Assessing Higher Order Thinking* Skills. *Eric/TME Report 90*. Princeton, NJ: OERI. 6-17

Khan, B. H. ed. (1997). *Web-based Instruction*. New Jersey: Educational Technology.

Klenowski, V. (2002). *Developing Portfolios for Learning and Assessment: Processes and Principles*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Knox, D. L. (1997). Integrating Design and Simulation into a Computer Architecture Course. *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Integrating Technology into Computer Science Education*. 29(3), 42- 44.

Koper, E. J. R. (1998). A Method and Tool for the Design of Educational Multimedia Material. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. 14(1): 19-30.

Krishnaprasad, S. (2002). Relecance of Computer Topics in Computer Science Curriculum. *The Journal of Computing in Small Colleges*. 18(2): 328-336.

Lankes, A. M. D. (1995). Electronic Portfolios: A New Idea in Assessment. *ERIC Digest*. NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology. (ED390377), [On-line] Available: http://www.ericdacility.net/ericdigests/ed390377.html Retrieved on: 31 Dec 2003.

Laney, J. D. (1990). Generative Teaching and Learning of Cost-Benefit Analysis: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*. 23(3): 136-144.

Laurie, B., and Laurie, P. (1997). *Apache The Definitive Guide*. Cambridge: O'Reilly.

Lau, Siong Hoe (2002). Designing Reusable Object-based Lesson for Mathematics. In W. C. Yang, Tilak de Alwis, S. C. Chu., and Faqir M Bhatti, *Proceedings of the 7th Asian Technology Conference in Mathematics* , December 17-21. VA: ATCM, 135-144

Linden, M., and Wittrock, M. C. (1981). The Teaching of Reading Comprehension According to the Model of Generative Learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 17(1): 44-57.

Link, F. R. (1991a). Instrumental Enrichment: A Strategy for Cognitive and Academic Improvement. In Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon, 31-48

Link, F. R. (1991b). Thinking to Write: Assessing Higher-Order Cognitive Skills and Abilities. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Program for Teaching*

Thinking. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 2, 12-15.

Lim, Teck Meng (2000). Prototyping Hypercal for Exploratory Learning of Quadrating Function. University Technology of Malaysia: Ph.D. Thesis

Lipman, M. (1991). Strengthening Reasoning and Judgment through Philosophy. In: Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon, 103-114.

Liu, Eric Zhi-Feng, Zhuo, Yi-Chin and Yuan, Shyan-Ming (2004). Assessing Higher-Order Thinking Using A Networked Portfolio System With Peer Assessment, *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 2004. [On-line] Available: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3756/is_200401/ai_n9362924 Retrieved on: 3 Sept 2005

Liu, M, and Pedersen, S. (1998). The Effects of being Hypermedia Designers on Elementary School Students Motivation and Learning of Design Knowledge. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*. 9(2): 155-182

London, S., and London, D. (2001). *Flash 5 Visual Insight*. Arizona: Coriolis.

Longmire, W. (2000a). A Primer on Learning Objects. *ASTD's Online Magazine All About E-Learning*. Mar, 2000. [On-line] Available: http://www.learningcircuits.org/mar2000/primer.html

Longmire, W. (2000b). Content and Context: Designing and Developing Learning Objects. In Brightman, D. ed. *Learning Without Limits*. San Francisco: Informania, Inc. 3, 21-30

LTSC. (2000). *Learning Technology Standards Committee Website*. [On-line] Available: http://ltsc.ieee.org/ Retrieved on: 20 Feb 2003.

Mahadevan, Shankar (2002). *A Learning Object Model for Electronic Learning*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Master Degree Thesis

Magagnosc, D. (1994). Simulation in Computer Organization; A Goals Based Study. *Proceedings of the 25th SIGSCE Symposium on Computer Science Education*, 26(1), 178-182.

Maj, S. P., Veal, D. and Charlesworth, P. (2000). Is Computer Technology Taught Upside Down? *Proceedings of the 5th Annual IGCSE-SIGCUE ITiCSE Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*. 32(3), 140-143.

Makkonen, P. (1997). Does Collaborative Hypertext Support Better Engagement in Learning of the Basics in Informatics? *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin*. 29(3), 130-132.

Maclure, S. (1991). Introduction: An Overview. In Maclure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference.* Oxford: Pergamon. viii-xviii

Marzano, R. J., and Arredoddo, D. E. (1986). Restructuring Schools Through the Teaching of Thinking Skills. *Educational Leadership*. 43(8): 20-25.

Marzano, R. J., Brandth, R. S., Hughes, C. S., Jones, B. F., Presseisen, Z., Rankin, R., and Suthor, C. (1988). *Dimension of Thinking: A Framework for Curriculum and Instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

McConnell, J. J. (1996). Active Learning ad its Use in Computer Science. *Proceeding of the 1st Conference on Integrating Tech. into C.S.E.* 28(1), 52-54.

McGriff, S. J. (2002). *Using Written Summaries as Generative Learning Strategy to Increase Comprehension of Science Text*. Online Available: http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/s/j/sjm256/portfolio/research/Quantitative Research.pdf Retrieved on: 27 Jan 2003.

McLoughlin, C. (1998). Participation, Cooperation and Autonomy: Students' Perceptions of Learning at Distance Using Technology. In McBeath, C. and Atkinson, R. eds. *Planning for Progress, Partnership and Profit*. Proceedings EdTech'98. Perth: Australian Society for Educational Technology.

McMillan, J. H., and Schumacher, S. (1997). *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction*. 4th ed. New York: Longman

McMurry, S. J. (1992). *JMP-An Introductory User's Guide*. Online Available: http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/s/j/sjm256/portfolio/research/Quantitative Research.pdf Retrieved on: 4 May 2006.

Meeker, M. N. (1985). SOI. In Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development. 187-192

Meeker, M. N. (1991). Structure of Intellect (SOI). In Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Programs for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development. 2, 3-8

Melograno, V. J. (1994). Portfolio Assessment: Documenting Authentic Student Learning. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*. 65(8): 50-55, 58-61

Miron, D., O'Sullivan, M., and McLoughlim, C. (2000). Authentic Student Learning: Assisting Students to Become Constructive Learners in a First Year Computer Science Unit. *Proceedings of 4th Pacific Rim, First Year in a Higher Education Conference University of Wollongong (2001)*, [On-line] Avaliable: http://cedir.uow.edu.au/programs/literacies/Tertiary_Literacies.pdf

Mills, S. (2002). *Learning about Learning Objects with Learning Objects*. [On-line] Available: http://www.alivetek.com/learningobjects/site_paper.htm. Retrieved on 14 Jan 2003

Mirmotahari, O., Holmboe, C., and Kaasboll, J. (2003). Difficulties Learning Computer Architecture. *ITiCSE' 03*. 35(3): 247.

Moersch, C., and Fisher III, L. M. (1995). Electronic Portfolios. *Learning and Leading with Technology*. 23(2). 10-15.

Mohan, P., and Brooks, C. (2003). Engineering a Future for Web-based Learning Objects. *ICWE*. [On-line] Available: http://www.cs.usask.ca/research/research_groups/aries/papers/icwe2003_mohan_brooks.pdf Retrieved on: 18 Feb 2004

Mohd Salleh Abu, and Tan, Wee Chuen (2002). VATrans: A Model of Self-Designed Learning Software That Helps Learners to Promote and Engage Themselves with the Visualization and Analysis Thinking. In: W. C. Yang, Tilak de Alwis, S. C. Chu., and Faqir M Bhatti, *Proceedings of the 7th Asian Technology Conference in Mathematics*. December 17-21. VA: ATCM. 253-262

Molenda, M., Pershing, J. A. and Reigeluth, C. M. (1996). Designing Instructional Systems. In: Craig, S. L. ed. *The ASTD Training and Development Handbook - A Guide to Human Resource Development*. London : McGraw-Hill.

Molenda, M., and Sullivan, M. (2002). Issues and Trends in Instructional Technology. *Trends and Issues*. 27: 3-18.

Morgan, T. (1996). Using Technology to Enhance Learning: Changing the Chunks. *Learning and Leading with Technology*. 23(5): 49-51.

Morrison, D., and Collins, A. (1996). Epistemic Fluency and Constructivist Learning Environment. In: Wilson, B. G. ed. *Constructivist Learning Environments: Case Studies in Instructional Design*. NJ: Educational Technology, 107- 119.

Morrison, G. R., and Lowther, D. L. (2001). Thinking in the Inofrmation Age. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking 3rd Edition*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 479-483

Mortimer, L. (2002). *Learning Objects of Desire: Promise and Practicality*. [On-line] Available: http://www.learningcircuits.org/2002/apr2002/mortimer.html Retrieved on: 5 Nov 2002.

Muller, R. (2003). *Developing Web Sites with Macromedia Flash MX*. MA: Thomson Course Technology

Murdock, K. L. (2000). *JavaScipt™*. Ontario: IDG Books Worldwide

Naps, T. L., Robling, G., Almstrum, V., Dann, W., Fleischer, R., McNally, M., Hundhausen, C., Korhonen, A., Malmi, L., McNally, M., Rodger, S., and Angel Velazquez-Iturbide, J. (2002). *Annual Joint Conference Integrating Technology*

into Computer Science Education Working Group Reports from ITiCSE on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education. 35(2). 131-152.

Nesbit, J., Belfer, K., and Leacock, T. (2003). Learning Object Review Instrument (LORI). User Manual. *E-Learning Research and Assessment Network*. [On-line] Available: http://elera.matchbox.surrey.sfu.ca/eLera/Home?Articles/LORI%201.5.pdf Retrieved on: 12 Jan 2004.

Newmann, F. M., and Wehlage, G. G. (1993). Five Standards of Authentic Instruction. *Educational Leadership*. 50(7): 8-13.

Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches 5th Edition*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Nickerson, R. S. (1995). Can Technology Help Teach for Understanding. In: Perkins, D. N., Schwartz, J. L., West, M. M. and Wiske, M. S. eds. *Software Goes to School. Teaching for Understanding with New Technologies*. NY: Oxford University Press. 3-20.

Noraffandy Yahaya (2000). *Pembangunan dan Penilaian Perisian Alat Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Melalui Web*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia : Master Degree Thesis.

Norris, S. P. (1989). Can We Test Validly for Critical Thinking? *Educational Researcher*. 18(9): 21-26.

Novak, J. D. (1998). *Learning, Creating, and Using Knowledge: Concept Map™ as Facilitative Tools in Schools and Corporations*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Novak, J. D., and Gowin, D. B. (1984). *Learning How to Learn*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Ogbuji, U. (2003). *Thinking XML: Learning Objects Metadata*. [On-line] Available: http://www-106.ibm.com/developerworks/library/x-think21.html Retrieved on: 14 Dec 2003

Oliver, R. (2001). Learning Objects: Supporting Flexible Delivery of Online Learning. In: Kennedy, G., Keppell, M., McNaught, C. and Petrovic, T. eds. *Meeting at the Crossroads: Proceedings of ASCILITE 2001*. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne. 453-460

Olwell, R. (2002). Building Higher-order Historical Thinking Skills in a College survey Class. *Teaching History: A Journal of Methods*. 27(1): 22-33.

Onosko, J. J. (1990). Comparing Teacher's Instruction to Promote Students' Thinking. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 22(5): 443-461.

O'Reilly, J., and Samarawickrema, G. (2003). Using Concept Maps to Enhance the Learner Experience in Business Law. *EET Conference Proceeding 2003*. July 16 – 17. Monash University, Clayton Campus. 38-46. Online Available: http://www.monash.edu.au/groups/fit/eet/full_papers/oreilly.pdf
15 November 2004

Osborne, R. J., and Wittrock, M. C. (1983). Learning Science: A Generative Process. *Science Education*. 67(4): 489-508.

Parham, J. R. (2003). An Assessment and Evaluation of Computer Science Education. *The Journal of Computing in Small Colleges*. 19(2). 115-127.

Parker, J. R.., Becker, K. (2003). .Measuring Effectiveness of Constructivist and Behaviorist Assignments in CS102.. *Proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*. 35(3): 40-44.

Parry, T., and Gregory, G. (2003). *Designing Brain Compatible Learning, 2nd Edition*. Illinois: Skylight Professional Development.

Paulsen, M. F. (2002). *Online Education Systems: Discussion and Definition Terms*. [On-line] Available: http://web.mit.edu/oki/learn/gloss.html. Retrieved on: 27 April 2006.

Paulson, F. L., and Paulson, P. R. (1996). Assessing Portfolios Using the Constructivist Paradigm. In: Fogarty, R. *Student Portfolios: A Collection of Articles*. Illinois: Skylight Training and Publishing. 27-45

Paulson, F. L., Paulson, P. R., and Meyer, C. A. (1991). What Makes a Portfolio a Portfolio. *Educational Leadership*. 48(5). 60-63.

Peck, K. L. and Dorricot, D. (1994). Why Use Technology? *Educational Leadership*. 51(7): 11-14.

Penman, M., and Lai, K. W. (2003). Synchronous communication and Higher-Order Thinking in a Tertiary Course in Occupational Therapy. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*. 14(4): 387-405.

Philips, J. A. (2000). Teaching A Graduate Course Using The Web to Support Classroom-Based Teaching and Learning: A Case Study. *International*

Conference Education & Information Communication Technology in the New Millennium, 27th-28th Oct, 44-53.

Pogrow, S. (1985). HOTS: A Computer-Based Approach. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development. 239-240

Pogrow, S. (1987). The HOTS Program: The Role of Computers in Developing Thinking Skills. *TechTrend*. 32(2): 10-13.

Pogrow, S. (1988a). Teaching Thinking to At-Risk Elementary Students. *Educational Leadership*. 45(7): 79-85.

Pogrow, S. (1988b). HOTS: A Thinking Skills Programs for At-Risk Students. *Principal*. 67(4): 21-24.

Pogrow, S. (1990). Challenging At-Risk Students: Findings from the HOTS Program. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 71(5): 389-397. [On-line] Available: http://www.hots.org. Retrieved on: 16 January 2004.

Pogrow, S. (1991). HOTS. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Programs for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development. 2, 62-64

Pogrow, S. (1994). Helping Students Who "Just Don't Understand'. *Educational Leadership*. 52(3): 62-67.

Pogrow, S. (1995). Making Reform Work for the Educationally Disadvantaged. *Educational Leadership*. 52(5): 20-25.

Pogrow, S. (1996). HOTS: Helping Low Achievers in Grades 4-8. *Principal*. November, 1996. [On-line] Avalable: http://www.hots.org. Retrieved on: 16 January 2004.

Pogrow, S. (1999). Systematically Using Powerful Learning Environments to Accelerate the Learning of Disadvantaged Students in Grades 4-8. In: Reigluth, C. ed. *Instructional Design Theories and Models Vol II: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. [On-line] Avalable: http://www.hots.org. Retrieved on: 16 January 2004.

Presseisen, B. Z. (1988). "Avoiding Battle at Curriculum Gulch: Teaching Thinking and Content. *Educational Leadership*. 45(7): 7-8.

Privateer, P. (1997). The Future of Learning in the Post-Gutenberg/Post-Industrial Era. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. 28(2): 83-86.

Quellmalz, E. S. (1987). Developing Reasoning Skills. In: Baron, J. B. and Sternberg, R. J. eds. *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory into Practice*. New York: W. H. Freeman. 86-105

Quinn, C. (2000). *International Forum of Educational Technology & Society, Formal Discussion Initiation: Learning Objects and Instruction Components*. [On-line] Available: http://ifets.ieee.org/discussions/discuss_feb2000.html Retrieved on: 13 December 2002.

Ramirez, R., and Bell, R. (1994). *Byting Back: Policies to Support the Use of Technology in Education*. Illinois: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Ramsay, J., McAteer, E., Harris, R., Allan, M., and Henderson, J. (2004). Flexible, Structured Support for the Reuse of Online Learning Objects. *Networked Learning*

Conference 2004. April 5-7. Lancaster University, UK. [Online] Available: http://www.shef.ac.uk/nlc2004/Proceedings/Individual_Papers/Ramsay_et_at.htm Retrieved on: 11 April 2005

Reding, E. E. (2004). *Adobe Photoshop CS Design Professional*. MA: Thomson Course Technology

Reed, D. (2002). The Use of Ill-Defined Problems for Developing Problem-Solving and Empirical Skills in CS1. *The Journal of Computin in Small College.* 18(1): 121-133.

Reeves, T. C. (1997). Using the WWW as a Cognitive Tool in Higher Education. In: Zahran Halim, Thomas Ottmann, and Zaidah Razak eds. *International Conference on Computers in Education*. Malaysia: UNIMAS. 1-8

Reeves, T. C. (1998, February). *The Impact of Media and Technology in Schools. A Research Report Prepared for The Bertelsmann Foundation*. [On-line] Available: http://www.athensacademy.org/instruct/media_tech/reeves0.html Retrieved on: 31 Dec 2003.

Reigeluth, C. M. (1996). Instructional Design Theories. In: Plomp, T. and Ely, D. P. eds. *International Encyclopedia of Educational Technology 2nd ed.* Oxford: Pergamon. 163-169

Reigeluth, C. M., and Nelson, L. M. (1997). A New Paradigm of ISD? In: Branch, R. C. and Minor, B. B. eds. *Educational Media and Technology Yearbook*. Englewood: Libraries Unlimited. 22: 24-35

Resnick, L. (1987). *Educating and Learning to Think*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Ristow, R. S. (1988). The Teaching of Thinking Skills: Does It Improve Creativity? *Gifted Child Today*. 11(2): 44-46.

Ritchie, D. and Volkl, C. (2000). Effectiveness of Two Generative Learning Strategies in the Science Classroom. *School Science and Mathematics*. 100(2): 83-93.

Robbins, S. R. (2002). The Evolution of the Learning Content Management System. *ASTD's Online Magazine All About E-Learning*. April, 2002. [On-line] Available: http://www.learningcircuits.org/apr2002/robbins.html Retrieved on: 13 Dec 2002.

Robson, R. (1999). Object-Oriented Instructional Design and Applications to the Web. *World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunication.* VA: AACE. 1999(1): 698-702

Rohaida Mohd. Saat, and Kamariah Abu Bakar (2000). A Development of a Web-Based Instruction for Primary School: SPICE. *International Conference Education & Information Communication Technology in the New Millennium*, 27th-28th Oct, 164-185.

Roschelle, J., Kaput, J., Stroup, W., and Kahn, T. M. (1998). Scaleable Integration of Educational Software: Exploring the Promise of Component Architectures. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*. 98(6): 1-31.

Rosenberg, I. M. (1976). Introductory Computer Science Courses A Modular Design. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCSE-SIGCUE Technical Symposium on Computer Science*. 2(1): 49-57.

Sarapuu, T., and Adojaan, K. (1999). Usage of Educational Web Pages to Develop Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills. *Society for Information Technology and Teacher Eductaional International Conference*. 1999(1): 257-262.

Schaverien, L. (2000). Towards Research Based Designing for Understanding Fundamental concepts: The case of the Web Delivered Generative Virtual Classroom for Teacher Education. *ASET*. 16(1): 1-12.

Schaverien, L., and Cosgrove, M. (2000). A Biological Basis for Generative Learning in Technology-and-Science Part II: Implications for Technology-and-Science Education. *International Journal of Science Education*. 22(1): 13-35.

Scragg, G. (1991). Most Computer Organization Courses are Built Upside Down. *SIGCSE Bulletin*. 23(1): 341-346.

Scragg, G., Baldwin, D., and Koomen, H. (1994). Computer Science Needs an Insight-Based Curriculum. *SIGCSE Bulletin*. 26(1): 150-154.

Sexton, T. G., and Poling, D. R. (1973). *Can Intelligent be Taught?* Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Shambaugh, R. N. and Magliaro, S. G. (1997). *Mastering the Possibilities: A Process Approach to Instructional Design*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Shepherd, C. (2000). *Objects of Interest*. *TACTIX, December 2000*, [On-line] Available: http://www.fastrak-consulting.co.uk/tactix/features/objects/objects.htm#Objects%20defined Retrieved on 9 Dec 2002.

Shelly, G. B., Cashman, T. J., and Vermaat, M. E. (2004). *Discovering Computers 2005: A Gateway to Information, Web Enhanced*. MA: Thomson Course Technology

Shepherd, J., Clendinning, J, and Schaverien, L. (2002). Rethinking E-Learning Design on Generative Learning Principles. *ASCILITE*. Auckland: UNITEC. [On-line] Available: http://www.unitec.ac.nz/ascilite/proceedings/papers/166.pdf. Retrieved on: 12 Jan 2004.

Shi, H., Rodriguez, O., Chen, S., and Shang, Y. (2004). Open Learning Objects as an Intelligent Way of Organizing Educational Material. *International Journal on E-Learning*. 3(2): 51-63.

Sholseth, R. D., and Watanabe, D. Y. (1991). How Do You Choose a Thinking Skills Program That Is Right for You? In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: Programs for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development. 2: 14-120

Sinclair, K. J., Renshaw, C. E., and Taylor, H. A (2004). Improving Computer-Assisted Instruction in Teaching Higher-Order Skills. *Computers & Education*. 42(2004): 169–180.

Singh, H. (2000). Achieving Interoperability in e-Learning. *ASTD's Online Magazine All About E-Learning Mar, 2000*. [On-line] Available: http://www.learningcircuits.org/mar2000/singh.html Retrieved on: 13 Dec 2002.

Skrien, D. (2001). CPU Sim 3.1: A Tool for Simulating Computer Architectures for Computer Organization Classes. *Journal of Educational Resources in Computing*. 1(4): 46-59.

Snow, R. (1989). Toward Assessment of Cognitive and Conative Structures in Learning. *Educational Researcher*. 18(9). 8-14.

South, J. B., and Monson, D. W. (2000). A University-Wide System for Creating, Capturing, and Delivering Learning Objects. In: Wiley, D. A. ed. *The Instructional Use of Learning Objects*. [On-line] Available: http://reusability.org/read/

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Choosing the Right Program. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 185-186

Stoney, S., and Oliver, R. (1999). Can Higher Order Thinking and Cognitive Engagement Be Enhanced with Multimedia? *Interactive Multimedia Electronic Journal of Computer-Enhance Learning*. 1(2). [On-line] Available: http://imej.wfu.edu/articles/1999/2/07/printver.asp Retrieved on: 13 Jan 2004.

Stoyanova, N., and Kommers, P. (2002). Concept Mapping as a Medium of Shared Cognition in Computer-Supported Collaborative Problem Solving. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*. 13(1/2): 111-133.

Swartz, C. W. (2001). *Concept Formation and Problem Solving: Understanding and Managing Two Key Components of Higher Order Cognition*. [On-line] Available: http://www.allkindsofminds.org/articleDisplay.aspx?articleID=18&categoryID=10 Retrieved on: 31 Dec 2003.

Tal, R., and Hochberg, N (2003). Assessing High Order Thinking of Students Participating in the "WISE" Project in Israel. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. 29(2). 69-89.

Tan Wee Chuen, Baharrudin Aris, and Mohd Salleh Abu (2004). A Proposed Design and Development Framework of GLOOTT: A Pedagogically-Enriched Web-Based

Learning Environment Designed to Inculcate Higher Order Thinking Skills. *International Conference in University Teaching and Learning*, 2004. University Technology Mara, Shah Alam, Malaysia.

Tan Wee Chuen, Baharrudin Aris, and Mohd Salleh Abu (2005). GLOOTT Model: A Conceptual Model of Web-Based Learning System Designed Framework to Improve Higher Order Thinking (HOT). *Southern College Academic Journal*. 1(1): 69-92.

Tay, Lee Yong (2002). *Using Information and Communication Technological Tools **to** Engage Students in Higher-Order Thinking: A Case Study*. Singapore National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University: Master Thesis.

Tillema, H. H. (1998). Design and Validity of a Portfolio Instrument for Professional Training. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. 24(3): 263-278.

Tillema, H. H., and Smith, K. (2000). Learning From Portfolios: Differential Use of Feedback in Portfolio Construction. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. 26(3): 263-278.

Ting, Choo Yee (2003). Enhancing Conceptual Change through Cognitive Tools: An Animated Pedagogical Agent Approach. *The 3rd IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT), July 09-11*, 314-315.

Tishman, S. (2001). Added Value: A Dispositional Perspective on Thinking. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking, 3rd Edition*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 72- 79.

Tishman, S. (1991). Connections. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Program for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development. 2: 69-72

Toh, Seong Chong (2004). Creating Reusable Learning Objects: Instructional Design and Development Considerations. *Malaysian Journal of Educational Technology*: 4(2): 63-74.

Valade, J. (2002). *PHP & MySQL for Dummies*. NY: Hungry Minds.

Van Zele, E., Vandaele, P., Bottledooren, D., and Lenaerts, J. (2003). Implementation and Evaluation of a Course Concept Based on Reusable Learning Objects. *Journal of Computing Research*. 28(4): 355-372.

Vockell, E., and van Deusen, R. M. (1989). *The Computer and Higher-Order Thinking Skills*. California: Mitchell Publishing.

Voutilainen, T. (1991). The Project FACE (Formal Aims of Cognitive Education. In: Marcure, S. and Davies, P. eds. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn. The Proceedings of the 1989 OECD Conference*. Oxford: Pergamon, 19-30

Wagner, E. D. (2002.) The New Frontier of Learning Object Design. *The eLearning Developers' Journal*. 18 June 2002. [On-line] Available: http://www.wlearningguild.com/pdf/2/061802DST-H.pdf Retrieved on 27 Dec 2002

Wai, N. N., and Hirakawa, Y. (2001). Teachers' Conceptualization and Actual Practice in the Student Evaluation Process at the Upper Secondary School Level in Japan, Focusing on Problem Solving Skills. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. 27(2001): 175-198.

Walker, J. M. T., and King, P. H. (2002). Concept Map as a Form of Student Assessment and Instruction. *Proceedings of the 2002 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition*. [On-line] Available: http://www.vanth.org/docs/010_2002.pdf

Weiss, R. E. (2003). Designing Problems to Promote Higher-Order Thinking. In *New Direction for Teaching and Leaning*. 95: 25-31.

White, G. (2001). Misconceptions in CIS Education. *The Journal of Computing in Small Colleges*. 16(3): 149-152.

Wiggins, G. (1992). Creating Tests Worth Taking. *Educational Leaderships*. 49(8): 26-33.

Wiley, D. A. (2000). *Learning Object Design and Sequencing Theory*. Brigham Young University: Thesis Doctor of Philosophy.

Wiley, D. A. (2001). Connecting Learning Objects to Instructional Design Theory: A Definition, A Metaphor, and A Taxonomy. In Wiley, D. A. ed. *The Instructional Use of Learning Objects*. [On-line] Available: http://reusability.org/read/ Retrieved on: 3 October 2002

Wiley, D. A. (2002a). Learning Objects. In Kovolchick, A. and Dawson, K. eds. *Educational Technology: An Encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO. [On-line] Available: http://wiley.ed.usu.edu/docs/encyc.pdf Retrieved on: 15 April 2003.

Wiley, D. A. (2002b). Learning Objects Need Instructional Design Theory. In: Rossett, A. ed. *The ASTD E-Learning Handbook*. NY: McGraw-Hill. 115-126

Wilson, B. G. (1997). Reflections on Constructivism and Instructional Design. In: Dills, C. R. and Romiszowski, A. J. eds. *Instructional Development Paradigms*, Engle Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publication.

Winocour, S. L. (1985). Project IMPACT. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 210-211

Winocour, S. L. (1991). IMPACT. In: Costa, A. L. ed. *Developing Minds: A Program for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development. 2: 33-34

Wittrock, M. C. (1974). Learning as a Generative Process. *Educational Psychologist*. 11(2): 87-95.

Wittrock, M. C. (1986). Students' Thought Process. In: Wittrock, M. C. ed. *Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd Edition*. NY: Macmillan. 297-314

Wittrock, M. C. (1991). Generative Teaching of Comprehension. *The Elementary School Journal*. 92(2): 169-184.

Wittrock, M. C., and Alesandrini, K. (1990). Generation of Summaries and Analogies and Analytics and Holistic Abilities. *American Educational Research Journal*. 27(3): 489-502.

Wolf, D. P. (1989). Portfolio Assessment: Sampling Student Work. *Educational Leadership*. 46(7): 35-39.

Wolffe, G. S., Yurcik, W., Osborne, U., and Holliday, M. A., (2002). Teaching Computer Organization with Limited Resources Using Simulators. *Proceedings of*

the 20th SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education. 34(1): 176-180.

Yehezkel, C., Yurcik, W., Person, M., and Armstrong, D. (2002). Three Simulator Tools for Teaching Computer Architecture: EasyCPU, Little Man Computer, and RTLSim. *Journal of Educational Resources in Computing*. 1(4): 60-80.

Yurcik, W., Osborne, H. (2001). A Crowd of Little Man Computers: Visual Computer Simulator Teaching Tools. In: Peters, B. A., Smith, J. S., Medeiros, D. J. and Rohrer, M. W. eds. *Proceedings of the 2001 Winter Simulation Conference*, 1632-1639.

Yuretich, R. F. (2004). Measuring Skills in Large Introductory Science Classes. *Journal of College Science Teaching*. 33(3): 40-45.

Zanariah Abdullah and Rosmatyuzie Ab. Satar (2001). *Kajian Teknologi Maklumat dan Komunikasi di Sekolah. Kota Putra: Maktab Perguruan Besut*. [On-line]. Available: http://www.angelfire.com/me4/zana/kajianTMK.html#silibusTM Retrieved on: 1 April 2004

Zhu, E. (1999). Hypermedia Interface Design: The Effects of Number of Links and Granularity of Nodes. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*. 8(3): 331-358.

Zohar, A., Weinberger, Y., and Tamir, P. (1994). The Effect of Biology Critical Thinking Project on the Development of Critical Thinking. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. 39(1): 183-196.

Zoller, U. (1999). Scaling-up of Higher-Order Cognitive Skills-Oriented College Chemistry Teaching: An Action-Oriented Research. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. 36(5): 583-596.