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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to develop a framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning through Facebook. A quantitative research design of a multiple-case study method was adopted in this research. Initially, a survey was conducted to identify student’s metacognitive abilities. 80 master degree students from the Educational Technology Program were randomly selected to answer the survey. Next, 37 students from the earlier survey were selected as respondents, which further contributed to the development of the framework. These 37 students comprised three cohorts of students from three subsequent semesters. The study identified the dominant mechanism of metacognitive scaffolding prompted by the instructor, along with the dominant types of online interaction triggered by the students in an online discussion. The data was analyzed by using content analysis technique. Besides that, 4 mobile applications or apps were developed by the researcher as the technological tool used in the learning. The mobile apps as well as the learning activities used in the current study follow the project-based learning approach. Data was collected from a General Metacognition Questionnaire (GMQ) survey, observation through Facebook discussions and through a performance test. The results show that the students’ metacognitive abilities in learning are high ($\mu=3.86$). Besides that, this study points out that the instructor often guides the students to focus on their learning process. The findings also demonstrate that students often give opinions rather than giving examples from their existing ideas; they are also unlikely to compare similarities and differentiate facts. Pearson correlation analysis shows a significant correlation between metacognitive scaffolding and students’ types of online interaction with the students’ learning performance. A data mining analysis using a decision tree technique was used to project a predictive model in order to suggest the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding appropriate to be used by the instructor; such a technique must be able to contribute to students’ performance in learning. Finally, the proposed framework recommends a series of rules that serves as a shortcut for the instructor to produce meaningful learning among students through metacognitive scaffolding. These rules were derived from data mining, i.e, association rule analysis. These rules also mentioned the types of student online interactions that actually represent their learning process, particularly in terms of their interactivity in Facebook discussions.
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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

A research conducted by Barg et al. (2000) has identified several problems among students who are learning computer-based subjects; the problems include dealing with technical issues, problems in the individual’s learning process and the need of basic concepts especially for students who are new in learning the subjects. Accordingly, Faessler (2006) suggested that students garner the capability of combining both concepts and skills while learning computer-based subjects. These students probably need guidance from instructors or more skillful peers in order to complete a particular task. Such guidance is actually part of scaffolding mechanisms, and this guidance nowadays can also be offered in discussions and interactions among instructors and knowledgeable peers.

In education, scaffolding refers to a strategy or guidance that helps learners during their learning sessions whereby the method makes learning easier for them (Azevedo and Hadwin, 2005). Yun-Ho (2010) has identified scaffolding in various forms including in guidance through resources, tools, question prompts, expert modeling and expert advices. Scaffolding no longer refers to a guidance that is literally given by a teacher to a student; rather, it can also exist when there is a computer or other technology-mediated learning tools that are used to support students throughout their learning process. Scaffolding can also be referred as a guidance that comes either from human, tutors, computers or software tools that are
intended to support learners in developing their knowledge and skills (Graesser et al., 2000; Reiser, 2002).

A few types of scaffolding exist in education and they are generally known as instructional scaffolding. Hannafin, Land and Oliver (1999) have identified four types of instructional scaffolding: conceptual, procedural, strategic and metacognitive scaffolding. Out of this four, metacognitive scaffolding is considered important as it serves to help students control their own learning (Azevedo et al., 2008). In fact, the concept of metacognition itself is often defined as “thinking about your own thinking.” Researchers recommend metacognitive scaffolding to be conducted in a technology-rich environment through various approaches (Herbert, 2003), but the field has yet to uncover the use of metacognitive scaffolding in learning computer-based subjects.

As technology extends learning beyond the classroom setting, the concept of scaffolding becomes more diverse. No longer is the method confined to face-to-face interaction; it now implies to students thousands of kilometers away from their colleges as well. Granted, scaffolding can now be mediated by technology. A technology that captures interests among university’s students nowadays includes the social networking tools. Today, these tools have attracted millions of users from all around the globe (Boyd and Ellison, 2008). Lucas and Moreira (2009) have found that social networking tools can foster informal learning dialogues among students and this encourages students’ participation and determination in sharing knowledge. A social networking tool such as Facebook ignites online interactions as it allows users to interact within their bounded network. According to Shambare and Mvula (2011), Facebook offers many opportunities that can facilitate teaching and learning since it promotes students-instructor interactions.

With this regard, there is a need of proper guidance by instructors to trigger students’ discussions in the learning of computer-based subjects through the online medium, including through social networking tools. It is possible that the discussions triggered by the network can initiate different types of online interactions in which the students can interact with instructors and peers throughout their
learning. Previous studies have reported how the social network has promoted interactions and participations among instructors and learners in supporting their teaching and learning (Santos et al., 2009; Minocha, Schroeder and Schneider, 2010; Shiu, Fong and Lam, 2010). It is important to understand that long before the existence of technology-mediated learning environment, Moore (1989) had defined three types of interactions in distance education, including the interaction between i) instructor-learner, ii) learner-learner and iii) learner-content. In the present study, the researcher had focused on learner-learner and instructor-learner interaction in which an instructor scaffolds learner and learners discussed with their peers throughout a discussion session.

Since scaffolding is best implemented through an authentic learning environment which includes reality-centered activities, a project-based learning seems to be the best learning approach to trigger a discussion. A project-based learning is a combination of both subject-matter objectives and an authentic learning environment (Eskrootchi and Oskrochi, 2010). It is based on learning activities that construct knowledge in an authentic context (Papanikolou and Boubouka, 2010). This approach is the best to facilitate learners in having full control throughout their learning process. The project-based learning approach was delivered through mobile applications or apps that installed on the iPad and other mobile tablets, such as a Samsung tablet in order to trigger the discussion in Facebook, as well as to elicit student’s learning process. In this study, the mobile apps act as the learning tools and technology-supported devices.

Therefore, this study expected to develop a framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning computer-based subjects through a social networking tool which is Facebook. By having the framework, the researcher intended to study students’ learning processes that are based not only on their communications, but also on their thinking about their own thinking. Integrating metacognitive scaffolding will trigger different types of students’ online interactions, which will represent their learning process (Farahani, 2003). In addition, this framework assumes that students who are lack of metacognitive skills and knowledge can be scaffolded through interaction on Facebook, in which their instructors inject
questions that will result in the instructor-learner interactions. It is hoped that a proper framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning can successfully facilitate learners’ metacognition and interactions in learning computer-based subjects.

1.2 Background of the Problem

Several studies have provided evidence that learning without proper guidance from instructors will result in the students’ feeling of isolation, lack of self-confidence, reduced motivation and difficulty in accomplishing complex tasks (McLoughlin and Marshall, 2000; Reiser, 2002; Ludwig-Hardman and Dunlap, 2003). These issues have also attracted other researchers to investigate the effects of students’ losing guidance from teachers and content expert. These students may lose their focus on their studies or lose hopes and interests in developing their potential skills and knowledge (Holmes et al., 2010). Such effects have ignited researchers and academicians to find possible guidelines or structures that can assist learners in their learning process. As a result, scholars have come to realize that learners require guidance from instructors or more skillful peers in order to meet instructional objectives in learning (Reiser, 2002; Kazlauskas and Applebee, 2007) and this guidance is necessary when it comes to online learning.

Authoring System is one of the computer-based subjects that expose students to creative activities, ranging from simple typing content to designing and developing of complex multimedia courseware by using an authoring tool to produce computer-based instructional applications (Otto and Pusack, 2009). Sidhu and Ramesh (2006) stated that the use of multimedia authoring tools requires one to have knowledge and skills to operate such tools. For example, some challenges that concern learners include their lack of knowledge (Payne et al., 2007) and technical skills (Blocher, 2003). On the other hand, the demonstration and hands-on activities in learning this subject are critical (Wang, 2006). Thus, support or scaffolding from knowledgeable others is crucial (Barg et al., 2000; Jones and Issroff, 2005).
In education, scaffolding refers to the process in which teachers or skillful peers assist a learner, solve problems and help the learners to complete a complex task that is beyond his or her knowledge (Reiser, 2002; Azevedo and Hadwin, 2005; Thomas, Davis and Kazlaukas, 2007). There are four types of scaffolding that support learning: procedural, conceptual, strategic and metacognitive scaffolding (Hannafin, Land and Oliver, 1999; Hill and Hannafin, 2001). Procedural scaffolding assists on how to use resources, so it focuses on using specific functions, procedures or navigations. Conceptual scaffolding assists students in managing the concepts in learning. It helps students in making connections between concepts or in simplifying complex concepts (Way and Rowe, 2008). This type of scaffolding also supplies a conceptual model or different representations of a concept. Strategic scaffolding assists by directly or indirectly suggesting approaches to solve problems and strategies or pathways to complete a task (Devolder, Braak and Tondeur, 2012). Metacognitive scaffolding assists learners in reflecting or expelling what they have learned (self-assess), or in giving feedback/opinions on how they are learning (Teo and Chai, 2009). This method of scaffolding may be in the form of a simple prompt to think about the goal or the problem, or it may be in the form of a more sophisticated guidance for organizing or assessing knowledge.

In this situation, the guidance given by the experts among the students or the lecturers themselves actually reflects the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) that was also introduced by Vygotsky (1978). In particular, Vygotsky considered that students are ready to learn when they are assisted through dialogues with an expert or a knowledgeable person. He stated that students’ achievements are based not only on their current level of skills, but also on their potential developments. Thus, the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is the distance between what students can do with and without help. The term *proximal* (nearby) points out that the assistance provided is just beyond the learners’ current knowledge in order for them to complement their abilities (Cole and Cole, 2001). The assistance can be in a form of scaffolding by the instructors and by peers.

Among the four types of scaffolding, metacognitive scaffolding seems to be the appropriate way to assist students in learning computer-based subjects.
Computer-based subject requires students to be involved with technical skills such as operating software tools and understanding its functions for the purpose of drawing, creating animations or developing multimedia applications. For students who are first being introduced to this subject, operating such tools can be quite troublesome. Thus, the guidance from the instructors through the use of metacognitive scaffolding may ease their difficulties, as this type of guidance supports students in understanding the best possible strategy to accomplish difficult tasks and thus, developing their thinking. According to Azevedo and Hadwin (2005), scaffolding students’ during learning can motivate them to learn challenging tasks, particularly in a computer-based learning environment. Furthermore, Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008) have stated that metacognitive scaffolding supports the learning process by framing the problem, guiding students, and giving ways for them to solve problems under possible strategies. This type of scaffolding suggests that students plan ahead, evaluate progress and determine their needs. Moreover, metacognitive scaffolding may also remind the students to reflect on the goal in order to manipulate the problem at hand. By using metacognitive scaffolding in a learning process, novice students can be assisted in learning in a better environment, particularly through good guidance from experts. There is a growing body of scholarly works on integrating metacognitive scaffolding through software-based activities (Luckin and Hammerton, 2002; Quintana, Zhang and Krajcik, 2005; Graesser, McNamara and VanLehn, 2005), metacognitive scaffolding in computer-supported learning environment (Cuevas, Fiore and Oser, 2002; Pifarré and Cobos, 2009; Molenaar et al., 2012) and the impact of metacognitive scaffolding on learning (Roll et al., 2012).

Scaffolding students in learning through an online learning medium is quite a challenging task. Because most educators face problems with scaffolding students through an online learning medium (Sims, Dobbs and Hand, 2002), a scaffolding framework through such a medium is required. The framework can provide a foundation in identifying a mechanism that will lead to the description of successful metacognitive scaffolding approaches in learning computer-based subjects. Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008) have categorized metacognitive scaffolding mechanisms provided by an instructor into the following mechanisms; i) presenting the rationale of the given task; ii) ask students regarding the relationship between reading items,
course objectives and tasks, iii) Supporting student’s reflective writing, iv) let students focus on the learning process, v) Encouraging the relationships among participants, vi) Permit student’s thoughts especially in discriminating between the conclusion, fact, opinion or hypothesis, and finally vii) supervising or guiding student’s text comprehension. All of these mechanisms are the focal points of a learning process that encourage interactions among participants. Resulting from their present study, Reingold, Rimor and Kalay discovered that metacognitive scaffolding encourages students to reflect on the task given and contributes to the students’ experience as a community of learners with a common task. Based on the mechanisms, the framework was developed from the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding used by Reingold, Rimor, and Kalay (2008), who have also implemented the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding in their study among university students. However, Reingold, Rimor, and Kalay (2008) did not formulate any framework of metacognitive scaffolding that can maximize students’ interaction through Facebook. With this gap, this study works into formulating the framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning through Facebook.

Concurrent with the changes of university students’ interest towards learning through the online learning medium is the existence of social networking tools that have attracted the students’ attention. Facebook is known as the most popular social networking tool among university students, with the users’ age ranging between 17 and 61 years old (Junco, 2012a). The services are free of charge and the users are free to connect with each other within their network. Most of the social networking sites provide multiple services to their users such as instant messaging, blogging, photo-sharing emailing and chatting services, etc. All of these services allow students to interact easily with each other. According to Santos et al. (2009), these sites have the potential to support teaching and learning sessions as they complement the traditional and online classroom activities.

Oradini and Saunders (2008) have shown that students can benefit social network in various ways, such as by integrating it with class activities or by sharing information about the activities they are engaged in. Santos et al. (2009) found that social networking sites such as Facebook may also promote informal dialogues and
knowledge sharing among students. According to Lucas and Moreira (2009), social networking tools also have the potential to support innovative pedagogical practices and different students’ learning types. For instance, the Facebook site has become a platform for students and teachers to be connected. This connection allows them to communicate and share their thoughts, emotions, facts and opinions without feeling hesitant and shy towards others since the communications take place virtually. Besides, the students can instantly obtain new information on their academic contents from other students or teachers.

Nevertheless, discussions that occur without any guidance from any expertise (such as instructors) are considered useless or a waste of time. In Berent and Bugbee’s (1993) study, they concluded that students who do not receive any external feedback or responses about their learning progress will have low learning achievements. This problem commonly occurs among novice students who do not have basic knowledge on technical applications. This is because the complexity of technical knowledge seems to daunt many people from developing their technical skills (Pavlina, 2006). As a result, students are unable to solve any technical problem even when they are attempting to make an application to work. For this reason, guidance is expected, especially when it comes to learning a computer-based subject, such as Authoring System, which requires knowledge and technical skills.

At the same time, issues in online learning process should be explored, particularly in learning through online interactions in Facebook, regardless whether the learning takes place or otherwise. One of the ways to measure a learning process in an online learning environment is by analyzing online interactions; experienced educators and researchers such as Henri (1992), Gunawardena, Lowe and Anderson, (1997), Kanuka and Anderson (1998), MacKinnon (2000), and Campos (2004) have proposed methods and models to assess learning processes through online interactions. Other scholars such as Fahy, Crawford and Ally (2001) and Jeong (2003) have explored and understood the patterns of online interactions. However, their views differ from the one addressed in the study by Topcu and Ubuz (2008), who investigated the effects of online interactions in a forum (MacKinnon, 2000) on students’ learning process. The same technique proposed by Topcu and Ubuz (2008)
was applied in this research which merely focuses on students’ types of online interactions facilitated through instructors’ metacognitive scaffolding on Facebook.

The metacognitive scaffolding triggered by the instructors or lecturers through interactions in Facebook was based on the mechanism of metacognitive as proposed by Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008). Each student’s interaction/post on Facebook was analyzed via a coding technique, specifically on the types of online interactions as the ones developed by MacKinnon (2000). This coding technique was chosen because of its mere focus on interactivity. Moreover, Shukri and Tasir (2012) had also used this coding technique to investigate the students’ different types of online interactions in learning Authoring Language in an online forum.

Learning environment that requires scaffolding should be authentic and reflective of the project’s task. This is suitable for an instructional method called project-based learning approach. The project-based learning approach allows students to work on a project over a particular period of time in which emphasis is given for doing some action-oriented tasks instead of learning on something (Muniandy et al., 2009), for example, facts or theories. In other words, a project-based learning is a ‘hands-on’ approach for the students that will lead to their thinking skills upon completing the project. Eskrootchi and Oskrochi (2010) have investigated the effectiveness of a project-based approach in a technology-rich environment. Their findings concluded that at best, students understand a concept of a particular lesson when they participate in manipulating a particular experiment. Prior researchers tend to agree that students learn at their best with a project-based approach as they will discover things by themselves and make full use of the technological tools (Lebow and Wager, 1994; Muniandy et al., 2009). With the existence of applications in learning and students’ interest towards new gadgets such as the iPad and other mobile tablets, the project-based learning can be represented in a form of mobile applications (or apps). A preliminary investigation that has been conducted in this study has proven that students show positive attitudes towards learning with mobile apps. In particular, the results indicated that students prefer to learn by using apps rather than by the traditional method.
As a conclusion, it is beneficial to have a metacognitive scaffolding framework to assist students in learning the Authoring System subject through Facebook. Moreover, the notion of scaffolding students in this study was through interactions in Facebook in which project-based learning tasks were delivered through Apple and Android–based tablets and designed learning activities. Through the discussions on Facebook, instructors’ dominant metacognitive scaffolding that have resulted in the dominant types of students’ online interaction can be expected to form an appropriate framework.

1.3 Problem Statement

Learning a computer-based subject, such as Authoring System requires both theoretical and technical skills. This subject exposes students to the basic tools and functions to create animations and applications by using the Adobe Flash software. At the end of the semester, students are expected to develop various kinds of instructional multimedia applications. Therefore, technical skills and knowledge on theoretical basis are highly necessary for this subject. Otherwise, students who do not have prior knowledge in this subject may find it difficult to build instructional multimedia applications by using the above mentioned software. To overcome these difficulties, it is best to have discussions with peers and instructors in order to solve the learning problems because students may find it complicated if they have to work on their own. In fact, they need support from others so that in the future, they are able to sharpen their skills and build any multimedia application by using the software.

Given the need for interaction and scaffolding in developing the required skills in learning Authoring System, how do we ensure and assess that instructors’ scaffolding can establish students’ deeper understanding of the learning process in relation to their types of interaction in online discussions?

With the idea of discussions and interactions between students and instructors, and how they can assist learners in their learning process, the researcher
focused on the medium that is capable of becoming the platform for the discussions. Social networking tools such as Facebook is recognized as an ideal platform for students to interact and discuss with their friends and instructors regarding their progresses and problems in learning. Like other social networking tools that allow socialization among users, Facebook allows users to contribute, share information and gain knowledge because of its open environment. However, educators should realize that the discussions that take place on Facebook without guidance from instructors or skillful peers are ineffective because students may prone to discuss unrelated topics. These students need support from their instructors or skillful peers since they may find it helpful if they can discuss with more knowledgeable persons.

In education, this support is known as instructional scaffolding, or commonly known as scaffolding. Scaffolding is best implemented with the existence of authentic tasks that are proven to enhance students’ performance and engagement in learning. Scaffolding can also be divided into several parts, one of them is metacognitive scaffolding. Metacognitive scaffolding provides strategy and assists students throughout their learning process. It enables them to plan what they will learn, monitor their learning and reflect upon what they have learned about a particular task. Proposed by Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008), the metacognitive support was injected by the instructor through the discussions with learners in a Facebook group page that is set up by the instructor him/herself. As mentioned, mobile apps were used as learning tools in which authentic tasks can be implemented. The apps contain project-based video tutorials on several topics covered in the learning of Adobe Flash. Students were given authentic tasks/activities at the end of every topic and they needed to refer to the apps to complete the tasks.

Hence, with the emergence of such authentic tasks through on-demand technology devices (such as the iPad), and with the students being assisted with metacognitive scaffolding through a social networking tool such as Facebook, the researcher then produced a proper framework that could assist learners in learning Authoring System subjects. To develop this framework, the researcher initially identified the students’ metacognitive abilities in learning by investigating the
students’ metacognitive skills and knowledge. Next, a Facebook group page was set up in which the students’ learning process was initiated by project-based tasks delivered through mobile apps. The students’ types of online interactions were measured from each post/discussion that took place in the Facebook group page. At the same time, the students were assisted with metacognitive support prompted by the instructor. At the end of the study, the researcher developed a framework of metacognitive scaffolding based on Reingold, Rimor and Kalay’s (2008) seven mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding that aim to support students in learning. In this study, these mechanisms were used to assist students in learning computer-based subjects through a discussion on Facebook, particularly by considering the students’ types of online interactions as suggested by MacKinnon (2000).

1.4 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are as follows:

i. To identify students’ metacognitive abilities in learning.

ii. To identify the dominant mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding by the instructor to assist students in learning Authoring System subject through Facebook.

iii. To identify the dominant types of online interactions among students in learning Authoring System subject when metacognitive scaffolding is infused through Facebook.

iv. To investigate the relationship among instructors’ metacognitive scaffolding and students’ types of online interaction with students’ performance.

v. To study how does the metacognitive scaffolding helps students’ in learning Authoring System subject.

vi. To develop a framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning Authoring System subject through Facebook considering different types of students’ online interaction.
1.5 Research Questions

The research questions are:

i. What are the students’ metacognitive abilities in learning?

ii. What are the dominant mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding by the instructor to assist students in learning Authoring System subject through Facebook?

iii. What are the dominant types of online interactions among students in learning Authoring System subject when metacognitive scaffolding is infused through Facebook?

iv. What is the relationship among instructors’ metacognitive scaffolding and students’ types of online interaction and students’ performance?

v. How does the metacognitive scaffolding help students’ in learning Authoring System subject?

vi. What is the framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning Authoring System subject through Facebook considering different types of students’ online interaction?

1.6 Theoretical Framework

Theoretical framework outlines the basis of theories or the basic concept that the researcher has used throughout his or her study. In this study, the researcher employed several concepts that acted as the baseline that contributed to the development of the framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning through Facebook. Figure 1.1 shows the theoretical framework of this research.
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1.6.1 Social Development Theory

The term scaffolding in education is best reflected in the works that had been carried out by Lev Vygotsky in 1978 and his renowned Social Development Theory. Social Development Theory suggests that social interaction plays an important role in cognitive development. In particular, Lev Vygotsky emphasized that community plays an important role in the process of cognition, development in which learning occurs through social interaction with skillful others. Two main principles were highlighted by Vygotsky in this theory: More Knowledgeable Others (MKO) and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).

Vygotsky referred MKO as teachers, parents or peers who have a higher ability level than learners; in other words, MKO are the persons whom the learners seek guidance in understanding a particular task, process or concept. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is related to the concept of MKO; it is defined as the area between what is known and what is not known from a child during learning. The ZPD is the area in which a child receives guidance or instruction from MKO, and the result is the child’s ability to develop skills on his own, and the allowing of the child to develop his understanding. With the existence of MKO, individuals are able to coordinate their cognition throughout the process of learning. Understanding this process of cognition is known as metacognition.

1.6.2 Metacognition

In 1976, John Flavell published a paper in which he describes metacognition as a concept of defining “one's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes” (p. 232), or simply thinking about one’s own thinking. It consists of both knowledge of cognition and the ability to control and regulate the cognitive processes (Flavell, 1979). Other pioneer researchers who studied metacognition include Reeve and Brown (1984), who considered metacognition as a term that has generally been referred as ‘individuals’ ability to understand and manipulate their
own cognitive processes” (p. 3). Failing to acquire metacognitive abilities will result in poor academic performance, especially in problem-solving tasks (Romainville, 1994; Hartman, 2002; Sungur, 2007; Cornoldi, 2009). An individual’s metacognition can be guided through the use of specific strategies known as metacognitive scaffolding.

1.6.3 Metacognitive Scaffolding

Fouché and Lamport (2011) once stated that metacognition is not easily taught, nor can it easily be transferred. However, many researchers proved that students’ metacognition can actually be trained (King, 1998). According to Luckin and Hammerton (2002), metacognitive scaffolding obviously can support and teach students’ metacognition in learning. Luckin and Hemmerton particularly studied how the technique could be a strategy to support the learners’ ability to challenge their own skill level and look for appropriate assistance.

The term metacognitive scaffolding was first introduced by Hannafin, Land and Oliver (1999). They referred metacognitive scaffolding as one of the types of scaffolding in an online learning environment that assists learners in establishing what is known and how to think during a learning process. For sure, metacognitive scaffolding has its root from the concept of metacognition defined by John Flavell in 1976, and the term of scaffolding was founded by the famous psychologist, Lev Vygotsky in 1978.

In this study, each student had to participate in ongoing discussions in a social networking tool, which is the Facebook group page created by the instructor. The discussion itself was initiated by the instructor based on the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolds promoted by Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008). The mechanisms include:

i. Presenting rational for task and activities.
ii. Presenting the relationship between reading items, course objectives and tasks.

iii. Supporting reflective writing.

iv. Focusing on the process of learning.

v. Encouraging relationship among participants.

vi. Discriminating between conclusion/fact/opinion/hypothesis.

vii. Supervising text comprehension.

1.6.4 Theory of Constructivism

This study also included the work of the Theory of Constructivism by John Dewey in 1916. In particular, Dewey (1916) pointed out that education depends on the action: the experience given to learners are important as it draws meaning to them. His ideas became influential to other researchers as the latters believed that the expanded ideas that evolved around the Theory of Constructivism explain how learners construct their own understanding. This study involved a learning strategy called project-based learning. A project-based learning requires students to be involved in authentic activities in which they can experience learning by doing.

1.6.5 Types of Online Interaction

Woo and Reeves (2007) claimed that an interaction is the vital element in any learning process. As we all know, the nature of interaction itself can be at a distance, or in a form of face-to-face interaction. The same goes to interaction that takes place in a learning environment. Interactions in learning have shifted from being in a face-to-face classroom setting to being in a technology-enabled medium. Educational technologies have long considered interactions in an online learning medium or what we know as online interactions or online discussions (Vrasidas and McIsaac, 1999; Spatariu, Hartley and Bendixen, 2004; Lee, 2006; Lai, Yang and Liang, 2006; Mavrou, Lewis and Douglas, 2010; Song and McNary, 2011).
Researchers have also considered the different types of online interactions among students in learning, and they have particularly conducted various methods to analyze them (Davidson-Shivers, 2009; Lee, 2006; MacKinnon, 2000; Song and McNary, 2011). In this study, however, the researcher gathered the students’ different types of online interactions based on the coding techniques of messages used by MacKinnon (2000). In particular, MacKinnon categorized types of interactions into specific categories including i) acknowledgement of opinion, ii) question, iii) compare, iv) contrast, v) evaluation, vi) idea to example, vii) example to idea, viii) clarification or elaboration, ix) cause or effect and lastly, x) off-topic or off-topic discussion. He then developed a coding technique called “cognotes” to evaluate students’ participation in an electronic discussion group. Other researchers, Topcu and Ubuz (2008), also used this coding technique to assess students’ interactions in an online forum. Based on the interactions that took place on Facebook, students’ engagements were considered important as from here, instructors could perceive the different types of online interactions among the students.

1.7 Research Framework

A research framework (Figure 1.2) explains how the researcher conducted this research in order to produce a framework of metacognitive scaffolding in learning through Facebook. Prior to assessing the students’ metacognitive scaffolding in learning, the researcher distributed General Metacognition Questionnaire (GMQ) as the one developed by Topcu (2005). The GMQ comprises questions that aim to assess students’ metacognitive abilities in three aspects of metacognition: metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive judgment and monitoring, and metacognitive self-regulation and control.

According to Pifarré and Cobos (2009), metacognitive knowledge is knowledge that concerns one’s metacognitive skills, such as how students can control their own learning processes. These metacognitive skills are highly related to
tasks and contexts’ characteristics. For example, students who can regulate their own thinking on a given task are those who possess metacognitive knowledge. This means that these students plan and organize their thinking well while completing a particular task. They know what they should or should not do in order to complete a task. Students with metacognitive knowledge will assure the understanding of their learning objective. They are the kind of students who will order their brain to perform well in order to meet the objective in learning.
General Metacognition Questionnaire (GMQ by Topcu, 2005)

Pre-Test

Project-Based Tasks
Apps 1| Apps 2| Apps 3| Apps 4

INSTRUCTOR
Metacognitive Scaffolding (Reingold, Rimor & Kalay, 2008)
1. Presenting rational for task and activities.
2. Presenting the relationship between reading items, course objectives and tasks.
3. Supporting reflective writing.
4. Discriminating between opinion, fact, conclusions and hypothesis.
5. Supervising text comprehension.
6. Focusing on the process of learning.
7. Encourage relationship among learners.

STUDENT
Types of Online Interaction (MacKinnon, 2000)
1. Acknowledgment of Opinions
2. Question (thoughtful query)
3. Compare (similarity, analogy)
4. Contrast (distinction, discrimination)
5. Evaluation (Unsubstantiated judgment, value)
6. Idea to example (deduction, analogy)
7. Example to idea (induction, conclusion)
8. Clarification, elaboration (reiterating, building on a point)
9. Cause and effect (inference, consequence)
10. Off topic/faulty reasoning (entry inappropriate)

Activities
Act 1| Act 2| Act 3| Act 4

Post-Test
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Figure 1.2 Research Framework
Unlike metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive judgment and monitoring refer to the way students confidently judge their success in learning by reporting that the information they obtained will be remembered later (Hertzog and Dunlosky, 2011). To demonstrate, these are the kinds of students who can extract the core important information while they are studying, and they remember what they referred previously. They can easily monitor their own learning materials and categorize them as ‘easy’ or ‘difficult’, and if they are stuck in Plan A, they will construct and go to Plan B.

Metacognitive self-regulation and control refer to the extent where students take control of their learning process (Mullin, 2012). Metacognitive self-regulation and control helps students to focus well in their studies. These students know what they are doing; the learning objective is clear for them to move on and strategically organize what and how they should do to meet those objectives in learning. Metacognition is known as an important aspect for successful learning and for this reason, it is crucial to assist or scaffold a learner’s metacognition process. Thus, metacognitive scaffolding is the best strategy to use.

In this study, the instructors prompted questions or statements that refer to the above mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding in order to assess the students’ learning process. These mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding were used by Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008) to study the relationship between an instructor’s scaffolding and students’ metacognition in online forums. The results of their study indicated that students’ metacognitive processes in learning were all correlated with the content - support type of instructor’s metacognitive scaffolding. This means that it is imperative to have instructors’ support in assessing a student’s learning process, especially to promote his or her metacognitive thinking.

In this study, the students were scaffolded throughout their learning process, while learning a computer-based subject (Authoring System). Metacognitive scaffolding seemed to be the best method to assess the students’ learning process; according to Bannert, Hildebrand and Mengelkamp (2009), a successful learning
mainly depends on metacognitive activities that are performed and constantly monitored during learning.

A learning environment that requires scaffolding should be authentic and reflect task based on project. In this study, the researcher developed iPad apps that contain a tutorial on learning Adobe Flash. The students were required to refer to the apps in order to complete the tasks/activities prepared by the instructors. Besides that, this project-based tasks had encouraged the students to use resources other than textbooks in order to communicate their findings; work collaboratively; and think critically, creatively and independently (Kwok and Tan, 2004). In this study, the researcher followed some criteria of project-based learning as forwarded by Larmer (2012). The criteria are as follows:

i. The project meets real world situations beyond the classroom setting, or the products that the students created can be used by real people. For example, students develop a project of multimedia application by using software, and the app can be used by others. They produce a product that they develop and design by themselves.

ii. The project focuses on a problem, issue or topic that is relevant to the learning content. For example, instructors provide a project or task that requires students to complete particular tasks. The main aspect is that it must be related to the learning content in class.

iii. The project sets up a scenario or simulation that is realistic.

iv. The project involves tools, tasks or processes in real settings. For example, students explore the issue of how to design a web-based system that can apply users’ interactivity by using an appropriate program language.

The above criteria of project-based learning has been embedded throughout the study in which the mobile apps will act as an educational tool for the students. The apps consist of interactive information and a video tutorial of learning Adobe Flash. The students must refer to the apps in order to complete the tasks provided by the instructor at the end of every topic. From here, the students may utilize hands-on approaches to complete the tasks on their personal computers by referring to the
apps. The interactive information and video tutorial in the apps provide the students with in-depth understanding of the learning content. On the other hand, the mobile feature of iPad has made it possible for the learners to access it anywhere and at any time, even outside the classroom setting. The assessment tasks were similar to the instructions provided in the apps, thus the students were fully responsible and had full control of their own learning. As a result, the learning process was gained through the learning project provided, that is the tasks. Obviously, in this study, the teacher acted as the facilitator of the learning who guided the students with metacognitive scaffolding prompts from the interactions that occurred in Facebook.

With metacognitive scaffolding infused by the instructor, the students’ responses were assessed according to the types of online interactions as proposed by MacKinnon (2000). As mentioned, MacKinnon has set up a coding technique of messages to assess students’ interactivity in an online discussion. In this study, the students’ types of online interactions represent the student’s learning process. A pre-test and post-test were also conducted by the researcher to access the students’ performance throughout this study.

1.8 Rationale of the Study

The findings of this study are useful as it defined students’ metacognitive abilities in learning, measured through a General Metacognition Questionnaire (GMQ) as the one developed by Topcu (2005). The rationale for this was to obtain an understanding of the students’ level of metacognitive abilities, whether they possess such metacognitive skills, metacognitive judgments and metacognitive self-regulation in their learning processes. Metacognitive supports provided by the instructors explained by the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding through Facebook which has assisted the students in learning.

Furthermore, the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding in learning Authoring System subjects was prior to instructor’s metacognitive scaffold as the one
developed by Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008). This revealed the importance of instructors’ support in learning computer-based subjects. Besides that, all the metacognitive scaffolding provided by the instructor was believed could have triggered different types of online interactions among students through their discussions on the social networking tool, which is in the Facebook. Thus, this study provides a better understanding on how metacognitive scaffolding can assist learners in learning Authoring System subjects through Facebook. The existence of mobile apps, on the other hand, has acted as a learning tool that assisted the students to complete the project-based tasks provided by the instructors while at the same time, the mobile tablets have allowed them to assess and participate in the discussions on Facebook anywhere and at any time.

Students who have metacognitive abilities in learning are believed to be better problem-solvers and critical thinkers than those who do not possess such skills (Dawson, 2008, Magno, 2010). They are more motivated persons and are able to cope with difficulties (Dawson, 2008). Thus, this will encourage them to perform better in class (Coutinho 2007). Rahman et al. (2011) have studied ‘metacognitive reflection’ activity in the classroom and have contributed towards variations of students’ metacognitive skills. Their findings, however, have indicated that the instructors or teachers did not quite participate in the activity. It was suggested that instructors or teachers can also participate and scaffold students throughout the learning process. It is for this reason that the instructors and students in this study participated in the online discussions on the Facebook page so that they are guided by the metacognitive support throughout their learning.

Recently, the interest in metacognition has increased among researchers who study students’ reflections in an online learning environment (Reingold, Rimor and Kalay, 2005; Murphy, 2008; Molenaar et al., 2012). This study will serve as a conceptual model or framework that is hoped to assist researchers in analyzing transcripts of online discussions on Facebook, particularly for evidence of engagement in metacognition by instructors who assess learners’ participations and those who set up metacognitive experiences for learners.
Facebook is often conceived as a space for exchanging thoughts and opinions among learners. It may constitute a valuable tool for examining student’s metacognition reflections. The comments, responds and feedback generated by the students seem appropriate for deriving metacognitive indices based on easily obtainable learner’ written reflections. The outcome of this study will be of great help in identifying the types of online interactions among students in learning through social networking tools especially when metacognitive scaffolding is infused to them. Hence, it can be valuable information for researchers to transcribe the students’ learning process.

The rationale of using mobile apps in this study follows a trend of today’s technology (Bellman et al., 2011). This study implemented the use of mobile computing or tablets, such as iPad as an educational tool in an educational setting. The preliminary investigation revealed that the majority of the student’s agreed to use iPad as an educational tool and to assist them in learning (Jumaat et al., 2012).

1.9 Importance of the Study

This study imposes importance to certain entities including students, instructors or lecturers, and the Ministry of Education in Malaysia (MOE).

1.9.1 Students

The findings from this study will inform students on how to perform better in learning computer-based subjects such as Authoring System through interactions and participation in online discussion in Facebook. Students will prompt different types of online interactions that represent their learning process through the discussion sessions with instructors and peers in Facebook group page.
1.9.2 Instructors or Lecturers

The framework can serve as a guideline for the instructors or lecturers to assist students based on the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding. At this point, the instructors can identify the different types of online interactions among students that represents their learning process occur through Facebook’s discussion. It is good to monitor the students’ learning process so that they will not lose hope and lose their motivation to learn. Besides that, instructors or lecturers can evaluate the students’ understanding of learning an Authoring System subject throughout the discussion process.

1.9.3 Ministry of Education (MOE)

The Ministry of Education (MOE) is able to identify the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding that help students to perform better in class. A proper framework provides an initiative for MOE to implement metacognitive scaffolding in the learning of computer-based subjects through social networking tools such as the Facebook. On the other hand, Facebook will be recognized as a potential platform for students to discuss their class lessons and other classroom activities.

1.10 Scope of the Study

This study features some scopes in which the readers will receive a clear cut about the capacity involved in this study. They include:

i. Sample Size

The respondents were limited to the postgraduate students who have enrolled in the Educational Technology Program in one university faculty in the southern region of Peninsular Malaysia.
ii. **Subject Matter**

The study only focused on the learning of one of the computer-based subjects offered by the Faculty that is Authoring System, and it has particularly narrowed down to the learning of the Adobe Flash software.

iii. **Demographic Variables**

In this study, the researcher restricted the indicators in demographic variables by only reporting the respondents’ gender, age and educational background.

iv. **General Metacognition Questionnaire (GMQ)**

Although General Metacognition Questionnaire (GMQ) was designed and developed to assess students’ metacognitive abilities in learning, the indicators may seem insufficient to cover all areas that measure metacognition criteria among students. In particular, they only measure students’ metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive judgments and monitoring, and metacognitive self-regulation and planning.

v. **Performance Level**

The assessment of performance among students in learning the subject was conducted only through a pre-test and post-test, and the students’ learning process can only be accessed through their participation and interactivity in the Facebook discussions.
1.11 Operational Definitions

There are several key terms that have been repeatedly used in this study. Below are the key terms and their definitions:

i. Scaffolding

In education, scaffolding means providing students with sufficient support to promotes learning when concepts or skills are first being introduced to them. Scaffolding in the teaching context is everything that a teacher does to assist the pupils in achieving higher-level thinking than what the learners would if they were working alone. Through scaffolding, teachers or instructors should first create a process and provide support, which finally enable the learners to solve problems, carry out the given tasks, or achieve goals that are beyond their efforts.

Scaffolding is a term associated with Vygotsky’s (1978) in the notion of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). In essence, the ZPD is the difference between what a child can accomplish alone and what he or she can accomplish with the assistance from teachers or knowledgeable others. In this study, scaffolding refers to instructors’ support to assist students in learning a computer-based subject.

ii. Metacognition

Metacognition is often defined as “thinking about thinking”. The concept of metacognition is usually associated with John Flavell (1976). He described that “metacognition refers to one’s knowledge concerning one’s own cognitive processes or anything related to them, e.g., the learning-relevant properties of information or data. For example, I am engaging in metacognition if I notice that I am having more
trouble learning A than B; if it strikes me that I should double check C before accepting it as fact”.

The definition emphasizes a role of metacognition of a learner’s cognitive process that finally can be reflected on his/her knowledge and understanding. In this study, the students’ metacognition in learning was developed through the guidance they received from the instructors’ scaffolding.

iii. Metacognitive Scaffolding

According to Way and Rowe (2008), metacognitive scaffolding is a strategy that assists learners to reflect on what they have learned (self-assess), or to reflect on how they are learning (awareness of processes). It may be in the form of a simple prompt to think about the goal or problem, or it may be a more sophisticated guidance for organizing or assessing knowledge. In order to create metacognition, teachers or instructors need to expand their position by taking on a guiding, questioning role which involves informing students about learning, for example, “what they are doing?” and “how they are going to do it?”

Successful metacognitive scaffolding is produced when teachers or instructors are prompting, modeling questions, demonstrating strategies, discussing about learning, helping students to reflect on what they have accomplished, and organizing students’ self-evaluation. In this study, the instructors initiated the discussion with metacognitive support indices developed by Reingold, Rimor and Kalay (2008) in order to evaluate the mechanisms of metacognitive scaffolding in learning a computer-based subject.
iv. **Metacognitive Abilities**

Generally, metacognition is defined as thinking about thinking (Coutinho, 2007). Metacognition also refers to one’s ability to control their cognitive (thinking) processes. These include one’s ability in metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive judgments and self-regulation. Students with high metacognitive abilities are the ones who have control over their own knowledge in their learning processes and learning activities. For example, students who are able to identify their own way to succeed in learning, providing strategies and reflect upon their thinking process are the ones who have high metacognitive abilities. In this study, students’ metacognitive abilities were evaluated following the distribution of the General Metacognition Questionnaire (GMQ) that covers students’ metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive judgment and monitoring, and self-regulation and control.

v. **Social Networking Tool**

Walsh (2011) defined social networking tool as an application that has “social aspect” in it. It requires the users to be part of it in order to use these tools to communicate and interact with others. Facebook is one of social networking tools that attract researchers to study on its usage in teaching and learning.

Ozkan and McKenzie (2008) reported that the existence of social networking tools and their popularity have made them compelling applications especially in higher education. They added that the social networking tools may be used in educational setting by offering a network in which communications and interactions affect the way people know and learn things. In this study, the researcher used Facebook as a platform for the communications and interactions between the instructors and peers.
vi. **Authoring System Subject**

Authoring System is one of a computer-based subject that exposes students to the creation and development of multimedia applications. This subject teaches the students the functions and tools in the Adobe Flash software that enables the students to develop multimedia applications at the end of their study.

vii. **Project-Based Learning**

Project-based learning is an instructional approach by which students are required to accomplish authentic task in authentic learning activities (Kwok and Tan, 2004). It is a combination of understanding a concept and application of skills. Students work on their own, organize strategies, and investigate possible solutions and decide potential ways to complete the task (Kwok and Tan, 2004). From this experience, the students are able to generate their own thinking skills and make them realize several ways of solving a problem.

The project-based learning in this study was incorporated into the design and development of mobile apps that acted as the educational tool that reflected tasks based on the project. This study follows the criteria of the project-based learning approach as proposed by Larmer (2012). This is further explained in Chapter Two of this thesis.

viii. **Mobile Applications**

Mobile application or apps consist of iPad apps and Android-based apps. Mobile apps are software applications that are developed for iPad and other mobile tablets. They are generally known as apps. Apps vary in categories including games, e-books, education, news, music, entertainment, etc. These apps are available for
download by users through purchase or download for free via the App Store or Google Play. The software applications run on iOS and Android-based devices. iOS is Apple’s mobile operating system. Again, these four mobile apps of learning Adobe Flash were developed by the researcher; the apps acted as the educational tools that were used throughout this study. In this study, however, the apps were installed for free by the researcher instead of being purchased by the students purchasing via the Apps Store or Google Play.

ix. Online Interactions

Moore (1989) pioneered in defining interaction within the context of distance education. He classified interactions in distance education into three types: learner-content, learner-instructor and learner-learner. Wagner (1994) defined interactions as common shared events that occur between at least two entities and two actions. Hillman, Willis, and Gunawardena (1994) indicated that the interactions must exist via a medium in a technology-rich environment. They added the fourth type of interaction: learner-interface interaction. Sutton (2001) then added the fifth type of online interaction named as “vicarious interactions” in which students actively engage in interactions apart from observing the interactions between other students or those with their instructors.

In this study, the researcher looked upon the types of online interactions that occurred during the discussion sessions based on MacKinnon’s (2000) coding techniques on types of online interactions. Moreover, MacKinnon (2000) has focused only on students’ participation and interactivity in an online discussion session.
1.12 Summary

There is a growing body of research on students’ scaffolding in order to assist them in performing well in their studies. However, metacognitive scaffolding seems to be the appropriate way to assist students in learning computer-based subject like Authoring System since the technique offers a comprehensive strategy of guiding students to think technically during the learning process. Interactions among peers and instructors allow the researcher to look upon the types of interactions among students as such an interaction will represent the students’ learning processes. Studies on these two factors were explored to produce the appropriate metacognitive scaffolding framework and to support the research. Chapter Two will discuss the theories and the findings of previous studies that relate to this research.
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