

# Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology


*Volume 14, Issue 3*  
*July 2015*

Prof. Dr. Aytekin İşman  
Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Jerry WILLIS - ST John Fisher University in Rochester, USA  
Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson - AECT President  
Editors

Assist.Prof.Dr. Fahme DABAJ - Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC  
Associate Editor

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu - National Central University, Taiwan  
Assistant Editor





**THE  
TURKISH ONLINE  
JOURNAL  
OF  
EDUCATIONAL  
TECHNOLOGY**

**July 2015**  
**Volume 14 - Issue 3**

**Prof. Dr. Aytekin İşman**  
Editor-in-Chief

Editors  
**Prof. Dr. Jerry Willis**  
**Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson**

Associate Editor  
**Assist. Prof. Dr. Fahme Dabaj**

Assistant Editor  
**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu**

**ISSN: 1303 - 6521**

**Indexed by**  
Education Resources Information Center – **ERIC**  
**SCOPUS - ELSEVIER**

Copyright © THE TURKISH ONLINE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

All rights reserved. No part of TOJET's articles may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Published in TURKEY

Contact Address:  
Prof. Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN  
TOJET, Editor in Chief  
Sakarya-Turkey

## **Message from the Editor-in-Chief**

Dear Colleagues,

We are very pleased to publish volume 14 issue 3 in 2015. As an editor-in-chief of The Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET), this issue is the success of the reviewers, editorial board and the researchers. In this respect, I would like to thank to all reviewers, researchers and the editorial road.

This issue covers different research scopes, approaches which subjects about educational technology by valuable researchers. I and The Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET), editorial team will be pleased to share various researches with this issue as it is the miracle of our journal. All authors can submit their manuscripts to [tojet.editor@gmail.com](mailto:tojet.editor@gmail.com) for the next issues.

TOJET will organize IDEC-2015 International Distance Education Conference ([www.id-ec.net](http://www.id-ec.net)) and ITEC-2015 International Teacher Education Conference ([www.ite-c.net](http://www.ite-c.net)) between September 02-04, 2015 in Russia. They promote the development and dissemination of theoretical knowledge, conceptual research, and professional knowledge through conference activities. Its focus is to create and disseminate knowledge about distance education. IDEC-2014 and ITEC 2014 conference books have been published.

### **Call for Papers**

TOJET invites you for article contributions. Submitted articles should be about all aspects of educational technology. The articles should be original, unpublished, and not in consideration for publication elsewhere at the time of submission to TOJET. Manuscripts must be submitted in English.

TOJET is guided by it's editors, guest editors and advisory boards. If you are interested in contributing to TOJET as an author, guest editor or reviewer, please send your CV to [tojet.editor@gmail.com](mailto:tojet.editor@gmail.com).

**July 01, 2015**

**Editor in Chief**

**Prof. Dr. Aytekin ISMAN**

## Editorial Board

### Editors

Prof. Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN - Sakarya University, Turkey  
Prof. Dr. Jerry WILLIS - ST John Fisher University in Rochester, USA  
Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson – AECT, Past President

### Associate Editor

Assist.Prof.Dr. Fahme DABAJ - Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC

### Assistant Editor

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu - National Central University, Taiwan

### Editorial Board

Prof.Dr. Ahmet Zeki Saka - Karadeniz Technical University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Akif Ergin - Başkent University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Ali Al Mazari - Alfaisal University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia  
Prof.Dr. Ali Ekrem Özkul - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Antoinette J. Muntjewerff - University of Amsterdam  
Prof.Dr. Arif Altun - Hacettepe University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Arvind Singhal - University of Texas, USA  
Prof.Dr. Asaf Varol - Fırat University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Aytekin İşman - Sakarya University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Brent G. Wilson - University of Colorado at Denver, USA  
Prof.Dr. Buket Akkoyunlu - Hacettepe University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Cengiz Hakan Aydın - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Chang-Shing Lee - National University of Tainan, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Charlotte N. (Lani) Gunawardena - University of New Mexico, USA  
Prof.Dr. Chi - Jui Lien - National Taipei University of Education, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Chih - Kai Chang - National University of Taiwan, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Chin-Min Hsiung - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Colin Latchem - Open Learning Consultant, Australia  
Prof.Dr. Colleen Sexton - Governor State University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Demetrios G. Sampson - University of Piraeus, Greece  
Prof.Dr. Dimiter G. Velev - University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria  
Prof.Dr. Don M. Flournoy - Ohio University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Dongsik Kim - Hanyang University, South Korea  
Prof.Dr. Enver Tahir Rıza - Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Eralp Altun - Ege University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Feng-chiao Chung - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Ferhan Odabaşı - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Finland Cheng - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Fong Soon Fook - Uniiiversiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
Prof.Dr. Francine Shuchat Shaw - New York University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Gianni Viardo Vercelli - University of Genova, Italy  
Prof.Dr. Gwo - Dong Chen - National Central University Chung - Li, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Hafize Keser - Ankara University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Halil İbrahim Yalın - Gazi University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Heli Ruokamo - University of Lapland, Finland  
Prof.Dr. Henry H.H. Chen - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Ing. Giovanni Adorni - University of Genova, Italy  
Prof.Dr. J. Ana Donaldson - AECT President  
Prof.Dr. J. Michael Spector - University of North Texas, USA  
Prof.Dr. Jerry Willis - ST John Fisher University in Rochester, USA  
Prof.Dr. Jie-Chi Yang - National central university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Kinshuk - Athabasca University, Canada  
Prof.Dr. Kiyoshi Nakabayashi - Chiba Institute of Technology, Japan  
Prof.Dr. Kumiko Aoki - The Open University of Japan, Japan  
Prof.Dr. Kuo - En Chang - National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Kuo - Hung Tseng - Meiho Institute of Technology, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Kuo - Robert Lai - Yuan - Ze University, Taiwan

- Prof.Dr. Liu Meifeng - Beijing Normal University, China  
Prof.Dr. Marina Stock Mcisaac - Arizona State University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Ali Dikermen - Middlesex University, UK  
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Çağlar - Near East University, TRNC  
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Gürol - Fırat University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Kesim - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Mei-Mei Chang - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Melissa Hui-Mei Fan - National central university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Min Jou - National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Ming - Puu Chen - National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Murat Barkan - Yaşar University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Mustafa Murat Inceoğlu - Ege University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Mustafa Şahin Dündar - Sakarya University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Nabi Bux Jumani - International Islamic University, Pakistan  
Prof.Dr. Nian - Shing Chen - National Sun Yat - Sen University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Paul Gibbs - Middlesex University, UK  
Prof.Dr. Petek Aşkar - Hacettepe University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Ramdane Younsi - Ecole polytechnique de Montreal, Canada  
Prof.Dr. Rauf Yıldız - Çanakkale 19 Mart University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Roger Hartley - University of Leeds, UK  
Prof.Dr. Rozhan Hj. Mohammed Idrus - Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
Prof.Dr. Saedah Siraj - University of Malaya, Malaysia  
Prof.Dr. Sello Mokoena - University of South Africa, South Africa  
Prof.Dr. Servet Bayram - Yeditepe University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Shan - Ju Lin - National Taiwan University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Sheng Quan Yu - Beijing Normal University, China  
Prof.Dr. Shi-Jer Lou - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Shu - Sheng Liaw - China Medical University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Shu-Hsuan Chang - National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Stefan Aufenanger - University of Mainz, Germany  
Prof.Dr. Stephen Harmon - Georgia State University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Stephen J.H. Yang - National Central University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Sun Fuwan - China Open University, China  
Prof.Dr. Sunny S.J. Lin - National Chiao Tung University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Teresa Franklin - Ohio University, USA  
Prof.Dr. Toshio Okamoto - University of Electro - Communications, Japan  
Prof.Dr. Toshiyuki Yamamoto - Japan  
Prof.Dr. Tzu - Chien Liu - National Central University, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Ülkü Köymen - Lefke European University, TRNC  
Prof.Dr. Vaseudev D.Kulkarni - Hutatma Rajjguru College, Rajguruunagar(Pune),(M.S.) INDIA  
Prof.Dr. Xibin Han - Tsinghua University, China  
Prof.Dr. Yau Hon Keung - City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong  
Prof.Dr. Yavuz Akpınar - Boğaziçi University, Turkey  
Prof.Dr. Yen-Hsyang Chu - National central university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Yuan - Chen Liu - National Taipei University of Education, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Yuan-Kuang Guu - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Prof.Dr. Young-Kyung Min - University of Washington, USA
- Assoc.Prof.Dr. Abdullah Kuzu - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Adile Aşkı Kurt - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ahmet Eskicumalı – Sakarya University  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Aijaz Ahmed Gujjar - Sindh Madressatul Islam University, Pakistan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Aytaç Göğüş - Sabancı University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Chen - Chung Liu - National Central University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Cheng - Huang Yen - National Open University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ching - fan Chen - Tamkang University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ching Hui Alice Chen - Ming Chuan University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Chiung - sui Chang - Tamkang University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Danguole Rutkauskienė - Kauno Technology University, Lietvenia  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. David Tawei Ku - Tamkang University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Meng - National pingtung university, Taiwan

- Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Zhi Feng Liu - National central university, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Erkan Tekinarslan - Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ezendu Ariwa - London Metropolitan University, U.K.  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Fahad N. AlFahad - King Saud University  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Fahriye Altınay - Near East University, TRNC  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Gurnam Kaur Sidhu - Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hao - Chiang Lin - National University of Tainan, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hasan Çalışkan - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hasan KARAL - Karadeniz Technical University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hsin - Chih Lin - National University of Tainan, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Huey - Ching Jih - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Huichen Zhao - School of Education, Henan University, China  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Yaratın - Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. I - Wen Huang - National University of Tainan, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. I Tsun Chiang - National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ian Sanders - University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. İsmail İpek - Fatih University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Işıl Kabakçı - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Jie - Chi Yang - National Central University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. John I-Tsun Chiang - National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ju - Ling Shih - National University of Taiwan, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Koong Lin - National University of Tainan, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Kuo - Chang Ting - Ming - HSIN University of Science and Technology, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Kuo - Liang Ou - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Larysa M. Mytsyk - Gogol State University, Ukraine  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Li - An Ho - Tamkang University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Li Yawan - China Open University, China  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Manoj Kumar Saxena - Central University of Himachal Pradesh, Dharamshala, Kangra, India  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Mike Joy - University of Warwick, UK  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ming-Charng Jeng - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Murat Ataizi - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Nergüz Serin - Cyprus International University, TRNC  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Norazah Mohd Suki - Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Normaliza Abd Rahim - Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Oğuz Serin - Cyprus International University, TRNC  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ping - Kuen Chen - National Defense University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Popat S. Tambade - Prof. Ramkrishna More College, India  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Prakash Khanale - Dnyanopasak College, INDIA  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Pramela Krish - Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Tzu - Hua Wang - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Vincent Ru-Chu Shih - National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Wu - Yui Hwang - National Central University, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ya-Ling Wu - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Assoc.Prof. Dr. Yahya O Mohamed Elhadj - AL Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud University, Saudi Arabia  
Assoc.Prof. Dr. Yavuz Akbulut - Anadolu University  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Zehra Altınay - Near East University, TRNC  
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Zhi - Feng Liu - National Central University, Taiwan
- Assist.Prof.Dr. Aaron L. Davenport - Grand View College, USA  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Andreja Istenic Starcic - University of Primorska, Slovenija  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Anita G. Welch - North Dakota State University, USA  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Betül Özkan - University of Arizona, USA  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Burçin Kısa Işık - Gaziantep University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chiu - Pin Lin - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chun - Ping Wu - Tamkang University, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chun - Yi Shen - Tamkang University, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chung-Yuan Hsu - National pingtung university, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Dale Havill - Dhofar University, Sultanate of Oman  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Ferman Konukman - College of Arts and Science, Sport Science Program, Qatar University  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Filiz Varol - Firat University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Guan - Ze Liao - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan



Assist.Prof.Dr. Hsiang chin - hsiao - Shih - Chien University, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Huei - Tse Hou - National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Ünlü - Aksaray University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Jagannath. K Dange - Kuvempu University, India  
Assist.Prof.Dr. K. B. Praveena - University of Mysore, India  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Kanvaria Vinod Kumar - University of Delhi, India  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Marko Radovan - University of Ljubljana, Slovenia  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Min-Hsien Lee - National central university, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Mohammad Akram Mohammad Al-Zu'bi - Jordan Al Balqa Applied University, Jordan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Muhammet Demirbilek - Süleyman Demirel University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Pamela Ewell - Central College of IOWA, USA  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Pei-Hsuan Hsieh - National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Pey-Yan Liou - National central university, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Phaik Kin, Cheah - Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kampar, Perak  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Ping - Yeh Tsai - Tamkang University, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. S. Arulchelvan - Anna University, India  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Seçil Kaya - Anadolu University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Selma Koç Vonderwell - Cleveland State University, Cleveland  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Sunil Kumar - National Institute of Technology, India  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Tsung - Yen Chuang - National University of Taiwan, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Vahid Motamedi - Tarbiat Moallem University, Iran  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Yalın Kılıç Türel - Fırat University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Yu - Ju Lan - National Taipei University of Education, Taiwan  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Zehra Alakoç Burma - Mersin University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Zerrin Ayvaz Reis - İstanbul University, Turkey  
Assist.Prof.Dr. Zülfü Genç - Fırat University, Turkey

Dr. Arnaud P. Prevot - Forest Ridge School of the Sacred Heart, USA  
Dr. Balakrishnan Muniandy - Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Brendan Tangney - Trinity College, Ireland  
Dr. Chen Haishan - China Open University, China  
Dr. Chin Hai Leng - University of Malaya, Malaysia  
Dr. Chin Yeh Wang - National Central University, Taiwan  
Dr. Chun Hsiang Chen - National Central University, Taiwan  
Dr. Chun Hung Lin - National central university, Taiwan  
Dr. Farrah Dina Yusop - University of Malaya, Malaysia  
Dr. Hj. Issham Ismail - Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Hj. Mohd Arif Hj. Ismail - National University of Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. I-Hen Tsai - National University of Tainan, Taiwan  
Dr. Jarkko Suhonen - University of Eastern Finland, Finland  
Dr. Li Ying - China Open University, China  
Dr. Norlidah Alias - University of Malaya, Malaysia  
Dr. Rosnaini Mahmud - Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia  
Dr. Sachin Sharma - Faridabad Institute of Technology, Faridabad  
Dr. Seetharam Chittoor Jhansi - Pushpa Navnit Shah Centre for Lifelong Learning, India  
Dr. Tam Shu Sim - University of Malaya, Malaysia  
Dr. Tiong Goh - Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand  
Dr. Vikrant Mishra - Shivalik College of Education, India  
Dr. Zahra Naimie - University of Malaya, Malaysia



## Table of Contents

Academic Progress Depending on the Skills and Qualities of Learning in Students of a Business School <i>Araiza Vázquez María de JESÚS, Dörfer CLAUDIA, Castillo Corpus ROSALINDA</i>	1
Assessing ELT Pre-Service Teachers via Web 2.0 Tools: Perceptions toward Traditional, Online and Alternative Assessment <i>Nazlı Ceren CIRIT</i>	9
Design on the MUVE: Synergizing Online Design Education with Multi-User Virtual Environments (MUVE) <i>Isinsu SAKALLI, WonJoon CHUNG</i>	20
Designing Effective Curricula with an Interactive Collaborative Curriculum Design Tool (CCDT) <i>Seda KHADIMALLY</i>	32
Developing a Teaching Model using an Online Collaboration Approach for a Digital Technique Practical Work <i>Muchlas</i>	63
Examination on ICT Integration into Special Education Schools for Developing Countries <i>Fahriye ALTINAY AKSAL, Zehra ALTINAY GAZI</i>	70
Identification of Difficulties in the Consolidation of Research Processes at a Higher Education Institution: A Case Study <i>Alejandro Valencia ARIAS</i>	73
Individual Factors that Encourage the Use of Virtual Platforms of Administrative Sciences Students: A Case Study <i>Alejandro VALENCIA Arias, Salim CHALELA Naffah, Jonathan, BERMUDEZ Hernández, Luz Mirelia BEDOYA PÉREZ</i>	81
Preferences and Willingness for Participating MOOCS in Turkish <i>İrem ERDEM-AYDIN</i>	88
Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of ICT Integration in Teacher Education in Turkey <i>Aydın ASLAN, Chang ZHU</i>	97
Research and Trends in the Studies of Homeschooling Practices: A Review on Selected Journals <i>Khairul Azhar JAMALUDIN, Norlidah ALIAS, Dorothy DEWITT</i>	111
Seamless Support: Technology Enhanced Learning in Open Distance Learning at NWU <i>Hennie ESTERHUIZEN</i>	120
Student's Perception about Online Interaction, access and Publishing Content for Academic Use <i>Carlos Arturo Torres-GASTELÚ, Agustín Lagunes DOMINGUEZ, María Alicia Flores GARCÍA, Gábor KISS, Ángel Roberto Alejandro ESPINOZA</i>	138
The Effect of Emotional Labor on Job Involvement in Preschool Teachers: Verifying the Mediating Effect of Psychological Capital <i>Ching-Sheue FU</i>	145
The Effect of Play Supported Program on the School Readiness of 60-72 Month-Old Disadvantaged Children <i>Özgül POLAT, Ayşegül SÖNMEZ</i>	157

## Developing a Teaching Model Using an Online Collaboration Approach for a Digital Technique Practical Work

**Muchlas**

*Ahmad Dahlan University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
muchlas.te@uad.ac.id*

### ABSTRACT

This research is aimed to produce a teaching model and its supporting instruments using a collaboration approach for a digital technique practical work attended by higher education students. The model is found to be flexible and relatively low cost. Through this research, feasibility and learning impact of the model will be determined. The model has been tested by some experts of learning multimedia, digital engineering, e-learning and instructional design, and analyzed using a Delphi technique. The model was also tested by 10 instructors and 25 students of the Electrical Engineering Department. The perception of the subjects was then analyzed using a percentage method. The determination of learning impact was done using a different average score. From the results obtained, the developed model: (1) could be implemented with more flexible and low cost to support the practical work in higher education; (2) has a positive impact on the learning, i.e. it can improve significant students' learning achievement; and (3) shows good perception from the subjects.

**Keywords:** developing, teaching model, online collaboration

### INTRODUCTION

In academic activities, practical work (practicum) that is usually run using hands-on labs has a weakness such of costly, inflexible and lack of student motivation. Further work, Ma & Nickerson (2006) reported that the characteristics of a hands-on labs introduces some disadvantages such of: (1) materials procurement and operation are expensive; (2) require more time for instructors; (3) makes students feel less comfortable during their work; (4) can not provide a special needs for students; and (5) can not serve the needs of the distance learning.

Elawady & Tolba (2009) reported that use of virtual laboratory in the practical work can offer an alternative technique of a practical work with more flexible, appropriate for purpose conceptual understanding, low cost, and has a better pedagogic aspects compare than other laboratory types. Macias & Mendez (2007) illustrate that the costs needed in that technique is much cheaper than the cost of a traditional laboratory. In addition, the use of virtual labs also provides benefits of increasing number of lab sessions and number of teams/groups of students per week.

Practical work run using a virtual lab can increase the financing efficiency because the system is based on a simulator that uses the available computer program. Previous studies showed that using simulators: (1) can increase students' understanding of learning material in practical work activity (Colace, et al., 2004), (2) can be as effective as using a real laboratory (Kantzavelou, 2005; Tzafestas, et al., 2006; Corter, et. al, 2007; Lang, et al., 2007; Wolf, 2010; Goodwin, et al., 2011), (3) can be more efficient than using a real laboratory (Candelas, et. al, 2006; Saleh, et al., 2009), and (4) provides convenient and high flexibility in practical work (Mateev, et al. 2007; Bailey & Freeman, 2010). By referring to the above advantages, we can say that the use of simulators to substitute a hands-on lab can enhance a students' learning achievement.

Shokri & Faraahi (2010) refer to the work of Malki & Matarrita (2002), and also Palagin, et al. (2007) reported that by using the simulator they have obtained some advantages of (1) relatively low cost of product, (2) more secure during the experiment from any hazardous substances, (3) practical work activities are more flexible because students can change the work environment, procedures or types of experiment quickly with low cost, (4) broad accessibility, because it can be accessed from anywhere and anytime, and (5) enable to create collaborative work.

Alessi & Trollip (2001) reported that by comparing with the real activities, simulation model provides some advantages such as: (1) increasing safety when interacting with objects or physical phenomena being studied; (2) providing an experience that is difficult to be experienced in the real world; (3) easy in setting the time of activity; (4) making the rare events become regular events; (5) enabling a complex learning situation can be controlled; and (6) allowing to save cost. Meanwhile, by comparing between media and other methods such as books, regular lectures, or tutorial, the use of simulation provides some advantages such of: (1) build the

motivation; (2) improve the transfer of knowledge; (3) perform more efficient; (4) perform more flexible; (5) apply to all phases of a learning process; and (6) show more adaptive for different educational philosophy.

Practical work using the virtual lab can be more flexible if this technique could be implemented using an online learning. Therefore, one solution to overcome that weakness is using an online system to run the practical work activities. The online teaching models has been developed by Candelas, et. al. (2006), Mateev, et al. (2007), Saleh, et al. (2009), Radu (2010), Shokri & Faraahi (2010), Hassan, et al. (2010), and Goodwin, et. al. (2011). Their works were done using online learning system, but has not facilitated using a collaboration method that is considered able to improve the results. The online collaboration is an approach that will determine the success of practical work because this approach can motivate the individuals in group work, and as a medium of learning among individuals (Kask, 2009).

In this research, the model and its supporting instruments will be produced, and derived from Anderson (2008), for an online teaching for practical work. The developed model will provide an online collaborative environment to support practical work in digital technique. This study is also aimed to determine the feasibility and learning impact of the model. The results of this research can be used as an alternative learning model in higher education that introduces more flexible and low cost of practical work.

## RESEARCH METHOD

Experiment was done using a method consists of some sections below.

### (i) Research Type and Procedure

This research was conducted through several steps of preliminary study, planning, preliminary model development, preliminary test, main model revision, field test, final model revision and model dissemination, from Borg & Gall (1983). Furthermore, the model was validated and revised by some experts. The model was tested by subjects in online practicum activities for 8 sessions. Based on the results of testing, the model is then conducted into the final revision. The final stage of the model development is dissemination to potential users.

### (ii) Research Subjects

The subjects were divided into two categories i.e. the subjects for preliminary testing and field testing. In preliminary testing, the model was tested by four experts of learning multimedia, digital engineering, e-learning and instructional design, respectively which were selected purposively. Meanwhile, the subjects of the field testing were 10 instructors and 25 students of the Department of Electrical Engineering, which were participants of the digital technique lecture/lesson.

### (iii) Data, Instruments, and Data Collection Techniques

In this research, type of data is classified into three categories i.e. data for the purposes of analyses of: (1) the experts judgement; (2) the learning impact; and (3) perception of the subjects to the developed model in the instructional and presentation aspects. The instruments to measure data related to the expert judgement is a questionnaire form. In this study, aspects of the experts validation includes: (1) identification of the problems; (2) determination of priority in type and model manufacture; (3) determination of the program goals; (4) structure and components of the model; and (5) instruments of the model. To obtain data for validation of the lessons plan (one of the supporting instruments of the model), it was used a questionnaire containing aspects of: (1) identity of the subjects matter; (2) basic competencies and indicators of the learning outcomes; (3) subject matter; (4) students activities in the learning process; (5) lecturer activities in the teaching; (6) assessment of learning; and (7) references. Data to validate the Digital Technique textbook were obtained through questionnaire including aspects of: (1) cover; (2) basic competencies and objectives; (3) subject matter; (4) graphics; (5) presentation; (6) language; (7) evaluation; and (8) references. Data related to the validation of the manual for an online practicum for lecturers/instructors/students as well as the manual for breadboard simulator were obtained through the questionnaires containing aspects of: (1) cover; (2) subject matters; (3) graphics; (4) presentation; and (5) language. Meanwhile, data to validate the manual for digital technique practicum were obtained through questionnaire with aspects of: (1) cover; (2) subject matters; (3) presentation; (4) language; and (5) evaluation.

Test of the learning effect was done by using the data obtained through the *pre-test* and *post-test* instruments. *Pre-test* instrument was given before a practical work and the *post-test* done. Both tests were done at each practical work session. The instrument of perception test in an instructional aspect is questionnaire containing some components of: (1) clarity of basic competences and goals; (2) clarity of the learning instructions; (3) ease of understanding the subject matter of practicum; (4) the breadth and depth of the subject matter; (5) the accuracy of the sequence of presentation; (6) interactivity; (7) flexibility; and (8) the accuracy of evaluation. Data related to the perception test in the model presentation aspect were obtained through questionnaire

containing some components of: (1) clarity of the instructions for use; (2) legibility; (3) quality of image and animation; (4) composition of color; (5) quality of communication facilities; and (6) ease of operation.

(iv) Data Analysis Techniques

To find out the validity of the developed model, a Delphi technique was used based on the consensus accepted by the experts. The consensus included the aspects of: (1) identification of the problem through a needs analysis; (2) determination of priority (type and model manufacture); (3) determination of program objectives; and (4) determination of the problem solution. Percentage of each aspect of the validation was predetermined before analysis. To determine the feasibility of the model, some criteria were used as shown in Table 1. To determine the effect of model developed, different test of average score between *pre-test* and *post-test* was used. Subject perception was determined through descriptive analysis using percentage of criteria as tabulated in Table 1.


**Table 1.** Criteria of the feasibility model and perception

Range	Level
80% - 100%	Very Good
66% - 79%	Good
56% - 65%	Poor
0% - 55%	Very Poor

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

From the research, model validity justified by the expert are shown in Figure 1. Based on that figure, the consensus given by the experts on the aspect of problem identification is 86.5% or categorized as ‘very good’ level. This means that the model developed based on a needs analysis is accurate respect to: (1) demands on needs of education; (2) demands on the development of science, technology and dynamics of the work places; (3) needs of potential users of the model; (4) demands on the effectiveness and efficiency improvement in an educational process; (5) a comprehensive needs analysis; and (6) type of model which can applied to the real world. Based on the analysis and validity criteria, it can be argued that from the problem identification aspects, the developed model considered by the experts is very feasible for further implementation.

From the aspects of determination to model type, the experts consensus toward validity of the model gives a percentage of 89.6%. The experts have agreed that: (1) determination of the developed model type is a priority for problems solution; (2) the developed model type can contribute to satisfy the needs of education; (3) the development of the model is an appropriate solution to solve the problem; (4) the developed model can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of education; (5) the model development is feasible by the researcher; and (6) the developed model type can be applied into the real world.



**Figure 1.** Histogram of experts' consensus for the model.

The results show that three experts mark a level of consensus over 80% except the digital engineering expert that gives a feasibility level for 75% or worthy category. This is due to the consideration of digital engineering expert that determination of developed model should be based on the character of the subjects matter that will be practiced. Not all courses can be conducted in practical work through virtual online models, but the proposed model could cover wider scope of courses. However, from the aspect of determination of model type, with the consensus level of 89.6%, the model is very feasible for implementation.

For determination of the program goals aspects as shown in Figure 1, the experts agree that the goals of the model development correlates to the problem solution that is a priority problem to be solved and the formulation has directed to the increase of educational effectiveness and efficiency. Consensus of average percentage of

93.8% has shown that the developed model, based on goal-setting aspects of the program is very feasible for implementation.

Furthermore, from the aspect of the structure and components of the model as shown in Figure 1, it is seen the experts have agreed that the developed model has adequate structures and components. In this case, the developed model: (1) has been described in forms of the structure that contains the components, (2) has its structure that is different from the existing models, (3) has relationships among its components that has been described clearly; (4) contains a clear and appropriate setting, (5) contains a syntax that can support achievement of competency standards, in line with the methods and learning approaches used, and can be implemented easily.

For the aspect of model determination and the structure and components, the consensus of digital engineering expert has a lowest percentage i.e. 75% (good level), meanwhile three other experts have categorized as 'very good' level of consensus. They consider that the structure and components of the model are not a new model at all, but rather the development of one component i.e. innovation in part of interaction among the students from offline into online collaboration approach, particularly in the use of simulator. The expert suggests to describe the difference between the developed model and the existing models. However, as a whole, from the aspect of the structure and its component, with an average consensus percentage of 90.6%, this developed model is very feasible for implementation.

The final aspect of the validity used by some experts to determine the feasibility of the model in this study is the instruments of model. In this case, the instruments of model cover all learning instruments supporting the implementation of the model. With an average percentage of 83.3%, from the graph (Figure 1), it can be argued that the experts agree to declare that the developed model has been equipped with adequate learning instruments which is easy to understand, implement, and can help the implementation of the model.

From Figure 1, it is shown that two experts of learning multimedia and digital engineering expert give a 'good' level of consensus and two other experts give a 'very good' level of consensus. This is because the learning multimedia expert considers that when this model was being consulted, the virtual lab as one instrument of the model that able to support the practical work. This still needs a revamping process in presentation and content aspects. Meanwhile the digital engineering expert considers that the textbook and manual of simulator as the instrument of the model should be revised in some parts to satisfy the characteristics of digital engineering field. However, in general the experts have agreed that the instrument aspect point of view, the developed model is very feasible to be implemented.

Figure 1 shows that the average consensus for all aspects respect to the model developed is 88.8 %. This result shows that the experts agree that this model of research is 'good' to be implemented. The interesting phenomenon we could see from the result is that e-learning expert and learning multimedia expert give about 100% for three of five aspects obtained.

The results of the learning impact analysis for the application of the model are shown in Table 2. Analysis of the learning impact has been done to determine the effectiveness of the model that has been validated by the experts in a learning process in the digital engineering practical work. Research subjects were given as a pre-test before attending the practical work activity with the developed model, and doing the post-test after the end of session. Pre-test and post-test were conducted in online with a monitoring through video conference facilities by the instructor.

In this test of learning impact, measurement of effectiveness is done by determining the significant difference between the average of value test of group before practical work (pre-test) and after practical work (post-test) at each session using a t-test. The criteria used are the value of the post-test and pre-test defined significantly different if the resulting t-test has error probability (p) less than 5%.

**Table 2.** Summary of analysis of learning impact

Session	Variable	Average	Standard Deviation	Average Diff.	t	p	Significance
I	Post-test 1	71.25	23.831	17.50	3.911	0.001	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 1	53.75	25.844				
II	Post-test 2	60.83	13.805	11.25	3.576	0.002	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 2	49.58	12.676				
III	Post-test 3	77.50	14.521	10.00	2.533	0.019	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 3	67.50	19.393				



IV	Post-test 4	72.08	12.504	4.16	2.095	0.047	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 4	67.92	13.181				
V	Post-test 5	55.83	16.659	9.16	2.247	0.035	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 5	46.67	18.805				
VI	Post-test 6	47.50	13.270	9.17	3.817	0.001	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 6	38.33	10.072				
VII	Post-test 7	70.41	25.449	19.58	3.230	0.004	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 7	50.83	15.581				
VIII	Post-test 8	62.50	16.746	11.25	2.261	0.034	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test 8	51.25	17.770				
Average	Post-test	64.74	9.376	11.46	8.857	0.000	Significantly (p<0.005)
	Pre-test	53.28	8.158				

By referring to Table 2, it is shown that each practical work session, the calculation of the t-test value gives the p-value less than 5%. This result indicates a significant difference between the post-test and pre-test values for all sessions. The table also shows a positive sign in all the mean difference between the value of the post-test and pre-test, which means that there is an increase average value significantly at each practical work session. Results of data analysis to the overall mean value also show very significant increase by 11.46 points due to the effect of the application of the developed model in practical work activities.

From the analysis, it can be argued that the use of online learning model applied to each session of digital engineering practical work activity was proven it can give a positive impact such of the ability to increase student achievement. To elaborate the impact of the developed model application, Figure 2 shows the learning impact occurred during the implementation of the practical work sessions.





Figure 2. Graph of learning impact of the model.

From that figure, it can be seen that achievement of the student’s learning is fluctuated yielded by the model introduced. This fluctuation follows the initial capability of students that could be due to the lesson’s difficulty experienced by the students. The lesson was practiced differently for different sessions.

Graph shows good achievement of the students occur at session- 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7, respectively. For a moderate/sufficient category, it occurs at session- 2, 5 and 8, respectively. Session-6 is the practical work session with the worst achievement for the students. In this session, the students learnt a flip-flop lesson that is considerably most difficult lesson among the other lessons. This difficulty is common as the topic is new and as an introduction to the sequential logic lesson. Meanwhile, the other 5 sessions, the topics are logical combination that is relatively easy for the students. The worst achievement in this session is not due to the model introduced but due to the higher lesson difficulty compare than that of the other lessons. Based on the above results, the model implemented through online learning for a digital technique lesson developed in this research leads to positive impact to increasing student’s achievement.

The analysis toward the subject perception is shown in Figure 3. As shown in that figure (left side) for the total score, the average percentage of instructor perception (81.8 %) is higher than for the students (73.1 %). The percentage of the instructor is categorized ‘very good’. For the student, that percentage is categorized ‘good’. This situation occurs because the instructor has attended the training in online practical work, more intensive compare than the students. Beside, based on the observation, the lecturer always emphasizes the instructor for his/her high responsibility of successful for the online implementation. With this, they are encouraged to have

more knowledge and skill compare than the students. This self-awareness improves higher perception of the instructional and model aspects for the instructors.



**Figure 3.** Histogram of subject perception in instructional aspects (left side) and presentation aspects (right side).

By referring to the results obtained, generally the subject has provided a positive perception of 75.8 % respects to the instructional aspect from the model developed through this research. However, in this research it was found that the students are still experiencing difficulties as shown by the perception level of 56 %. The difficulty arises due to the constraints related to the internet facility such of limited bandwidth leads low speed of data access needed for this online practical work.

The analysis result of the subject perception toward the model display is shown in Figure 3 (right side). From that figure, it is found that model developed has shown better performance and ease for operation with an average perception level of 78.8 %.

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The research done has produced an online teaching model for practical work and its supporting instruments of digital technique lesson that could introduce more flexible, and low cost in higher education institutions. The online system was supported by using an online collaboration approach. Model produced from this research is a portal of Virtual Laboratory at <http://elab.uad.ac.id>. Beside other products of a *Manual for an Online Learning Model for Practical Work*, *Lessons Plan for Digital Technique*, *Digital Technique Textbook*, *A Manual for Breadboard Simulator*, *A Manual for Online Practicum for Lecturers/Instructors/ Students*, and *A Manual for Digital Technique Practicum* with the guided inquiry method.

The model produced from this research shows a positive impact toward the student learning by increasing the significant achievement. The model also obtained positive perception from the related subject of instructional and model display aspects. Management of practical work under study program in electronic/electrical engineering is suggested to use this model as an alternative online learning as the model offers more flexible and low cost in operation.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Prof. Herman D. Surjono, Ph.D., the Chairman of the Department of Educational Technology, Postgraduate Program at Yogyakarta State University, for valued discussion in this work, and also both students and teaching assistants of the Department of Electrical Engineering at Ahmad Dahlan University, who volunteered to participate in this research.



## REFERENCES

- Alessi, S. M. & Trollip, S. R. (2001). *Multimedia for learning: Methods and development*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Anderson, T. (2008). *The theory and practice of online learning*. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press.
- Bailey, C. & Freeman, M. J. (2010). A java bread-board simulator: Digital circuit simulation with an open-source toolset. *IADIS International Journal on Computer Science and Information System*, 55(1), 13-25.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Candelas, F. A., Torres, F., Gil, P., Puente, S., & Pomares, J. (2006). Including the virtual laboratory concept in an on-line collaborative environment. *Published in advances in control education* (pp. 571-576). Laxenburg: International Federation of Automatic Control.
- Colace, F., De Santo, M. , & Pietrosanto, A. (2004). Work in progress-virtual lab for electronic engineering curricula. *Published in frontiers in education 2004* (pp. T3C/22-T3C/24). Piscataway, NJ: The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.
- Corter, J. E., Nickerson, J. V., Esche, S. K., Chassapis, C., Im, S. & Ma, J. (2007). Constructing reality: A study of remote, hands-on, and simulated laboratories. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 14(2), 7-27.
- Elawady, Y. H. & Tolba, A. S. (2009). Educational objectives of different laboratory types: A comparative study. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Security (IJSIS)*, 6(2), 89-96.
- Goodwin, G. C., Mediolli, A. M., Sher, W., Vlacic, L. B., & Welsh, J. S. (2011). Emulation-based virtual laboratories: a low-cost alternative to physical experiments in control engineering education. *IEEE Transaction on Education*, 54(1), 48-55.
- Hassan, R., Omari, N., Arshad, H., Sahran, S., & Yusof, N. H. (2010). DigiLab: A virtual lab for IT students. *WSEAS Transactions on Advances in Engineering Education*, 7(5), 151-160.
- Kantzavelou, I. (2005). A virtual lab model for an introductory computer science course. *Facta Universitatis (Nis), Ser.: Elec. Energ.*, 18(2), 263-274.
- Kask, K. (2009). *A study of science teacher development towards open inquiry teaching through an intervention programme*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tartu University, Estonia.
- Lang, D., Mengelkamp, C., Jäger, R. S., Geoffroy, D., Billaud, M., & Zimmer, T. (2007). Pedagogical evaluation of remote laboratories in emerge project. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 32(1), 57-72.
- Ma, J. & Nickerson, J. V. (2006). Hands-on, simulated, and remote laboratories: A comparative literature review. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 38(3), 1-24.
- Macias, M. E., & Mendez, I. (2007). Elab-remote electronics lab in real time. *Published in 2007 37th Annual frontiers in education conference-global engineering: knowledge without borders, opportunities without passport* (pp. 1512-1517). Piscataway, NJ: The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.
- Mateev, V., Todorova, S. & Smrikarov, A. (2007). Test system in digital logic design virtual laboratory tasks delivery. In B. Rachev, A. Smrikarov & D.Dimov (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2007 international conference on computer systems and technologies* (pp. IV.11-1-IV.11-6). New York, NY: ACM Inc.
- Radu, T. (2010). Virtual and remote control lab experiment using matlab. *Annals of the Oradea University. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering*, 9(19), 78-81.
- Saleh, K. F., Mohamed, A. M., & Madkour, H. (2009). Developing virtual laboratories environments for engineering education. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 3(1), 9-17.
- Shokri, A. & Faraahi, A. (2010). Designing of virtual laboratories based on extended event driving simulation method. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 68, 1357-1359.
- Tzafestas, C. S., Palaiologou, N. & Alifragis, M. (2006). Virtual and remote robotic laboratory: Comparative experimental evaluation. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 49(3), 360-369.
- Wolf, T. (2010). Assessing student learning in a virtual laboratory environment. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 53(2), 216-222.