

Pedagogical-Based Learning Object System to Support Self-  
Regulated Learning of Computer Science

A thesis submitted to the  
School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science  
The University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia

for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Computer Science)

By

**Ali Alharbi**

BSc. in Computer and Information Sciences (Information Systems),  
MSc. in Information and Communication Technology (MICT)

August, 2013

# Statement of Originality

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

---

(Ali Alharbi)

# Acknowledgement

I consider myself very lucky to have the chance to live and study in Newcastle, Australia for the last few years. The work completed in this thesis would not come into light without the support and encouragement I have received from many people.

First and foremost, my sincere thanks go to my supervisors, A/Prof. Frans Henskens and Dr. Michael Hannaford, for their continuous support and guidance throughout my research journey. They were more than supervisors for me; I really appreciated their confidence in me. I have faced many obstacles to achieve the final goal of my research, and without their support and encouragement, it would have been difficult for me to overcome these obstacles.

My warm thanks go to my amazing wife, Asma, for her patience, support, and love throughout this long and difficult journey. She has always been there to encourage me in the most challenging situations. Her support and sacrifice all the time make me believe that it is difficult to adequately recognise her with words. To my children, Ola and Emad, who keep creating joy and happiness in my life, I love you. To my new born son, Elias, you are my gift at the end of my research journey. To my mother, you may not know anything about the process of my research, but I am sure you understand that I was working very hard to achieve my goal. Thanks a lot for your prayers. To my brothers and sisters, thank you for being proud of me all the time. Your support and encouragement really empowered my motivation to achieve my goal.

I am also indebted to the students who volunteered to participate in this study. Many thanks for completing the study questionnaires and using the learning object system. Many thanks also go to my research group members, especially Dr. David Paul and Mark Wallis. Thanks a lot guys for sharing my happiness and sadness throughout this journey. David, I really appreciate your encouragement and help all the time. Thank you so much.

In conclusion, I would not forget to thank the staff and faculty members of The University of Newcastle who helped me either directly or indirectly to achieve my goal.

# Contents

<b>Chapter 1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background of the Research Problem .....	2
1.2 Motivation .....	4
1.3 Problem Definition.....	5
1.4 Research Objectives and Questions .....	6
1.4.1 Research Objectives .....	6
1.4.2 Research Questions .....	7
1.5 Contributions .....	8
1.6 Structure of the Thesis.....	10
1.7 Definitions of Key Terms .....	11
<b>Chapter 2. Review of Learning Theories.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Behaviourism Theory .....	13
2.2 Cognitive Theory .....	15
2.3 Constructivism Theory .....	17
2.4 Social Cognitive Theory.....	19
2.5 Summary.....	21
<b>Chapter 3. Self-Regulated Learning and Learning Styles Theories.....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1 What is Self-Regulated Learning? .....	22
3.2 Self-Regulated Learning Models .....	23
3.2.1 Zimmerman’s Cyclical Model of Self-Regulated Learning .....	23
3.2.2 Winne and Hadwins’s Model of Self-Regulated Learning.....	25
3.2.3 Pintrich’s Conceptual Framework for Self-Regulated Learning.....	25
3.3 Self-Regulated Learning Strategies.....	26
3.3.1 Cognitive Learning Strategies.....	27
3.3.2 Metacognitive Learning Strategies.....	27

3.3.3	Resource Management Strategies .....	28
3.4	Measurement of the Use of Self-Regulated Learning Strategies .....	29
3.4.1	Self-Reported Measure of Self-Regulated Learning .....	29
3.4.2	Trace-Logs in Computer-Supported Learning Environments.....	31
3.5	Learning Styles .....	31
3.6	Learning Styles Models .....	32
3.6.1	Hirman Witkin’s Field Dependence/ Field Independence.....	33
3.6.2	Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI).....	33
3.6.3	Kolb’s Learning Style Model.....	34
3.6.4	Honey-Mumford Learning Style Model.....	36
3.6.5	VARK Learning Style Model .....	36
3.6.6	Dunn and Dunn Learning Style Model.....	37
3.6.7	Felder–Silverman Learning Style Model.....	37
3.7	Studies on Self-Regulated Learning.....	39
3.8	Studies on Learning Styles .....	40
3.9	Discussion and Future Directions .....	43
3.10	Conclusion and Summary.....	45
<b>Chapter 4.</b>	<b>Computer Science Education .....</b>	<b>46</b>
4.1	Computer Science Education Research.....	47
4.2	Difficulties in Teaching and Learning Computer Science: Programming Languages Concepts as an Example .....	48
4.3	Student-Centred Educational Paradigms in Computer Science Education.....	51
4.3.1	Research Related to Constructivism.....	53
4.3.2	Research Related to Social Learning Theories .....	55
4.3.3	Research Related to Self-Regulated Learning and Learning Styles in Computer Science Education.....	55
4.3.3.1	Learning Styles of Computer Science Students.....	56
4.3.3.2	Self-Regulated Learning: Cognition and Metacognition .....	58
4.4	Limitations of Current Design and Delivery of Learning Material in Supporting Self-Regulated Learning .....	61

4.4.1	Programming Languages Concepts as a Case Study.....	62
4.4.2	Review of Approaches of Teaching Programming Language Concepts .....	65
4.4.3	Learning Material Delivery .....	69
4.4.4	Conclusion.....	70
4.5	Discussion and Significance of the Approach Proposed in This Study .....	71
4.6	Conclusion and Summary .....	72
<b>Chapter 5.</b>	<b>Learning Object Instructional Technology.....</b>	<b>74</b>
5.1	What are Learning Objects? .....	74
5.1.1	Learning Objects are Digital Learning Resources .....	75
5.1.2	Reusable via Metadata.....	76
5.1.3	Pedagogical Purposes .....	77
5.2	Learning Object Economy .....	78
5.3	Learning Object Systems .....	79
5.3.1	MERLOT.....	79
5.3.2	Connexions .....	79
5.4	Learning Technology Standards .....	80
5.4.1	IEEE Learning Object Metadata (IEEE LOM).....	80
5.4.2	Sharable Content Object Reference Model (SCORM).....	81
5.5	Learning Objects and Self-Regulated Learning .....	83
5.5.1	Learning Objects and Learning Theories .....	84
5.5.2	Locating and Retrieving Learning Objects: Application Profiles and Learning Object Search Tools.....	85
5.6	Learning Objects and Computer Science Education .....	87
5.6.1	Growth of Learning Objects over time.....	88
5.6.2	Quality of Computer Science Learning Objects .....	90
5.6.3	Reuse of Learning Objects based on Types of Learning Material .....	92
5.6.4	Discussion and Recommendations.....	93
5.7	Conclusion and Summary .....	95
<b>Chapter 6.</b>	<b>Pedagogical-Based Learning Object System .....</b>	<b>96</b>

6.1	The Proposed Pedagogical Framework .....	97
6.1.1	Design of Learning Objects .....	98
6.1.1.1	Level of Abstraction (Sensing / Intuitive) .....	100
6.1.1.2	Presentation (Visual / Verbal) .....	100
6.1.1.3	Interactivity (Active / Reflective) .....	100
6.1.1.4	Sequencing and Organisation (Sequential / Global) .....	100
6.1.2	Cyclical Process for Self-Regulated Learning .....	101
6.1.2.1	Forethought (Planning and Activation) .....	101
6.1.2.2	Action (Performance) .....	102
6.1.2.3	Self-Reflection .....	102
6.2	The Framework in Action: A Pedagogical-Based Learning Object System .....	102
6.2.1	Learning Objects for Programming Languages Concepts .....	103
6.2.1.1	Memory Management .....	103
6.2.1.2	Data Structures .....	105
6.2.1.3	Object-Oriented Concepts .....	106
6.2.1.4	Parameter Passing Methods .....	107
6.2.1.5	Concurrency .....	108
6.2.2	Structure of the Learning Object System .....	109
6.2.2.1	Learning Object Repository .....	109
6.2.2.2	Learning Style Awareness Module .....	110
6.2.2.3	Self-Assessment and Misconception Detection Module .....	110
6.2.2.4	Self-Reflection Module .....	111
6.2.2.5	Self-Regulated Learning Record .....	112
6.3	Supporting CS Learning Objects Searching .....	113
6.3.1	Computer Science Learning Object Metadata Application Profile .....	113
6.3.2	Custom Search Engine for Computer Science Learning Objects .....	117
6.3.2.1	Search Engine User Interface .....	118
6.3.2.2	Learning Object Metadata Harvester .....	119
6.3.2.3	Learning Object Microdata Generation Tool .....	119
6.3.2.4	Rich Snippets Renderer .....	120
6.4	Learning Object System Implementation .....	120
6.5	Conclusion and Summary .....	123
<b>Chapter 7.</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology .....</b>	<b>124</b>
7.1	Introduction .....	124
7.2	Research Questions: Revisited .....	124
7.3	Mixed Methods of Data Collection .....	125
7.4	Research Design: Quasi-Experimental Study .....	125



7.5	Description of the Course and Participants.....	126
7.5.1	Introduction .....	128
7.5.2	Memory Management Concepts .....	128
7.5.3	Linked Structures .....	128
7.5.4	Object-Oriented Concepts .....	128
7.5.5	Parameter Passing Techniques.....	129
7.5.6	Concurrency.....	129
7.5.7	Functional and Logic Programming.....	129
7.6	Data Collection Instruments .....	130
7.6.1	Index of Learning Style (ILS).....	130
7.6.2	Self-Regulated Learning Strategies Questionnaire (SRLSQ).....	130
7.6.3	Students' Pre and Post Tests.....	131
7.6.4	Self-Regulated Learning Record.....	131
7.6.5	Students' Satisfaction Instruments .....	131
7.6.5.1	Learning Object Ratings.....	132
7.6.5.2	Students' Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ).....	132
7.6.5.3	Open-Ended Comments .....	133
7.7	Method and Procedure.....	134
7.8	Data Analysis Techniques .....	135
7.8.1	Analysis of Quantitative Data.....	136
7.8.1.1	Overview .....	136
7.8.1.2	Preliminary Analysis.....	137
7.8.1.3	Inferential Statistics .....	137
7.8.2	Analysis of Qualitative Data.....	139
7.9	Threats to Experimental Validity .....	140
7.9.1	History .....	140
7.9.2	Design Contamination.....	141
7.9.3	Resentful Demoralisation .....	141
7.9.4	Experimental Mortality .....	141
7.9.5	Instrumentation .....	142
7.10	Conclusion and Summary.....	142
<b>Chapter 8.</b>	<b>Results and Discussions .....</b>	<b>143</b>
8.1	Overview of Research Questions .....	143

8.2	Preliminary Analysis .....	144
8.2.1	Students' Learning Styles and Self-Regulated Learning Strategies .....	144
8.2.2	Discussion and Summary of the Preliminary Analysis .....	147
8.3	The Educational Effectiveness of the Learning Object System .....	148
8.3.1	The Result of the Quasi-Experimental Study .....	149
8.3.2	Power Analysis .....	151
8.3.3	Students' Achievement Grouped by Topics .....	154
8.4	The Influence of Learning Styles and Self-Regulated Learning Strategies .....	157
8.5	Analysis of Students' Self-Regulated Learning Record .....	161
8.5.1	Time Spent Using the Learning Object System .....	161
8.5.2	Analysis of Navigation Behaviour .....	163
8.6	Extra Evaluation: Computer Science Learning Object Search Engine .....	165
8.6.1.1	Performance of the Custom Search Engine .....	167
8.6.1.2	Ease of Use and Usefulness .....	168
8.6.1.3	Discussion .....	169
8.7	Students' Satisfaction Analysis .....	170
8.7.1	Learning Objects Ratings .....	170
8.7.2	Satisfaction Questionnaire .....	171
8.7.3	Qualitative Comments .....	178
8.8	Conclusion and Summary .....	183
<b>Chapter 9.</b>	<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>184</b>
9.1	Research Questions .....	184
9.1.1	Research Question 1 .....	185
9.1.2	Research Question 2 .....	185
9.2	Implications .....	189
9.2.1	Research on Learning Styles and Self-Regulated Learning .....	189
9.2.2	Support for Self-Regulated Learning in Computer Science Learning Materials ..	189
9.2.3	Standards and Pedagogical-Based Design and Delivery of Computer Science Learning Materials .....	190
9.3	Limitations of the Study .....	191

9.4	Future Research Directions.....	191
	<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	195
Appendix A.	Learning Material Evaluation Instrument for the support of Learning Styles and Self-Regulated Learning.....	195
Appendix B.	Data Collection Instruments.....	202
Appendix C.	Learning Object System Screenshots.....	213
	<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	228

# List of Figures

Figure 3.1: Cyclical Model of Self-Regulated Learning .....	24
Figure 3.2: Felder-Silverman Learning Style Model .....	37
Figure 5.1: Growth of the learning objects over time in science and technology .....	88
Figure 5.2: Comparison of growth rates of learning objects .....	88
Figure 5.3: Growth of CS learning objects based on types of learning material .....	89
Figure 5.4: Distribution of MERLOT Classic Award in the science and technology .....	91
Figure 5.5: Distribution of MERLOT Classic Award based on type of learning material .....	92
Figure 6.1: The pedagogical framework .....	98
Figure 6.2: A learning object to compare memory management approaches of Java and C++.	104
Figure 6.3: A learning object shows placement, lifetime and visibility of variables .....	105
Figure 6.4: Doubly linked list learning object .....	106
Figure 6.5: A learning object to describe polymorphism in Java and C++ .....	107
Figure 6.6: A learning object to describe parameter passing methods .....	108
Figure 6.7: A learning object that describes the bounded-buffer problem .....	109
Figure 6.8: The pedagogical-based learning object system components .....	109
Figure 6.9 : An example of a self-assessment question and the feedback given by the system	111
Figure 6.10: A screenshot of the self-reflection support as appears to the students .....	112
Figure 6.11: An IEEE LOM classification element .....	114
Figure 6.12: An example of an IEEE LOM Classification Element in XML format.....	116

Figure 6.13: Structure of the Custom Computer Science Learning Object Search Engine .....	118
Figure 6.14: The user interface of the Custom CS Learning Object Search Engine .....	118
Figure 6.15: Learning object query result as rich metadata snippets .....	120
Figure 6.16: Learning object design template .....	121
Figure 6.17: The SCORM and LMS Run Time Communication .....	123
Figure 7.1: Flow of the quasi-experiment .....	134
Figure 8.1: Sample size calculation .....	153
Figure 8.2: A chart generated by G*Power to show an adequate sample size.....	154
Figure 8.3: Comparison between the study groups based on their achievements in different topics .....	154
Figure 8.4: Navigation behaviour patterns chart.....	164
Figure 8.5: The average percentage of students who responded to each level in the Likert scale in the evaluation of the educational effectiveness of the learning objects.....	172
Figure 8.6: The average percentage of students who responded to each level in the Likert scale in the evaluation of the learning styles awareness module.....	174
Figure 8.7: The average percentage of students who responded to each level in the Likert scale in the evaluation of the self-regulated learning record.....	175
Figure 8.8: The average percentage of students who responded to each level in the Likert scale in the evaluation of the rich metadata snippets .....	177
Figure 8.9: The average percentage of students who responded to each level in the Likert scale in the overall satisfaction with the idea of learning object systems .....	178
Figure 8.10: A cloud tag shows the most frequent words in students' qualitative comments ...	179
Figure 9.1: Generalisation of the idea of self-regulated learning record.....	192

# List of Tables

Table 3.1: Self-Regulated Learning Strategies .....	29
Table 3.2. The internal reliability of the Self-Regulated Strategies scales of the MSLQ, adapted from (Pintrich et al., 1991) .....	30
Table 5.1: Sample size .....	87
Table 5.2: User-rated learning objects .....	90
Table 5.3: Average user ratings based on material types .....	91
Table 5.4: Personal collections based on material types .....	93
Table 6.1: Learning style-based pedagogical framework for learning objects .....	99
Table 6.2: An example of an IEEE LOM Classification Element for computer science learning objects .....	115
Table 8.1: Learning style distribution .....	145
Table 8.2: Descriptive statistics of self-regulated learning strategies .....	145
Table 8.3: Correlation matrix of self-regulated learning strategies.....	146
Table 8.4: Summary of the research groups at the end of the study .....	149
Table 8.5: Descriptive statistics for the pre-test of the study groups .....	150
Table 8.6: ANCOVA test for difference between the study groups in the post-test .....	151
Table 8.7: Descriptive statistics for the exam scores grouped by topics .....	155
Table 8.8: Students' Post-test scores categorised based on different learning styles in the control group .....	157
Table 8.9: Students' post-test scores categorised based on different learning styles in the intervention group .....	158

Table 8.10: ANCOVA test for the differences in the post-test scores based on the levels of self-regulated learning in the control group .....	159
Table 8.11: ANCOVA test for the differences in the post-test scores based on the levels of self-regulated learning in the intervention group .....	159
Table 8.12: Comparison of the post-test scores of students with the same level of self-regulation between the two experimental groups .....	160
Table 8.13: Descriptive statistics for the time spent using the learning objects .....	161
Table 8.14: Comparisons between different learning styles in terms of the time spent using the learning object system.....	162
Table 8.15: ANCOVA test for the differences in the post-test scores between the meta-cognition and non-meta-cognition group.....	165
Table 8.16: Metrics used to evaluate the performance of information retrieval systems .....	167
Table 8.17: The performance of the search engine in the three query tasks.....	167
Table 8.18: Students' responses on the ease of use of the Custom Search Engine .....	168
Table 8.19: Students' responses on the usefulness of the Custom Search Engine.....	169
Table 8.20: The average ratings of the learning objects .....	170
Table 8.21: Students' satisfaction with the educational effectiveness of the learning objects ..	172
Table 8.22: Students' satisfaction with the learning styles awareness module.....	173
Table 8.23: Students' satisfaction with the self-regulated learning record.....	175
Table 8.24: Students' perceptions on the rich metadata .....	176
Table 8.25: Overall satisfaction with the idea of learning object systems .....	177
Table 9.1: Prospective view of the SRLR approach .....	192

## ABSTRACT

Educators strive to design high-quality learning materials to help students gain an understanding of the subjects under study. Today, in many disciplines, learning is self-regulated by students rather than enforced by teachers. Students are expected to seek knowledge through active participation in the learning process, and teachers serve as facilitators. In areas such as computer science, a dynamically changing field that is affected by new technologies, there is a lack of application of learning theories to the design and delivery of learning materials.

In the last few years, there has been increased attention to the concept of learning objects as a future generation in designing and delivering learning materials. Learning objects can provide a standard approach to design of flexible, adaptable, reusable, and easy to find learning materials. However, research indicated a lack of consideration of learning theories in the current approach to the design and delivery of learning objects.

This thesis investigates the educational effectiveness of the design and delivery of learning objects based on contemporary theories of self-regulated learning by taking into consideration students' learning styles. The study proposes a pedagogical self-regulated learning framework that considers the theory of learning styles as one of its central components. The framework was then applied to the design of a learning object system to demonstrate how learning theories can be embodied in the design and delivery of computer science learning materials. A number of learning objects were designed to support students' different learning styles. The system also implemented a learning style awareness module, which is responsible for identifying students' learning styles and providing guides to learning strategies to help students utilise the strengths and overcome the weaknesses of their learning styles. Moreover, the system focuses on improving students' metacognitive strategies, such as self-assessment and self-reflection, to help them become more self-regulated learners.

An empirical study was conducted to educationally evaluate the system in a core course on programming languages. The study used a quasi-experiment to compare the academic achievement of a group of students who used the system for their self-



regulated learning with a group that was taught using the traditional instructional approach. The results of the study support the educational effect of the system, as indicated by the students' achievement and high level of satisfaction.