❋   . .

❋   .

❋   .

.2011 – 2010

.   (16)   (48)

:   (49)

.(Storyboard)

.

.   .

.   :

Abstract

This study aimed at evaluating graduation projects produced by Instructional Technology Department's students in Jadara University on the bases of instructional software criteria. The study was conducted on (16) projects produced by (48) students in the second term 2010 - 2011. A check list of (49) criterion forming 5 major categories was prepared to achieve the aims of the study. The results of the study showed that the students' performance was generally good in designing and producing pre-post tests, instructions, multimedia and attraction means, while they were not so at

.   −   −   ❋

....

utilizing the systematic approach, teaching strategies, colors, text, and applying the prepared storyboard, specially with respect to sound and special effects. The study reached at the end to a number of recommendations.

Keywords: Evaluation, Criteria, Instructional Technology, Instructional software.

:

.

.

.

.

.

Paula,)

.(Jose & Nuno, 2007 .

:

( )

.2011-2010

:

2011/2010

:

.

.

:

:

.1

.2

.3

145

....

:

.1

:

.2

.

:

:

.1

(   )

2011-2010 .

.2   .

:

:   (Storyboard)

.

:

(   )

2010-

2011   (Storyboard)

:

"

)"

2004: 20).   "

"   .(41: 2005   )"

"   .(5 :2002   )"

:2003   )"

.(274

.

"

"   (103 :2002   )."

(28 :2009   )"

Titus & Lynn,)

.(2003

(Bangert-Drowns, 2002)

(Bayram& Nous, 2004)   .

.

147

....

:

:

(2012)

.

.

.

(2009)

.

26

.

. 43

.

:

.

(Kara, 2007)

Erzurum   32   .

40   .

.   :

(2007)

.

2014   .   .

                                                                              .

                                                                              .

                                                                              .

              (   )

                                                                              .

                         "   (Quynh& Lê, 2007)

                                                                                                                "

       .

                                                                    :

                                                                              .

                                                    (2006)

       .

                                            .

                                                                                                   .

                                                              .

                                                    (2006)

              48   .

                                            .

              81

                                    149

....

:

.

.

(2009)					(2005)

.

.							30

.

.

.					.

(2005)

.

.

137					.

.			20			228

)

.(

(Boyce et al, 2004)

:

.

(2003)

31 .

74

.

.

.

(Georgiadou& Economides, 2001)

:

.

.

(Georgiadou& Economides,2000)

.

:

.

(2000)

.

....

20

.

(1998)

.

) :

(

)

) (

. (

.

.

.

:

storyboards

.

2014   . .

:

(48)   (16)

2011-2010

."   "

:

/

(2012)   (2009)   (2007) Kara   (2006)   (2004)

.

:   (49)

(Storyboard)   (1).

(1):

15	15-1		1
9	24-16		2
11	35-25		3
6	41-36		4
8	49-42	(Storyboard)	5

153

....

.

.

(4)   (5)   :   (   )

.(1)   (2)   (3)

.(2   )

<div dir="rtl">

(2):

	%50	39-1	1
	50 %75	59-40	2
	%75	80-60	3

</div>

:

(60)

.

(15)   %80

%80

(49)   .   .

:

:   (0,990)

(Storyboard)

2014 . .

(0.982 / 0.848 / 0.954 / 0.950 / 0.961)

.

:

:

"

"

: (49) (1)

.(Storyboard)

"

" 2011-2010

:(3-8)

(3):

.000	%100	5.000	80		9
.000	%100	5.000	80		11
.957	%67.5	3.375	54		6
2.049	%65	3.250	52		10
.910	%63.75	3.187	51		8
.885	%62.5	3.125	50		7
.806	%62.5	3.125	50		3

....

.680	%61.25	3.062	49		5
.856	%55	2.750	44		12
.873	%53.75	2.687	43		15
1.014	%53.75	2.687	43		13
.704	%53.75	2.687	43		2
.793	%53.75	2.687	43		1
.813	%51.25	2.562	41		14
.957	%38	1.875	30	.	4
	%62.75	3.137	50.2		

(3)

(5)

(11) (9)

(4)   (1.875)

.(3.125)   .

(6,10,8,7,3,5,12,1513,12,1,14)

.

.(% 62.750)   (5.000)   (3.137)

.

156

(4):

.730	%90	4.500	72		20
.730	%90	4.500	72		18
.730	%80	4.000	64		24
.806	%77.5	3.875	62		23
.577	%75	3.750	60		21
1.024	%57.5	2.875	46		22
.718	%57.5	2.875	46	) (	19
.341	%22.5	1.125	18		17
.341	%22.5	1.125	18		16
	%63.604	3.180	50.88		

(4)

(4.500)

(20) (18)

(1.125)   (16)

.   .(3.375)

(21 23 24)

.

(19 22)   .(2.875)

(16 17)   (1.125)

157

....

(3.180)   .

(5.000)   (% 63.604)

.

(5):

.000	%100	5.000	80		27
.341	%97.5	4.875	78		26
.806	%77.5	3.875	62		28
1.078	%73.75	3.687	59		33
1.093	%71.25	3.562	57		29
.730	%70	3.500	56		25
1.078	%66.25	3.312	53		30
1.046	%63.75	3.187	51		35
.966	%60	3.000	48		34
.981	%56.25	2.812	45		31
.341	%22.5	1.125	18		32
	%68.997	**3.448**	**55.181**		

(5)

(5.000)

2014 . .

(27)

(32) (1.125)

.

(26,28) .(3.875)

.

(59,57,56,53,51)

(34, 31) .

.

.(% 68.977) (5.000) (3.448)

.

(6):

.000	%100	5.000	80		39
1.400	%66.25	3.312	53		40
.806	%57.5	2.875	46		36
.894	%50	2.500	40		37
1.250	%46.25	2.312	37		38
.341	%22.5	1.125	18		41
	%57.082	2.856	645.66		

....

(6)

(5.000)

(39)

(41)   (1.125)

.(3.875)   .

(40,36,37)

.

(38,41)   .

.

. (57.082)   (5.000)   (2.854)

.

(7):

.885	%87.5	4.375	70	(Storyboard)	47
1.024	%67.5	3.375	54		43
1.014	%66.25	3.312	53		46
1.046	%63.75	3.187	51		45
.957	%62.5	3.125	50		48
.718	%52.5	2.625	42		42
1.014	%.46.75	2.312	37		44
.806	%37.5	1.875	30		49
	60.046%	3.023	48.4		

2014 . .

(6)

(4.375)

(47)

(49)   (1.875)

.(2.5)   .

(42,43,46,45,48)

(44,49)   .

.

.(%60.046)   (5.000)   (3.023)

.

"

:(8)

	% 68.977	3.448		1
	% 63.6	3.180		2
	% 62.750	3.137		3
	% 60.046	3.023	(Storyboard)	4
	%57.082	2.854		5
	% 62.577	3.128		

161

....

(8)

(%68.9)   (3.4)

.   (%57.082)   (2.854)

:

.

:

.

(3)

.

.

.

(2007)

.

2014   . .

(4)

.

.

.

.

.

(5)

.

Georgiadou, & Economides,)

(2001

.

.

(6)

....

.

.

.

(2012)   (2006)   (2005)

.

(7)   (Storyboard)

.

.

.

(2009)   (Kara, 2007)

.

:

:

•

.

•

.

2014 . .

●

●

●

●

1- :

– (2005). . : .

– (2000).

369– 400.

– (2003). . : .

– (2006).

. . 2012/1/21

http://www.gulfkids.com/ar/book12-938.htm

– (2004). :

. . : .

– (2004).

. 31(1) 68 – 87.

....

–   (2005).

.

.

–   (2009).

.

.

–   (2006).

.

.

–   (1998).   .

.

–   .(2007).

:   .

–   (2002).

.   .   .

–   (2002)   .   2.

:   .

–   (2012).

.   "

"   24   2.   423– 462   :

.

2-

‒ Bangert-Drowns; R. L. (2002). Teacher ratings of student engagement with educational software: An exploratory study; *Educational Research & Development Technology,* 50(2), 23 - 37.

- Bayram, S. & Nous, A. (2004). Evolution of educational software evaluation: Instructional software assessment. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET* 3 (2), 21 – 27.

- Boyce, G., MacKay, G. & O'Brien, S. (2004). A Software Evaluation Model Education 531 UCCB. [Online]. [Accessed 17, January, 2012]. Available from the World Wide Web: http://garymackay.efoliomn.com/uploads/software%20evaluation%20model.pdf

- Georgiadou, E. & Economides, A.A. (2000). Evaluation factors of educational software. Proceedings IWALT 2000, *International Workshop on Advanced Learning Technologies,* pp. 113-120.

- Georgiadou, E., Economides, A.A., Michailidou, A. &Mosha, A.(2001) *Evaluation of online educational software designed for the purpose of teaching programming*. ProceedingsWebNet2001 World Conference on the WWW and Internet, pp. 399-404.

- Paula, E., José, B. &Nuno, E. (2007 October*). Evaluating Educational Software.* Paper presented at the World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education (ELEARN) Quebec City, Canada

- Quynh, L. and Le, T. (2007). Evaluation Of Educational Software: Theory into Practice, in J. Sigafoos& V. Green (Eds.). '*Teaching and Technology*' (pp 115 124) – Nova Science Publishers, New York, USA.

- Titus K.L.& Lynn A. (2003). Evaluation of educational software. *Journal of Dental Education November l. 67 (11) 1221-1228.*

- Kara,Y (2007). *Educational Software Evaluation Form for Teachers. Paper presented at the International Educational Technology* (IETC) Conference 7th, Nicosia, Turkey.