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Abstract

Web-based learning is widespread in educational settings. The popularity of web-based learning is due in great measure to its flexibility. Multiple navigation tools provided some of this flexibility. Different navigation tools offer different functions. Therefore, it is important to understand how the navigation tools are used by learners with different backgrounds, knowledge, and skills. This paper presents two empirical studies in which data mining approaches were used to analyze learners’ navigation behavior. The results indicate that prior knowledge and subject content are two potential factors influencing the use of navigation tools. In addition, the lack of appropriate use of navigation tools may adversely influence learning performance. The results have been integrated into a model that can help designers develop web-based learning programs and other web-based applications that can be tailored to learners’ needs.
1. Introduction

E-learning is becoming an essential part in educational settings. Current course design and instructional methods are influenced by the development of modern technology (Ngai, Poon, and Chan, 2007). Technological advances in computing and communication have allowed the transition from traditional classrooms to virtual learning spaces. Currently, a growing number of universities worldwide are offering web-based learning programs. In addition, numerous companies are using web-based learning to train their employees. The popularity of web-based learning reflects its flexibilities (Chen and Macredie, 2004).

Unlike traditional computer-based learning, web-based learning programs offer multiple navigation tools for learners to develop their own navigation strategies. Among various navigation tools, alphabetical indices, hierarchical maps, hypertext links and main menus are most commonly used in web-based learning programs. An alphabetical index provides learners with a means to locate particular information without going through a fixed sequence of information. The index lists all concepts in an alphabetical order and does not provide any indication for the relationships between them. A hierarchical map is a graphical representation of important relationships between concepts. With the map, each key concept can be represented as a hierarchy of concepts going from a higher level of abstraction (general concepts) to lower levels (specific concepts, examples). Hypertext links are a mechanism for learners to move quickly to related pages and may reflect either the connectivity of the subject matter or the organization of the content. A main menu in a web-based learning program is a displayed list of choices referring to the concepts (Khalifa and Kwok, 1999).

It seems that these navigation tools provide different functions, and navigating with these tools is complex (Padovani and Lansdale, 2003). In particular, learners who use web-based learning programs are diverse, in terms of their preferences, skills, and needs. In response to this challenge, more attention needs to be directed to see how diverse populations use the navigation tools provided by web-based learning programs. As suggested by Stanney, Mourant, and Kennedy (1998), understanding human factors is useful in identifying the needs of each individual. Therefore, empirical evaluation of learners’ navigation behavior becomes paramount, because such evaluation can provide concrete prescriptions for developing web-based learning programs that can accommodate the learners’ needs.
In this vein, two empirical studies reported in this paper aim to examine how human factors influence learners’ navigation behavior, especially when using navigation tools. Among a variety of individual difference approaches, this study will focus on prior knowledge, because it plays a central role in the setting of goals, which, in turn, determines learners’ navigation paths (Corredor, 2004). In addition to navigation behavior, the effects of learning performance are also investigated. By doing so, a sound understanding can be provided not only for which tools learners prefer to use, but also for which tools are most suited to them. In other words, two research questions were investigated: (a) what are the effects of prior knowledge on the use of navigation tools and (b) what are the effects of the use of navigation tools on learning performance. Answers to these two questions are sought by using a data mining approach to analyze students’ navigation behavior because data mining has been successfully applied in many fields to help discover knowledge and to help make decisions, including bioinformatics (Liu and Kellam, 2003), financial analysis (Thawornwong and Enke, 2004), and information retrieval (Zhang and Dong, 2002).

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents research rationale by analyzing the problems of existing work in the field. Section 3 describes the methodology used to conduct two empirical studies and the techniques applied to the analysis of the corresponding data. Subsequently, the grouped navigation behavior of two empirical studies is presented in Section 4, where the effects of prior knowledge on learners’ navigation behavior and the relationships between navigation behavior and learning performance are also discussed. Finally, conclusions are drawn and possibilities for future work are identified in Section 5.

2. Research Rationale

Learning is a process of making connections between what is already known and new information (Anderson, Spiro, and Anderson, 1978). Thus, prior knowledge is essential to the learning process. As claimed by Ausubel (1968), the most important single factor influencing learning is what learners already know. Previous research indicates that experts and novices, who have different levels of prior knowledge, demonstrate different learning characteristics. Their different characteristics are summarized in Table 1. In the past decade, research into the influence of prior knowledge on the use of web-based learning programs has mushroomed. A number of studies have found that learners with different levels of prior knowledge benefit differently from the web-based learning programs, with experts and novices requiring different levels of navigational support (McDonald and Stevenson,
Chen et al., (2006) present a review of relevant research covering 26 quantitative and qualitative studies. One of the conclusions in their review is that experts are more interested in using tools that could facilitate the location of detailed information related to specific entities (Farrell and Moore, 2000), while novices seem to benefit from hierarchical maps that can facilitate the integration of individual topics (Potelle and Rouet, 2003).

While this conclusion has provided initial guidance on the role of navigation tools, some problems are still being ignored. One of them is whether subject content also influences learners’ navigation behavior. Anderson (1983) divided learning into two states: declarative and procedural knowledge. Derry (1990) distinguishes between these two, declarative being “knowledge that” and procedural being “knowledge how”. Declarative knowledge refers to knowledge about the world and its properties while procedural knowledge refers to knowledge of how to do things (McGilly, 1994). Sun, Merrill, and Peterson (2001) proposed another distinction based on consciousness processing. Learners tend to have conscious access to declarative knowledge but not to procedural knowledge. In other words, declarative knowledge is explicit knowledge whereas procedural knowledge is implicit knowledge (Dienes and Perner, 1999). Chen (2005b) found that the learning performance of obtaining declarative knowledge was influenced by learners’ perceptions to the design of learning programs. On the other hand, the learning performance of getting procedural knowledge was affected by their prior knowledge. However, paucity of research examines whether learners’ navigation strategies in taking learning programs to present subject content on declarative knowledge are different from those in taking learning programs on procedural knowledge.

Another problem is the majority of previous studies use statistical analyses, which indicate some trends about learners’ navigation behavior. However, these are not enough to build learner communities, who demonstrate similar navigation behavior. For such a task, data mining is more appropriate because it can search for valuable information in large volumes of data (Hand et al., 2001). The main difference between statistical analyses and data mining lies in the aim that is sought. The former is used to verify existing knowledge in order to prove a known relationship (Moss and Atre, 2003) while the latter is aimed at finding unexpected relationships (Wang, Rees, and Liao, 2002). As opposed to traditional experiments designed to verify priori hypotheses with statistical analyses,
data mining uses the data itself to uncover relationships and patterns. By doing so, hidden relationships, patterns, and interdependencies can be discovered and predictive rules can be generated, which are the advantages of data mining (Hedberg, 1995; Gargano and Raggad, 1999).

Much of the work in data mining can be divided into three major categories based on the nature of their information extraction: classification, clustering, and association rules (Chen and Liu, 2004). Clustering, a major Exploratory Data Analysis method (Tukey, 1977), is concerned with the division of data into groups of similar objects. Each group, called a cluster, consists of objects that are similar between themselves and dissimilar to objects of other groups (Roussinov and Zhao, 2003). This technique has the advantage of uncovering unanticipated trends, correlations, or patterns. Also, no assumptions are made about the structure of the data. Wang et al. (2004) have developed a recommendation system for the cosmetic business. In the system, they segmented the customers by clustering algorithms to discover different behavior groups. Customers in same group have similar purchase behavior. Classification refers to the data mining problem of attempting to discover predictive patterns where a predicted attribute is nominal or categorical. The predicted attribute is called the class. Subsequently, a data item is assigned to one of a predefined set of classes by examining its attributes (Changchien and Lu, 2001). In other words, the objective of classification is not to explore the data to discover interesting segments, but rather to decide how new items should be classified. For example, Esposito, Licchelli, and Semeraro (2004) built student models for an e-learning system based upon the student performance evaluation: good, sufficient or insufficient. Association rules that were first proposed by Agrawal and Srikant (1994) are mainly used to find out the meaningful relationships between items or features that occur synchronously in databases (Wu, Zhang, and Zhang, 2002). This approach is useful when one has an idea of the different associations being sought. This is because one can find many different correlations in a large data set. Cunningham and Frank (1999) applied the association rules to the task of detecting subject categories that co-occur in transaction records of books borrowed from a university library. As shown by the aforementioned studies, data mining opens a new window for data analyses. We, therefore, used a data mining approach to analyze learners’ navigation behavior in two empirical studies conducted in web-based learning programs, which are described in the next section.
3. Methodology Design

3.1 Empirical studies

- **Web-based Learning Programs**

  As described in Section 2, learning can be divided into two conditions: procedural knowledge and declarative knowledge. The two empirical studies described in this paper attempted to identify their impacts on web-based learning. Study One investigated the effects of prior knowledge in a web-based learning program that taught students procedural knowledge, i.e. *How to Use HTML* (Figure 1), and Study Two examined this issue in another web-based learning program that delivered declarative knowledge to the students, i.e. *Computational Algorithms* (Figure 2). The other reason of choosing these two topics was that they were related to students’ lectures. As recommended by Reeves (1993), an optimal scenario for answering research questions would be conducted as a study in an environment and context that is meaningful and relevant to the sample population.

  {Figures 1, 2 Here}

  To identify the learners’ different navigation behavior, both web-based learning programs provided them with a variety of navigation tools, including an alphabetical index, a hierarchical map, a main menu and section buttons. In addition, there were rich hypertext links within the text. In this way, the learners were given the freedom to decide their own navigation strategies so that the navigation tools of their choices could be identified by examining their navigation behavior.

- **Participants**

  In order to find reliable evidence about the use of navigation tools, two empirical studies were conducted. 65 learners participated in Study One and 69 learners in Study Two. Participants were undergraduate students in a university in the UK and they volunteered to take part in the studies. A request was issued to students in lectures, and further by email, making clear the nature of the studies and their participation. All participants had the basic computing and Internet skills necessary to operate a web-based learning program.

- **Procedure**

  Both Study One and Study Two consist of four testing steps, which are illustrated in Figure 3. All of the participants interacted with the web-based learning (WBL) programs for about two hours and their interactions were
collected by recording them in a log file, including the frequencies of access of navigation tools named hierarchical map, alphabetical index, section buttons, hypertext links and main menu. These data were analyzed by using data mining techniques (See Section 3.2).

{Figure 3 Here}

The questionnaire was applied to measure students’ prior knowledge. The questions were classified into two major groups based on their homogeneity: (a) **domain knowledge**: the preliminary understanding of subject content, for example, How familiar are you with designing Web pages with HTML?; (b) **system experience**: the experience of using a variety of systems, for example, How much do you enjoy accessing the Internet?. Each question used a five-point Likert Scale consisting of: very much; quite a lot; average; not much; not at all. The last two were recognized as novices and the remaining three were identified as experts. To reduce the bias of this study, other human factors such as culture background and gender differences were also examined using the questionnaire.

The pre-test and post-test were designed to assess the participants’ performance both before and after using the web-based learning programs. Both included 20 multiple-choice questions, each with four different answers and a “don’t know” option, from which the students could choose only one. The students’ learning performance was measured based on **gain scores**, which was calculated as the post-test score minus the pre-test score. The details of the design rationale of the questionnaire, pre-test, and post-test for Study One can be found in Chen and Macredie (2004) and for Study Two in Mitchell et al. (2005).

### 3.2 Data analysis

As indicated in Section 2, much of the work in data mining can be divided into clustering, classification, and association rules. Among these three approaches, clustering is selected for analyzing data of the aforementioned two studies because it can form groups that share similar characteristics (Nolan, 2002). More precisely, given a set of data points, each having a set of attribute values, clustering is the process of grouping the data points into different clusters using a dissimilarity measure such that data points in the same cluster are more similar to one another and those in different clusters are less similar to one another. The principle of clustering is to maximize the
similarity between all points inside a cluster and minimize the similarity between the different clusters (Han and Kamber, 2001).

There are three different general types of clustering algorithms: those based on the attempt to find the optimal partitions into a specific number of clusters, those based on a hierarchical attempt to discover cluster structures and those based on probabilistic models for underlying clusters (Hand, et al., 2001). The choice of the most appropriate type of algorithm is strongly related to the objectives of the task as well as the nature of the data. The aim of two studies described in this paper is to group users into clusters based on attributes that originate from the use of navigation tools within the web-based learning programs so partition-based clustering is used here for analyzing the data. The most well-known and commonly used partition-based clustering is K-means (Han and Kamber, 2001). However, the challenge of using the K-means algorithm is that the number of clusters needs to be fixed in advance. Therefore, there is also a need to find out the most appropriate number of clusters with probabilistic clustering methods, of which the Expectation Maximization (EM) algorithm is used. In summary, K-means was selected for the formation of the final clusters and EM algorithm was used to gain an insight about the optimal number of clusters. A main disadvantage of the probabilistic approach is the complexity of the associated estimation algorithm. Partition-based clustering methods, such as K-means, on the other hand, have the advantage of being simple and transparent (Hand, et al., 2001). The approaches of using these two algorithms are described below.

- **EM algorithm**

  The EM algorithm is a statistical model that makes use of Gaussian mixtures model. A mixture is a set of N probability distributions where each distribution represents a cluster. EM assigns a probability to each data point. It is the probability that the data point would have, if it were to have a certain set of attribute values, given it was a member of a specific cluster. The probability distribution estimates the membership of each data point to each of the clusters. Consequently, these probabilities are used as the basis of partitioning the data and hence defining the clustering (Alpaydin, 1998).

  More specifically, the EM algorithm iterates between two steps for estimating parameters of generative models based on available data. The two steps are the Expectation step and the Maximization step. The Expectation step deals with the unknown underlying variables using the current estimate of the parameters and conditioned upon
the observations. The Maximization step then provides a new estimation of the parameters. The two steps are iterated until a desired convergence value is achieved. The convergence value that constitutes the stationary point is the one that maximizes the likelihood, but it is not guaranteed to be the optimal one, as the algorithm can terminate upon reaching a local maximum. To overcome this problem, different initial values or random numbers should be used (Stoica and Selén, 2004).

EM can be viewed as an iterative optimization algorithm for maximizing a likelihood score function given a probabilistic model with missing data. In the present study, the mixture model can be regarded as a distribution in which not the variables but the class labels are missing (Hand, et al., 2001). In contrast to clustering algorithms such as hierarchical clustering and K-means clustering, EM can generate clusters based on cross validation without requiring any input on the number of clusters. As a result, it is possible to find an indication for the ‘optimal’ number of clusters in a specific dataset by exploiting the algorithm (Chen, 2005a). The EM algorithm was applied to both datasets from Study One and Study Two. For both datasets, the EM algorithm groups learners into three clusters for different assignments of initial random numbers.

- **K-means algorithm**

A re-estimation procedure was conducted in K-means algorithms in order to cluster a given data set through a certain number \( N \) of \( K \) clusters fixed a priori. In the first step, the core idea is to define \( K \) centroids (cluster centers), for each cluster. Another parameter called seed \( S \) is used to generate the random numbers for the assignment of the initial centroids. Since K-means is sensitive to how clusters are initially assigned (Pena, et al, 1999), it is necessary to try different random values and evaluate the results in order to find which combination fit better to the data. This can be achieved by varying the value of \( S \). In detail, the algorithm consists of the following: the first step is to define \( K \) centroids or average of the points, one for each cluster. Following that, each point is associated to the nearest centroid. The next step starts when all the points are assigned to clusters; it is the re-calculation procedure of \( K \) new centroids. For these \( K \) new centroids, a new binding has to be done between the same data set points and the nearest new centroid. These two steps are alternated until a stopping criterion, named also cost function (Sun and Wang, 2001), is met, i.e., when there is no further change in the assignment of the data points. K-means uses the squared-error cost function, which is an indicator of the distance of the given points from their respective cluster centers; the aim is to minimize distance. A mentioned before, in this particular case, K-means
uses the Euclidean distance measure to compute distances between a data point and a cluster center. The K-means performance reveals the centroid of each cluster as well as statistics on the number and percentage of instances assigned to different clusters. Thus, centroids can be used to characterize each one of the formed clusters.

Despite of the insight from the EM algorithm about the number of clusters, different combinations in the number of clusters and seed values have been tested in order to reveal which combination provides the best algorithm performance and to check whether the outcome is consistent with what the EM algorithm recommends. The performance of the algorithm was evaluated according to: (a) the value of the sum of squared errors; (b) the percentage of clustered instances in each cluster; (c) the mean value of each attribute within the cluster and (d) their visual representation (data not shown). Results are in accordance with the EM algorithm, which indicated that the K-means algorithm performs better when the number of the pre-defined clusters are \( N=3 \) and \( S=20 \) for Study One and \( N=3, S=10 \) for Study Two. The sum of squared errors within clusters for Study One is 16.9 and the one for Study Two is 22.1.

### 4. Results and Discussions

There are five navigation tools and the descriptive statistics for each navigation tool is showed in Table 2. To correspond with human factors, the results of both studies have indicated that prior knowledge of subject domain has a great influence on the use of navigation tools (Section 4.1). In addition, we found that the use of navigation tools has an impact on the students’ learning performance (Section 4.2).

{Table 2 Here}

### 4.1 The Use of Navigation Tools

{Table 3 Here}

#### 4.1.1 Study One

The left column of Table 3 reveals the attributes that characterize each cluster in Study One. The percentage of learners within each cluster is satisfactory for the total number of 65 instances (learners). Clusters can
be characterized as roughly balanced: Cluster 1 (N = 18): 28%, Cluster 2 (N = 25): 38%, Cluster 3 (N = 22): 34%.

The mean values of the above attributes, i.e., the average frequencies each navigation tool (including main menu, hierarchical map, alphabetical index etc) is chosen by learners, are shown in the table, which has indicated that the learners are grouped according to the following trends:

- Cluster 1 (C1): learners frequently used the hypertext links and seldom used the main menu, hierarchical maps, alphabetical index, and section buttons;
- Cluster 2 (C2): learners frequently used the alphabetical index, occasionally used the hypertext links, and seldom used main menu, hierarchical map, and section buttons;
- Cluster 3 (C3): learners frequently used the hierarchical maps, occasionally used the hypertext links, and seldom used the main menu, section buttons, and alphabetical index.

{Figure 4 Here}

To find the corresponding human factors for each cluster, the results indicated that learners with different levels of prior domain knowledge, i.e. the preliminary understanding of HTML, appear in different clusters. The experts who had a high level of HTML knowledge mainly emerge in Cluster 2, in which the learners visited the alphabetical index many more times (Figure 4). The alphabetical index is useful for locating specific information (Chen and Macredie, 2002). This finding is in line with that of the study by Carmel et al (1992), which found that high-knowledge users were more interested in using tools that could facilitate the location of detailed information related to specific entities. Conversely, the majority of novices who had a low level of HTML knowledge appear in Cluster 1 or Cluster 3, in which learners often used the hypertext links or hierarchical map respectively. A possible explanation for this finding is that the mental structure of novices is more chaotic and disorganized (Spires and Donley, 1998). Therefore, they need to rely on the hypertext links to connect the relevant concepts or to use hierarchical map to identify the content structure. In particular, the hierarchical map not only reveals the document structure, i.e. the physical arrangement of a document, but also reflects the conceptual structure, i.e. the relationships between different concepts (Nilsson and Mayer, 2002). In other words, the hierarchical map can help novices incorporate the document structure into the conceptual structure, which can facilitate the integration of individual topics (Dee-Lucas, and Larkin, 1995; Möller and Müller-Kalthoff, 2000).
4.1.2 Study Two

The navigation behavior of the three clusters in Study Two is presented in the right column of Table 3. The mean value of the above attributes indicates that learners are grouped according to the following trends:

- Cluster 1 (C1): learners occasionally used the hypertext links and seldom used any other navigation tools;
- Cluster 2 (C2): learners frequently used the hypertext links, occasionally used section buttons, and seldom used the main menu, hierarchical maps, and the alphabetical index;
- Cluster 3 (C3): learners frequently used the hypertext links, occasionally used section buttons and hierarchical maps, and seldom used the main menu and alphabetical index.

According to the percentage of students within each cluster, clusters can be considered as very unbalanced for the total number of 69 instances (learners): Cluster 1 (N = 40): 58%, Cluster 2 (N= 24): 35%, Cluster 3 (N = 5): 7%. In other words, the majority of learners appear in Cluster 1, in which the hypertext links were occasionally used and other navigation tools were rarely used by the students. This is very different from the findings of Study One. It may be due to the fact that the web-based learning programs of these two studies present different subject content. As indicated in Section 3, the subject content in Study One presents procedural knowledge of how to use HTML, while Study Two introduces declarative knowledge about the properties of computation algorithms. Procedural knowledge is not available to awareness (Dienes and Perner, 1999). Thus, the learners can appreciate the advantages of using navigation tools when they learn procedural knowledge. Conversely, the learners are aware of declarative knowledge in the existing content. Therefore, they may not consider navigation tools as useful mechanisms when the subject topic is related to declarative knowledge. This issue suggests that subject content is another critical factor that should be considered in the design of navigation tools for web-based learning programs.

Like Study One, the learners’ prior domain knowledge, i.e. their preliminary understanding of computational algorithms, is a dominant human factor for each cluster. As showed in Figure 5, all learners in Cluster 3 are novices who had a low level of knowledge about computational algorithms. The main difference between Cluster 3 and other clusters is that the hierarchical map is a preferred tool in Cluster 3. This is consistent with the findings of Study One, which indicate that the hierarchical map is favored by the novices because it can
help them to build an integrated picture of the subject content. On the other hand, it may not be useful for experts to locate the details of specific items.

{Figure 5 Here}

4.1.3 Overall Use

The overall use of navigation tools for Study One is presented in Figure 6 and Study Two in Figure 7. It seems clear that the hypertext links are the most favored tool in both Study One and Study Two. The web-based learning programs employ hypermedia techniques (Federico, 2000), of which the major feature is the capability to link relevant pages (Bar-Ilan, 2005). The aforementioned finding confirms the value of this feature, which encourages learners to navigate by association. In this way, they can make learning paths in their own self-directed manner, instead of having to follow passively some form of pre-defined linear access (Farrell and Moore, 2000).

Section buttons are the second favored tool in Study Two, while they are the least used tools in Study One. A possible reason is that the subject content of Study Two has a specific division and includes 6 sections: (1) Introduction to Algorithms, (2) Asymptotically Slow Sorts, (3) Divide and Conquer, (4) Analysis of Algorithms, (5) Searching Algorithms, and (6) Background Mathematics. Each section is further split into four sub-topics. On the other hand, the subject content of Study One is roughly divided into 3 sections: (1) What is HTML?; (2) Working with HTML; and (3) Relations with SGML and WWW. Section 2 is the key element of the web-based instructional program, which covers 12 sub-topics of HTML authoring. In other words, the content structures of these two studies are different, which suggest that the content structure of the web-based learning programs also influences the choice of navigation tools.

{Figures 6, 7 Here}

4.2 Impacts on Learning Performance

The results of Section 4.1 indicate that the learners of different clusters have different levels of prior knowledge. Prior knowledge seems to influence the learners’ behavior. To investigate whether the learners’ behavior influences their performance, the learning performance of each cluster showed in Table 4 was analyzed on the basis of the gain score.
4.2.1 Study One

The left column of Table 4 reveals the learning performance of each cluster in Study One. Experts who were in Cluster 3 had a better performance than those who were in other clusters. On the other hand, novices in Cluster 2 performed slightly better than those in Clusters 1 and 3. This is not consistent with the findings of the navigation behavior presented in Section 4.1.1, which indicates that most of the experts appeared in Cluster 2, where the alphabetical index was frequently used. Conversely, the novices mainly emerged in Cluster 1 or Cluster 3, where the hypertext links and hierarchical map were often selected. This implies that experts may prefer to use the alphabetical index although it may not be beneficial for their learning performance. In contrast, the novices may prefer to select the hypertext links and hierarchical map but these two tools may not be helpful for improving their learning performance. These findings imply that what learners like may not be what they need. The other explanation is that preferences and performance are two different things. Preference is defined by a function that represents how much a user likes or dislikes a given item (Jung, Hong, and Kim, 2005) while performance is the ability of the learners to actually solve problems (Topi and Lucas, 2005). Competent performance requires not only perquisite knowledge and skills but also beliefs of personal efficacy to use both effectively (Mavis, 2001). The findings of this study suggest that there is no direct relationship between performance and preferences. These results do not echo the findings of previous studies (Ford and Chen, 2001; Fullerton, 2000), which suggest that matching the design of learning programmes with learners’ preferences can enhance their performance.

4.2.2 Study Two

The learning performance of three clusters in Study Two is presented in the right column of Table 4. It seems that the learners who were in Cluster 2 performed best and those in Cluster 1 did worst, especially the novices. As indicated in Section 4.1.2, the learners in Cluster 2 frequently clicked the hypertext links and those in Cluster 1 rarely used the navigation tools, apart from choosing the hypertext links occasionally. This implies that the absence of the appropriate use of navigation tools might hinder the learners’ performance, which is in line with the finding of the study by Tung et al. (2003). As indicated by Jul and Furnas (1997), navigation is the process of moving around an environment, deciding at each step where to go. Navigation tools help to support the learner’s
navigation through the site, performing two functions: telling the learner what information is held within the site; and helping them to find the information quickly and easily (Park and Kim, 2000). However, the majority of learners appeared in Cluster 1. This indicates that the learners did not appreciate the value of the navigation tools even though using them would have been beneficial. These findings reiterate those of Study One that the learners are probably not aware of what they need in their learning process. Therefore, the designers of web-based learning programs should not only consider accommodating learners’ different preferences, but also should investigate how to provide support for learners to identify suitable navigation tools.

5. Development of a Model

The results presented in the aforementioned section are very interesting. Based on the key results, Figure 8 presents a model that illustrates the impact of prior knowledge and subject content on the use of navigation tools and the effects of the use of navigation tools on learning performance. This model can help designers understand more easily “what” learners’ need and “why” they need. The designers can then develop web-based programs and other web-based applications that can tailor navigation support to the learners’ knowledge, skills, and tasks.

• **Learners with different levels of prior knowledge prefer to use different navigation tools.**

The results of these two studies reveal that learners with different levels of prior knowledge benefit from different navigation tools. The hierarchical map was favored by novices while the alphabetical index was preferred by experts. It may be due to the fact that novices lack the prior knowledge and the hierarchical map presents the content in a structured format and can thus help novices organize content (Calisir and Gurel, 2003). On the other hand, experts have acquired a great deal of prior knowledge and they are more able to impose structure on the content (Spires and Donley, 1998). Therefore, they tend to use navigation tools that can provide them with free navigation and help them find specific information. The alphabetical index is one type of such tools.

• **Subject content is a potential issue that influences the use of navigation tools.**

The web-based learning programs used in the two studies introduced different subject contents. Their subject contents represent different types of knowledge. The web-based learning program used in Study One was
related to procedural knowledge and that in Study Two was concerned with declarative knowledge. As indicated in Section 2, this difference can be equated to the distinction between implicit and explicit knowledge, because procedural knowledge is generally inaccessible to consciousness while declarative knowledge is accessible (Sun and Zhang, 2004; Sun, Merrill and Peterson 2001). When learners interact with subject content about procedural knowledge (implicit knowledge), they may need to rely on visual cues to access information. Navigation tools offer such visual cues. This may be the reason why learners in Study One used the navigation tools more frequently than those in Study Two.

6. Conclusions

This paper presents two empirical studies, in which data mining approaches were applied to answer two research questions. In response to the first research question, *what are the effects of prior knowledge on the use of navigation tools*, we have found that the students’ prior knowledge plays an influential role in their use of navigation tools. In terms of the second research question, *what are the effects of the use of navigation tools on learning performance*, we have demonstrated that the use of navigation tools has great impact on the students’ learning performance. The results also suggest that the degree of the use of navigation tools is influenced by subject topics. In brief, prior knowledge, subject content, and learning performance are three issues that should be considered in the design of navigation tools for web-based learning programs.
These two empirical studies described in this paper have shown the importance of understanding the use of navigation tools in web-based learning. However, they were only small-scale studies. Further work needs to be undertaken with a larger sample to provide additional evidence. Another limitation of these studies is that the sample was not very balanced. There were fewer experts and more novices in Study One, while more experts and fewer novices in Study Two. This limitation may influence the validity of the results in that the standard deviation is generally high. Further empirical studies are needed to verify the results described in this paper.

Given any dataset, there are often no strict rules that impose the use of one specific method over another in its analysis. Therefore, there is a need to analyze learners' navigation behavior using other clustering algorithms or even other data mining approaches, e.g. classification and association rules. It would be interesting to see what results will be found by using these methods. Gathering information on these issues through further work can help clarify the findings from the present study. In addition, the results of such studies could be integrated to build robust user models for the development of effective web-based learning programs that can accommodate the need of each individual learner.
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Table 1: Learning Characteristics of Experts and Novice (Adapted from Chen, et al, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experts</th>
<th>Novices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global mental models</td>
<td>Local mental models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed search</td>
<td>Undirected search (trial and error)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep structures</td>
<td>Surface features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental simulation of integrated functions and whole application</td>
<td>Mental simulation of isolated functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete analysis deferring details</td>
<td>Incomplete analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth-first strategies</td>
<td>Breadth-first strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design whole and add pieces</td>
<td>Design pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated whole throughout the process</td>
<td>Failure to integrate pieces into a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find the best solution</td>
<td>Find a (any) solution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The Descriptive Statistics for Each Navigation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navigation Tools</th>
<th>Study One</th>
<th>Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Menu</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Map</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabetical Index</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertext Links</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Buttons</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SD: Standard Deviation)

Table 3: Clusters of Study One and Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navigation Tools</th>
<th>Study One</th>
<th>Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Menu</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Map</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabetical Index</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertext links</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Buttons</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered Instances</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Instances</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SD: Standard Deviation)
Table 4: Learning Performance of Study One and Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Performance</th>
<th>Study One</th>
<th>Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SD: Standard Deviation)

Learning to Use HTML

Introduction to HTML

HTML (HyperText Markup Language) is a markup language that consists of tags embedded in the text of a document. The browser reading the document interprets these markup tags to help format the document for subsequent display to a reader. However, many of the decisions about layout are made by the browser. Remember, web browsers are available for a wide variety of computer systems.

The browser thus displays the document with regard to features that the viewer selects either explicitly or implicitly. Factors affecting the layout and presentation include:

- The markup tags used.
- The physical page width.
- The font used to display the text.
- The color depth of the display.

Other detailed information about HTML background is represented in Section 1.

Figure 1: The web-based learning program of Study One

Introduction to Algorithms

What are Algorithms?

An algorithm is any well-defined computational procedure that takes some value (or set of values) as input and produces some value (or set of values) as output. It can be seen as a tool for solving a well-specified computational problem.

Most of what is studied in an algorithm course includes classic algorithms for fundamental operations such as sorting or searching and on data structures such as trees or graphs. These algorithms are often used as basic building blocks for solving hard real-world problems, e.g., in bioinformatics, e-commerce, engineering, etc. Common algorithms include sorting algorithms and search algorithms.

Why Study Algorithms?

Algorithms are the heart of computation, and are at the core of most computing technologies. However, algorithmic economics studies the same problem under different efficiency criteria not the same problem. For example, the efficiency of an algorithm is very important. However, computers are not infinitely fast, and memory will be free - these may not be a limit to the problem size.

Figure 2: The web-based learning program of Study Two
Figure 3: Procedures

Figure 4: Novices and Experts in Study One

Figure 5: Novices and Experts in Study Two
Figure 6: The use of navigation tools in Study One

Figure 7: The use of navigation tools in Study Two

Figure 8: A Model based on the key results