

The Effect of Embedded Questions in
Programming Education Videos

by

Christopher Mar

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Approved November 2016 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Sohum Sohoni, Chair
Brian C. Nelson
Scotty D. Craig

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2016

ABSTRACT

One of the primary objective in a computer science related course is for students to be able to write programs implementing the concepts covered in that course. In educational psychology, however, learning gains are more commonly measured using recall or problem solving questions. While these types of questions are relevant to computer science exams, they do not necessarily reflect a student's ability to apply concepts by writing an original program to solve a novel problem.

This thesis investigates the effectiveness of including questions within instructional multimedia content to improve student performance on a related programming assignment. Similar techniques have proven effective in educational psychology research using other measures. The objective of this thesis is to apply educational techniques used in other domains to an experiment with real world measures of students in a computer science course. The findings of this paper demonstrate that the techniques used were promising in improving student performance on a programming assignment.

DEDICATION

To my parents who have been supportive of my many passions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Sohum Sohoni for giving me the opportunity as a graduate teaching assistant to be deeply involved in course material design. This experience helped in guiding me to my thesis topic. I am also thankful for the time he took to work with me on designing and implementing my experiment.

I would also like to thank Dr. Scotty Craig, my instructor for my research methods course, introducing me to the finer details of experimental and quasi-experimental design. He also provided a great deal of help analyzing the data collected for this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my mom for being my ever-dependable proof reader and questioning awkwardly phrased sentences that sounded fine to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Motivation	1
Background and Review of Literature	1
Problem Statement	5
2 METHODS	6
Design and Variables.....	6
Participants.....	6
Materials	7
Measures	10
Procedure	12
3 PILOT STUDIES	13
Participants	13
Materials	13
Measures	14
4 RESULTS	16
Posttest Results	16
Quantitative Analysis.....	17
5 DISCUSSION	21

CHAPTER	Page
6 CONCLUSION	24
7 FUTURE WORK	25
REFERENCES	26
APPENDIX	
A PRETEST QUESTIONS	28
B PROGRAMMING ASSINGMENT DESCRIPTION	30
C PROGRAMMING ASSINGMENT EXAMPLE SOLUTION	33
D PROGRAMMING ASSINGMENT RUBRIC	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Posttest Results	16

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Instructional Video Screenshots	8
2.	Zaption Video Screenshot	9
3.	Comparison of Load Immediate Grading Criterion	18
4.	Comparison of Store Word Grading Criterion	18
5.	Comparison of Control Flow Grading Criterion	19
6.	Comparison of Addition Grading Criterion	20
7.	Comparison of Overall Posttest Scores	20
8.	Posttest Scores vs. Time of Subject Introduction	22

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Motivation

Multimedia can be used in a variety of learning environments including flipped classrooms, for-credit online university courses and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). In all three environments, multimedia provides a way to deliver educational content without requiring a lecturer or textbook. Popular MOOC providers, such as edX and Coursera, offer a majority of their content through videos, which also embedded quizzes (Mamgain, Sharma, & Goyal, 2014).

This study will look at the effects embedded questions in a multimedia instructional video have on promoting knowledge transfer to a computer programming assignment. The primary motivation behind this study is to determine if adding interactive questions to instructional videos is a worthwhile endeavor for educators who produce their own content.

Background and Review of Literature

Multimedia Learning. While this paper will not directly compare different techniques used to produce effective multimedia content, these techniques form a foundation for the content used in the experiment. To be clear, when this paper refers to multimedia it is referring to the type discussed by Mayer (1997) in which multiple modes of communication are used. This paper focuses utilizes on the combination of auditory communication in the form of narration and visual communication using graphics and text.

Research by Moreno and Mayer (1999) highlights the importance of using multiple modes of communication that do not distract from one another. Part of their experiment compared three different ways of presenting information. Two of the groups were shown text and animation without narration. For one group the text was physically separate from the animation while the other group saw text that was closely integrated with the animation. The third group was shown narrated animation without text.

Three measures were used in the experiment. A verbal retention test was administered and scored based on the number of major ideas recalled. A transfer test was used that contained questions requiring participants to apply information presented in the multimedia content to related scenarios. The third measure was a matching test where participants matched labels with elements. In all three of these measures the highest scoring group was the group given narrated animation. The next highest scores in all measures was the group with text integrated into the animation. The group shown text separated from the animation scored lowest on all three measures.

Recorded multimedia offers a flexible middle ground between books (or text on a webpage) and a real-time instructor lecture (Clark & Mayer, 2016). Books are self-paced, but limited to static text and graphics. Real-time lectures, whether they are in-person or watched online, are paced by the instructor and require students to follow along with the instructor with only one order of content presentation. Multimedia provides the self pacing of a text while allowing for audio present in a lecture and the adding of animation to graphics.

The Testing Effect. The potential effectiveness of including questions as part of course content could be explained by the *testing effect*, which is discussed by Roediger

and Karpicke (2006). *The testing effect* is the effect by which retention of material is generally improved if an individual is tested on it. The theory behind this effect is that the act of retrieval from memory results in improved future recall (Bruchok, Mar, & Craig, 2016; Roediger & Karpicke, 2006). If the effect is strong enough it could improve retention of instructional videos that have questions embedded directly in them.

The Testing Effect with Feedback. In a paper by Butler and Roediger (2008) the advantages and disadvantages of using multiple choice questions in an educational setting are discussed. The most prominent advantage is that they are a practical and reliable way to assess students. The drawback of multiple choice questions is that they introduce incorrect answer choices, which can result in incorrect knowledge being acquired. In this regard, the testing effect is reinforcing the wrong answer. This is where the authors note that feedback comes into play by both helping to correct errors in knowledge and improving retention of knowledge. They put forth that the minimum feedback message should provide the correct answer. It may also present the original question, which is particularly important if there is a delay between the time the question is presented and when the feedback is presented.

The experiment by Butler and Roediger (2008) looked at variances caused by the amount of studying prior to the test (no studying, studying, and restudying), the number of alternative answer choices given (two, four, or six), the type of feedback given (no feedback, immediate feedback, and delayed feedback), and reporting type (free reporting or forced reporting). Of particular interest for this thesis is the effect of feedback on overall performance. Embedding questions within instructional content provides an

excellent opportunity to provide feedback to the student on these questions if it is an effective teaching technique.

The highest proportion of correct responses found in the experiment by Butler and Roediger (2008) resulted from providing delayed feedback, followed by immediate feedback and then no feedback. Overall feedback during testing resulted in increased performance during the posttest. The authors note, however, that without a sufficient amount of studying the amount of misinformation acquired by students by a multiple choice questions increases. Changing the number of alternative answer choices did not result in a significantly lower posttest scores, but scores were worse as the number of answer choices increased.

The Testing Effect with Multimedia. Johnson and Mayer (2009) examined the testing effect in a more practical educational setting of a multimedia lesson. They compared students who studied and then took a retention test with students who studied twice (restudy). The experiment also looked at knowledge transfer from topics covered in the multimedia lesson to the solving of novel problems. Questions in this study include making predictions about the system or modifying the system to achieve a goal.

The study showed that a retention test did improve retention over restudying when used with multimedia as it had with other non-multimedia materials. It also showed that knowledge transfer with educational material can be improved by the testing effect. From a practical standpoint in education this means that testing can be used, not only as a tool for assessment, but also for teaching. The study demonstrated that such quizzes can even target application of knowledge in related problems by including transfer questions.

While Johnson and Mayer (2009) used retention tests after the video, this study focused on how including retention questions embedded within a multimedia lesson would affect problem transfer to solving problem solving. It also varies in that a restudy group will not be used and the comparison will be between having and not having retention testing within the same multimedia video. The questions will also include feedback, which, as previously discussed, provides additional benefits to multiple choice questions.

Problem Statement

The primary question that will be addressed by this thesis is:

Does embedding questions about concepts into instructional videos improve learning outcomes in an applied programming problem where participants write original code?

Based on this question, the hypothesis proposed is the following:

Learners who view an instructional video with questions embedded in it will perform better on a graded programming assignment than those presented a video without embedded questions.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Design and Variables

This experiment used a pretest-posttest control group design (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). Dependent variables being measured were results from pretests and posttests. The pretest measured prior knowledge from prerequisite courses. The posttest measured how successfully participants were able to implement concepts from the instructional video. The primary independent variable was the use of instructional video type, which was either a standard video or an interactive video that included embedded questions about the content being presented. The participants completed the experiment as an individual in-class activity using the Progressive Learning Platform (PLP) tool (PLP, 2016). They were shown one of the two versions of the instructional video on PLP and then they were given a programming assignment as a posttest.

This experiment was run with one control group and one treatment group. Each group completed a pretest and posttest. This allowed conclusions to be drawn about whether including embedded questions in the instructional video had an impact on participant's ability to complete the programming assignment.

Participants

There were 42 participants in the study. Participants in the study were students in an undergraduate course at a research-intensive PhD granting university in the United States of America. The course was required for students of a BS degree program in Software Engineering. Students were a mixture sophomores, juniors, seniors and graduate students. The control group was composed of 20 participants (17 men and 3

women) and the treatment group was composed of 22 participants (19 men and 3 women).

The study was conducted as an in-class activity covering topics that were part of the standard curriculum for this course. This was done to ensure that participants would have similar relevant prior knowledge that would be adequate to prevent floor effects that may have been seen in participants who had no prior domain knowledge.

Materials

Experiment Administration. All aspects of this study, with the exception of the programming assignment attempts, were administered using Blackboard Learn (Blackboard Learn, 2016). Video content was embedded within a timed Blackboard assessment with separate timed assessments used for the pretest and posttest. Timing within the assessments was used to ensure all participants adhered to the time limits at each stage of the study.

Instructional Video. Content for both the control and treatment group was produced from a single instructional video covering the assembly language, PLP, and the software tool used to write and simulate PLP assembly, PLPTool (PLP, 2016). The instructional video contained a mixture of narrated screen recordings showing both PowerPoint presentation slides and a desktop environment showing PLPTool being used. The video begins with a screen recording which shows the program they will write after the video concludes. A high level overview of the purpose of assembly language is given, followed by an introduction of assembly language instructions necessary to complete the study. Each instruction's meaning is introduced along with example usage to present proper syntax. Two code examples, which combine multiple instructions and concepts,

are explained and presented within PLPTool. This was done to explain the relationship between concepts and to demonstrate features of PLPTool.

Principles of effective multimedia were used to explain the concept of memory mapped input/output, which instructors and teaching assistants for CST 250 have observed to be a commonly confusing topic for students. A graphic representation of a CPU and memory bus was shown in the instructional video with individual elements of the graphic added one at a time and explained in the video narration. Figure 1 shows the graphic at several stages of the video.




Figure 1. Instructional video screenshots showing a graphic at four different points during the video as elements are added and explained with narration.

The control group was presented the instructional video as an embedded YouTube video with no interactive features. The treatment group was presented with the same

video through Zaption (Zaption, 2016), which allows embedded activities such as multiple choice questions to be added to standard YouTube videos. Multiple choice questions were added immediately after each new topic.

Figure 1 shows a screenshot of the instructional video as it appears using the Zaption website. In the screenshot the video has reached a point where a multiple choice question is being asked. Zaption has several options regarding how the questions are displayed to the user. For consistency, all questions in the instructional video were presented to the right of the video, which is the default display setting. Other options for displaying questions include showing questions to the left of the video and in the center covering the video. Feedback text replaces the question in the region to the right of the video immediately after clicking the “submit” button. Feedback for each question included the correct answer and an explanation of why that answer was correct. If an incorrect answer was given it also explained why the answer selected was incorrect. A comparison of the effect of displaying questions in different positions for same instructional video is a potential topic of future research.




Figure 2. Zaption video screenshot with an embedded question displayed

Programming Assignment Description. A description of the program requirements was created to present to the students on Blackboard during the programming assignment portion of the experiment. This description gave details about how the program should function when complete. It also included two elements meant to mimic a subset of the materials a student might use while working on a similar project during CST 250. The first element was a reference table containing example usages of the assembly language instructions covered in the video and a description of the meaning of this instruction. This table is similar to a table provided in the documentation for PLP. The second element is a figure taken from the instructional video that covers features of the PLPTool user interface needed to test the program.

The program participants were asked to implement counts up indefinitely starting from zero using a loop. Each time the counter is increased the value of the counter is represented in binary using an array of LEDs (Light Emitting Diodes). The program description, which contains a more technically description of what is required to accomplish this, is provided in Appendix B. An example solution program can be found in Appendix C.

Measures

Pretest. A pretest was used to determine successful randomization of participants (see Appendix A for pretest questions). The pretest is designed to measure prior knowledge and does not directly test content presented in the study in order to avoid sensitizing participants. It contains four short answer question and two multiple choice questions.

The first four questions are targeting knowledge covered in the course participants were recruited from. The first two questions cover number representations and require not only conceptual knowledge, but application to determine the correct value. The first is a multiple choice question, but provides a “none of the above option”. The second is a short answer question that asks the participant to convert a value from decimal to hexadecimal representation. The next two questions cover Boolean operators and also require participants to apply a procedure.

The last two questions are targeted at identifying potential outliers who may have already had experience with topics related to those in this study such as computer microarchitecture. The first of these questions is a short answer question where the concept being tested is whether the participant understands the limitations of a processor in handling numbers that are larger than its registers. The last question is a multiple choice question to determine if the participant is already familiar with memory mapped input/output, which is an underlying principle in the programming assignment.

Posttest. Participant performance was measured using a programming assignment that combines all of the instructions and concepts covered in the instructional video. Programming assignments were scored based on whether they met functional requirements given in the assignment description. Descriptions that were given to participants and requirements used to score the programs can be found in Appendix B. A sample solution for the programming assignment and the rubric used to score programs can be found in Appendix C and Appendix D, respectively.

Procedure

Participants first completed a 10-minute pretest in which concepts important to understand content in the study were tested, followed by a 20-minute instructional video. Next each participant was allowed 25 minutes to make an attempt at the programming assignment.

CHAPTER 3

PILOT STUDIES

Two pilot studies were conducted primarily as usability studies. The main concerns before running the final experiment were if participants would be able complete all the tasks in the study during the given amount of time and if all content critical to the completion of the programming assignment was adequately addressed.

Participants

Both pilot studies were run with participants from online students from the same university in courses that are prerequisites for the course from which material in this study is drawn from. These online courses were chosen in order to have sample populations with experience and knowledge similar to participants in the final experiment.

Materials

The only changes in material between the pilot studies and the final thesis experiment were the use of Qualtrics (Qualtrics, 2016) for administration instead of Blackboard and the modifications made to the instructional video to match adjustments made to the programming assignment. Qualtrics is a professional online data collection platform commonly used to conduct research and customer surveys. Changes to the programming assignment between the two pilot studies and rationale for doing so is detailed below.

First Pilot Study. While designing instructional content for this study, there was some uncertainty about the concepts and scope of the programming assignment because programs are typically assigned as projects that span multiple days or weeks rather than a

single class period. The results from the first pilot study showed that the programming assignment was too challenging to complete in the given amount of time for the target participants. Considerable floor effects were seen in programs submitted. Only half of the 28 participants in the first pilot study submitted assembly code.

A reference table was provided during the programming assignment with example usage of the assembly instructions needed to complete the assignment, given in the same order they were presented in the instructional video. Example usages of the assembly instructions were arbitrary and would not produce the required behavior without modification as described in the instructional video. Despite this, it was common to see programs composed of lines that had been copied and pasted from the reference table examples with no modification. In some of these instances the order of the instructions in a submitted program was also the same as the ordering of the examples in the reference table.

Second Pilot Study. A simpler programming assignment was designed for the second pilot study, which did not require the use of one assembly instruction from the previous assignment. This modification had the desired result of reducing the floor effect and allowing more variability in programming assignment scores. This simplified programming assignment and the instructional video corresponding to this change were used for the thesis experiment in this study.

Measures

The first pilot study programming assignments was scored using a rubric similar to the rubric used in the final thesis experiment (see Appendix D), but with one more grading criterion for the additional required assembly instruction. The second pilot study,

which had the same programming assignment as the final thesis experiment, used the same rubric as the final thesis experiment.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Posttest Results

Two outliers, one from each treatment group, were removed due to adherence problems. One participant did not submit a program file and the other submitted an empty program file (the program only contained the project header that is added when a new project is created). Both submissions were coded with zero points for all grading criteria and were subsequently removed from the data set before performing quantitative analysis.

Table 1 shows the mean score and standard deviation for each of the four grading criteria. On the left are the results for participants in the control group and on the right are the results for participants in the treatment group. The final row shows the mean and standard deviation for the overall score on the posttest.

Table 1.
Posttest Results

Grading Criteria	Treatment Condition			
	Control Group		Treatment Group	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Load Immediate	.90	.13	.93	.11
Store Word	.78	.38	.67	.42
Control Flow	.90	.26	1.00	.00
Addition	.95	.15	.97	.12
Overall Score	3.53	0.58	3.57	0.55

Quantitative Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed to compare differences between each of the groups for each grading criterion and for their overall posttest scores. An α level of .1 was used in the analyses to determine significance in order to account for the one tailed (directional) hypothesis and predictions (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2015). Analysis also includes Cohen's d measurements of effect size. Effect sizes indicate the strength of an effect with larger numbers indicating stronger effects. In general, a Cohen's d effect size of .2 is considered small, .5 is a medium effect size, and .8 and above is a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). It should be noted that effect sizes are sensitive to the variability in the data and increases in environmental noise (uncontrollable events) can reduce the effect size (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). The natural classroom setting used in this experiment will, as a result, have a tendency towards smaller observed effect sizes.

Load Immediate. A t-test was conducted on the average scores for the *load immediate* grading criterion to determine if there was a difference in scores between participants who viewed the standard video and the interactive video. The test did not reveal a statistically significant difference, but there was a small effect size in the predicted direction ($t(40) = 0.861, p = .4; d = 0.25$). The observed mean was $M=.90$; $SD=.13$ for control group and $M=.93$; $SD=.11$ for the treatment group.




Figure 3. Comparison of *load immediate* grading criterion for control and treatment groups

Store Word. A t-test was conducted on the average scores for the *store word* grading criterion to determine if there was a difference in scores between participants who viewed the standard video and the interactive video. The test did not reveal a statistically significant difference, but there was a small effect size in the opposite direction from what was predicted resulting in a negative effect size ($t(40) = 0.845, p = .4; d = -0.27$). The observed mean was $M=.78; SD=.38$ for control group and $M=.67; SD=.42$ for the treatment group.




Figure 4. Comparison of *store word* grading criterion for control and treatment groups

Control Flow. A t-test was conducted on the average scores for the *control flow* grading criterion to determine if there was a difference in scores between participants who viewed the standard video and the interactive video. The test revealed a statistically significant difference with a medium effect size in the predicted direction ($t(19) = 1.710$, $p = .1$; $d = 0.54$). The observed mean was $M=.90$; $SD=.26$ for control group and $M=1.00$; $SD=.00$ for the treatment group. The significance most likely would have been higher had it not been for a ceiling effect. Every participant in the treatment group earned full points on this criterion.




Figure 5. Comparison of *control flow* grading criterion for control and treatment groups

Addition. A t-test was conducted on the average scores for the *addition* grading criterion to determine if there was a difference in scores between participants who viewed the standard video and the interactive video. The test did not reveal a statistically significant difference and the effect size did not reach a small level, but the effect was in the predicted direction ($t(40) = 0.379$, $p = .7$; $d = 0.15$). The observed mean was $M=.95$; $SD=.15$ for control group and $M=.97$; $SD=.12$ for the treatment group.




Figure 6. Comparison of *addition* grading criterion for control and treatment groups

Overall. A t-test was conducted on the average total posttest scores to determine if there was a difference in scores between participants who viewed the standard video and the interactive video. The test did not reveal a statistically significant difference, but there was a small effect size in the predicted direction ($t(40) = 0.246, p = .81; d = 0.23$). The observed mean was $M=3.53; SD=0.58$ for control group and $M=3.57; SD=0.55$ for the treatment group.




Figure 7. Comparison of overall posttest score for control and treatment groups

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In most cases, with the exception being the *store word* instruction, the data shows that embedding questions in an instructional video result in small improvements in learner performance compared to the presentation of the same video without embedded questions. The effect sizes were not as strong as they might have been in a laboratory setting, which is to be expected, but they were present in the predicted direction. In the case of *control flow* instructions, the medium effect size was large enough to produce ceiling effects in the treatment group with all participants earning the maximum possible score. While the overall results were not conclusive, they do warrant further research.

While reviewing the mean scores for the grading criteria a plausible explanation was observed for the relatively low mean score by both groups for the *store word* grading criterion. According to the serial position effect, subjects are most likely to remember information mentioned earlier on due to the primacy effect and information mentioned towards the end due to the recency effect (Rundus, 1971). This results in a U-shaped curve with information closest to the beginning or end having the highest probability of being recalled and information toward the middle having a lower probability of being recalled.

Figure 6 shows the mean score for both groups at the time in the instructional video when the presentation of information related to each grading criterion begins. The start and end times of the video have been plotted with a mean score of 1 to show the general trend and its similarity to the serial position effect, however no posttest measurements were taken at these points in time. From this figure, it can be seen that

material related to the *store word* grading criterion began toward the middle of the instructional video, which is where mean scores are also the lowest compared to other criteria.




Figure 8. Posttest scores vs. time of subject introduction

Topics related to the *store word* criterion are arguably some of the more challenging topics covered in the instructional video, in part because they build on previous topics. Content in the instructional video was arranged in this order because it made the most sense to build concepts on top of one another, but unfortunately this led to the unintended consequence of placing this information where it was least likely to be recalled. Small considerations like this demonstrate how complex and challenging it can be to generate effective instructional content based on available research findings. These

challenges are well documented and many researchers have put forth suggestions to help bridge the gap between evidence based practices and practices used in engineering classrooms (Besterfield- Sacre, Cox, Borrego, Beddoes, & Zhu, 2014; Feser, Borrego, Pimmel, & Della-Piana, 2012; Henderson & Dancy, 2007; Henderson, Finkelstein, & Beach, 2010; Sohoni & Craig, 2016).

Mayer's (2002) work on cognitive theory in multimedia suggests that one challenge students may face when presented questions embedded within a video is the added load to working memory. Quickly switching from watching and listening to a video to reading and thinking about a question may overload a student's working memory. From this perspective, the questions would serve as a distraction, much as separated text and graphics were distracting in the work done by Moreno and Mayer (1999). Alternatively, the switch from watching and listening to interacting could be preventing the overloading of working memory by taking reducing the amount of new information presented to the student at one time and requiring the retrieval of memory (i.e. the *testing effect*).

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This paper compares the performance between learners in two groups. One group watched an instructional video without any interactive content and the other group watched the same instructional video, which had been augmented with embedded questions. The results warrant further research after findings indicate that some improvements can be seen from learners when questions with feedback are embedded within instructional content. This finding means it may be worthwhile for instructional content creators, particularly those in the domains that teach computer programming, to include embedded questions and feedback in their instructional videos.

CHAPTER 7

FUTURE WORK

In this study only quantitative data was collected and analyzed. In a future study qualitative data could be collected including process data and student preferences. This data could reveal what parts of an instructional video work and what happens when participants were struggling.

Alternative services to Zaption could also be explored. Other services that allow for the creation of interactive instructional content may provide different tools, ways of presenting questions, and ways of providing feedback. These variations could potentially offer improved effectiveness of instructional videos with embedded questions.

REFERENCES

- Besterfield- Sacre, M., Cox, M. F., Borrego, M., Beddoes, K., & Zhu, J. (2014). Changing engineering education: Views of US faculty, chairs, and deans. *Journal of Engineering Education, 103*(2), 193-219.
- Blackboard Learn. (2016). The Blackboard Learn Website. Retrieved from <http://www.blackboard.com/learning-management-system/blackboard-learn.aspx>
- Bruchok, C.M., Mar, C. & Craig, S.D. (2016). Is Free Recall Active: The Testing Effect through the ICAP Lens. In *Proceedings of E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education 2016* (pp. 325-339). Chesapeake, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Butler, A. C., & Roediger, H. L. (2008). Feedback enhances the positive effects and reduces the negative effects of multiple-choice testing. *Memory & Cognition, 36*(3), 604-616.
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *E-learning and the science of instruction: proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (second ed.)*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates:Hillsdale, NJ.
- Feser, J., Borrego, M., Pimmel, R., & Della-Piana, C. (2012). Results from a survey of National Science Foundation Transforming Undergraduate Education in STEM (TUES) program reviewers. In *ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, San Antonio, TX*.
- Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2016). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Cengage Learning.
- Henderson, C., & Dancy, M. H. (2007). Barriers to the use of research-based instructional strategies: The influence of both individual and situational characteristics. *Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research, 3*(2), 020102.
- Henderson, C., Finkelstein, N., & Beach, A. (2010). Beyond dissemination in college science teaching: An introduction to four core change strategies. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 39*(5), 18-25.
- Johnson, C. I., & Mayer, R. E. (2009). A testing effect with multimedia learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(3), 621.

- Mamgain, N., Sharma, A., & Goyal, P. (2014). Learner's perspective on video-viewing features offered by MOOC providers: Coursera and edX. In *MOOC, Innovation and Technology in Education (MITE), 2014 IEEE International Conference on* (pp. 331-336). IEEE.
- Mayer, R. E. (1997). Multimedia learning: Are we asking the right questions?. *Educational Psychologist, 32*(1), 1-19.
- Mayer, R. E. (2002). Cognitive theory and the design of multimedia instruction: an example of the two- way street between cognition and instruction. *New directions for teaching and learning, 2002*(89), 55-71.
- Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (1999). Cognitive principles of multimedia learning: The role of modality and contiguity. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(2), 358.
- PLP. (2016). The Progressive Learning Platform Website. Retrieved from <https://plp.asu.edu/>
- Qualtrics. (2016). The Qualtrics Website. Retrieved from www.qualtrics.com
- Roediger, H. L., & Karpicke, J. D. (2006). The power of testing memory: Basic research and implications for educational practice. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*(3), 181-210.
- Rundus, D. (1971). Analysis of rehearsal processes in free recall. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 89*(1), 63.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference. *Wadsworth Cengage learning*.
- Sohoni, S., & Craig, S. D. (2016). Making the case for adopting and evaluating innovative pedagogical techniques in engineering classrooms. *ASEE Annual Conference and Expo*. New Orleans, LA.
- Zaption. (2016). The Zaption Website. Retrieved from www.zaption.com

APPENDIX A
PRETEST QUESTIONS

1. A state machine with 2 state bits has how many possible states?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- None of the above

2. Convert 255 in decimal to Hexadecimal.

3. What is the result, in binary, of the following bitwise operation (both values represented in binary):

0110 AND 0011

4. What is the result, in binary, of the following bitwise operation (both values represented in binary):

0110 OR 0011

5. What is memory-mapped input/output?

- Input/output devices can directly read and write any memory location.
- Input/output devices are given specific memory locations to use for their own storage.
- Input/output devices are accessed using addresses in the memory address space.
- Input and output devices are accessed using special instructions and are accessed through a bus that is separate from the memory bus.


6. Please explain why a 32-bit processor will or will not be able to correctly add the numbers 1241390809987 and 378902930.

APPENDIX B
PROGRAMMING ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION


As covered in the instructional video, your task is to write a program in assembly that counts up by one from zero inside a loop and continuously writes this value to the LEDs (within the loop). The memory address of the LEDs is 0xf0200000. The table below shows the instructions covered in the video as well as their meaning. When you are done with your program, please upload your PLP project file at the bottom of this page.

Instruction	Meaning
li \$t0, 8	Register \$t0 is set to the value, 8.
sw \$t2, 0(\$t1)	The value in register \$t1 is used as the memory address. The value in register \$t2 is copied into this memory address.
addiu \$t4, \$t3, 29	Register \$t4 is assigned the sum of 29 and the value in register \$t3.
j <i>your_label_name</i>	The program jumps to the line following the label, " <i>your_label_name</i> ".
<i>your_label_name</i> :	Defines a label called " <i>your_label_name</i> :" that can be jumped to.

The image below shows the buttons that will allow you to enter simulation mode, view the LEDs, and run your program. Remember that you can't edit your program while in simulation mode and the run and LED buttons will not be available while not in simulation mode.



After the loop in your program has iterated 10 times the LED panel should look like the one below. Note that the LED panel also shows the value being displayed in hexadecimal, which is 0xa (equivalent to the decimal value, 10).



APPENDIX C

PROGRAMMING ASSIGNMENT EXAMPLE SOLUTION

Below is the program that was simulated to demonstrate the required output during the instructional video and is one possible approach to the programming assignment given in Appendix B.

```
1  .org 0x10000000
2
3  li $t0, 0xf0200000
4  loop:
5      addiu $t1, $t1, 1
6      sw $t1, 0($t0)
7      j loop
```

APPENDIX D
PROGRAMMING ASSIGNMENT RUBRIC

Levels of Achievement

Grading Criteria	1 point	0.75 points	0.5 points	0 points
Load Immediate	Load immediate used to assign meaningful value to registers	Load immediate instruction usage contains minor syntax error	Load immediate instruction usage contains major syntax error	Load immediate instruction not used
Store Word	LEDs are correctly written to using store word instruction.	Store word implementation contains minor flaws	Store word implementation contains major flaws	Store word instruction not used.
Control Flow	Jump and label used correctly for desired single infinite loop.	Jump and label contain minor flaws in syntax or implementation	Jump and label contain major flaws in syntax or implementation	Required control flow instructions missing.
Addition	Add instruction used correctly to increment a single register	Add instruction contains minor flaws in syntax or implementation.	Add instruction contains major flaws in syntax or implementation.	Add instruction not used.