*

:

:   (93)
.   :   (   )   :
            (0.78)

                                                        :   .(Kendall's tau-*b*)

                                                                                                        .

.   :

(Abdul-Hamid,   **.1**
                                    .2002)

                                                                                                .

                                                                                                        −

                                                                                                            −

                                                                                        (Information Superhighway)
            .(Moneta and Moneta, 2002: 433)   .
                            "   (Nichols, 2003: 2)

                        (Web-based)
."(Web-capable)   (Web-distributed)   (Learning-on-
"   (Govindasamy, 2002: 287)   demand)

                                                                                                            *
                                                                        .
            ."CD-ROM"
                                                                            .2006/2/8   2005/5/17

:   (NASBE, 2001)

1-

3-

2-

3-

( )

4-

5-

6-

(The Web-based Education Commission, 2001)

:

(Farmer and

Hargrave, 2000; University of South Australia, 2002;

NASBE, 2001; Boling, 2002)

:

1-

2-

(ICDL)   (Bork, 2001)

(   )   :

-1

-2

-3   -3

(cognitive overload)   .

-4

-5

-4

(University of California, 2002)

:

-5   -1

-2

-6   .

-3
-4

-7

-5

(Preece, 1993)   .   -6
:   (2001   )

:

:   .   -1
-2

:

(Semler, 2001)

.   -   :

.   -

(E-Learning   /

Competency Centre, National Institute of Education,   (Whitlock, 2001)   /

Singapore, 2002)   :

:

:

:

.   .   (   )

:

:   (Lisa, Elliot, Grant,

:   :   -1   Holschuh, Kim, Lauber, Loly and Reeves, 2001)

:   :

:

.   .

:   -2   :

:   -

.

.   -

:   -3   .

.   -

:   -4   .

.   -

.   .   -

:   .   -

(   )   (   )   :   .   -

.   -

.   .   -

.   .   -

(Manzo, 2002)   .   -

.   -

:   .   -

)   .   -

(.   -

(   )   -

(   )   .   -

.   .   -

:
)

(:
.   :   -1
(European   Learning   .   (   )
Consultant Analysts, 2002)   -2

.   :   -3
The European
Training Village (ETV)   .
%1   .

%5   .
%33   :   -4
%15   %46
.   .
:   -5
:   (   )
.   -1   .
-2
(Florida Gulf Coast University, 2002)
.   -3
:   :
.   -4
(Wright, 2003)
:   .

.
.   (138)
(Elisabeth   and   .
Economides, 003)

.

(124)
(5-0)   )
(   )   (
(   )

.

.   :

                                                                          :

                                                                                       -

)

                                         (

)

:   .(

                                                                                       -

.   .

                                                                                       -

)

                                    .(

                                 .   -

                                                   .

                                     (Advanced

.   Distributed Learning ADL, 2005)

)

The Sharable Courseware   (

                                Object Reference Model (SCORM)

:   .   (2000)

                                                                     :

                                              (Overview)   -1

                                                             .

                        Content Aggregation Model   -2

:   (CAM)

                -1   )

.   .   (

                -2   Run Time Environment (RTE)   -3

                                                         .

                -3   .

                        Sequencing and Navigation (SN)   -4

                                    (2004)

.

:

.

:

(Elisabeth and Economides, 2003); (E-Learning   :
Competency Centre, 2002); (Sonwalkar, 2002); (Manzo,
2002); (Wright, 2003); (SCORM, 2004); (Whitlock,
2001); (Semler, 2001); (Florida Gulf Coast University,
2002)

:

.

:   :   :

:

:   –

.

.   –   .   (93)

.   –   :

.   –

:   :   .

:   (   )

.   –

.   –   :

.   –

.   –

.   –

.   .

.   –

:   :   :

.   –

.   –

.   –

.

(   )   :

.2

:

:

(Item Pool)

:

(143)

.

(1)

27		:
5		
12		
2		
3		
49		
11		:
4		
5		
7		
2		
2		
31		
5		:
4		
4		
13		
93		

:   -   .

:   -   .

-1   -2

:   70%

(93)   .

(1)

.

:

.   :

(   )   :   -1   (www.al-islam.com)

-         .

-        .   .

-        .   -2

-        .

:

:

(●)

.(%80) (74) (

●

(73-46)

.(%79-%50)

● .

(45) -3

.(%50) (Kendall's tau-b)

: (Cooper and Schindler, 1998:233)

$$\tau b = \frac{P - Q}{\sqrt{(P + Q + Tx)(P + Q + Ty)}}$$

. $= Tx$

. $= Ty$

.( ) $= P$

.(Kendall and Jean, 1990) $= Q$

(0.78)

.

. **.3**

: :

: :

- :

: ● :

. . : ●

- . :

:

( ) ●

( ) ●

. . :

- . .(93-0)

.

Lisa, B., Elliot, D. Grant, M., Holschuh, D., Kim, B., Kim, H., Lauber, E., Loh, S. and Reeves, T. 2001. *Heuristic Evaluation Instrument and Protocol for E-Learning Programs*. Available: http://useit.com/papers/heuristic/.

Manzo, K. 2002. *Sizing UP Online Content*. Education Week in Web. 35 (12): 37-38 Available: http://www.edweek.org/sreports/tc02/article.

Moneta, S. and Moneta, G. 2002. E-learning in Hong Kong: Comparing Learning Outcomes in Online Multimedia and Lecture Versions of an Introductory Computing Course. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 4 (33): 432-443.

NASBE. 2001. *Any Time, Any Where, Any Path, Any Pace: Taking the Lead on E-learning Policy.*

Nichols, M. 2003. A Theory for E-learning. *Educational Technology and Society*, 2 (6): 1-10.

Preece, J. 1993. Hypermedia, Multimedia and Human Factors. In, *Interactive Multimedia,* London: Kogan: 135-149.

Semler, S. 2001. Criteria for Evaluating Learning Technology. *Learning Safari.* Available at: http://www.learningsim.com/print.asp? ID=5914.

The Web-based Education Commission. 2001. *The Power of the Internet for Learning: Moving from Promise to Practice.*

University of California. 2002. The California Virtual School Report, Available at: www.edpath.com/images/VHSReport.pdf.

Whitlock, Quentin. 2001. Course Design for Online Learning- What's Gone Wrong?: 182-191. *Teaching and Learning Online-Pedagogies for new Technologies*, Edited by: John Stephenson, Kogan Page Limited, London.

Wright, C. 2003. *Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of Online Courses.* Grant MacEwan College Edmonton, Alberta. Available at: http://www.imd.macewan.ca/imd/documents/online Evaluating.doc.

2001

)

(

www.najah.edu/Arabic_texct/

.InternetCon/internet1.htm

Abdul-Hamid, A. 2002. E-Learning: Is It the "E" or the Learning that Matters? *Internet and Higher Education,* 4: 311-316.

Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL). 2005. SCORM, Available at: www.adlnet.org.

Boling, J. 2002. *How Does an Online Professional Development Program Support Teacher Change*? PhD. Dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi.

Bork, A. 2001. What is Needed for Effective Learning on the Internet? *Educational Technology and Society*, 3 (4): 139-144.

Cooper, D. and Schindler, S. 1998. *Business Research Methods*, 6th ed., Boston, US: McGraw-Hill.

E-Learning Competency Centre, National Institute of Education, Singapore. 2002. *Quality Criteria for E-Learning Courseware.*

Elisabeth, G. and Economides, A. 2003. An Evaluation Instrument for Hypermedia Courseware. *Journal of Educational Technology and Society*, 2 (6): 31-44.

European E-Learning Consultant Analyst. 2002. *Quality and E-Learning in Europe*, Survey Report, Available: www.elearningae.co.uk.

Farmer, A. and Hargrave, S. 2000. Internet Usage in Education. *Technological Horizon in Education (THE).* 27 (10): 33-39.

Govindasamy, T. 2002. Successful Implementation of E-Learning Pedagogical Considerations. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 3-4 (4): 287-299.

Kendall, M. and Jean, D. 1990. *Rank Correlation Methods*, Fifth Edition. NY: Oxford Univ. Press, ISBN: 0195208374.

Establishing a Measure to Evaluate Electronic Learning Sites in Islamic Education for the Secondary Stage

Naser A. Al-Khawaldeh and Majdi S. Al-Mashalah*

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at developing a measure, by providing clear criteria, to evaluate electronic learning sites in Islamic Education for the secondary stage. The main question of the study was:

What are the criteria to evaluate electronic learning sites in Islamic Education for the secondary stage?

The measure was composed of three categories; First: instructional design criteria, second: instructional media design criteria (site components), and third: support services. The measure consisted of (93) criteria with a reliability coefficient of (0.78) by using (Kendall's tau-*b*) coefficient. The validity was measured through a panel of (40) referees. Some implications and recommendations were suggested.

Keywords: Measure, Evaluate, Electronic Learning, Islamic Education, E-learning Sites, Criteria.

---

* Department of Curricula and Instruction, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Jordan; and Ministry of Education, Amman, Jordan. Received on 17/5/2005 and Accepted for Publication on 8/2/2006.