



**Faculty of Information and Communication Technology**

**DEVELOPMENT OF FRAMEWORK TO ENGAGE STUDENT'S  
LEARNING IN TECHNICAL MOOC USING WEARABLE  
TECHNOLOGY**

**Siti Feirusz binti Ahmad Fesol**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**2019**

**DEVELOPMENT OF FRAMEWORK TO ENGAGE STUDENT'S LEARNING IN  
TECHNICAL MOOC USING WEARABLE TECHNOLOGY**

**SITI FEIRUSZ BINTI AHMAD FESOL**

**A thesis submitted  
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**Faculty of Information and Communication Technology**

**UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA**

**2019**

## DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled “Development of Framework to Engage Student’s Learning in Technical MOOC Using Wearable Technology” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature : .....

Name : SITI FEIRUSZ BINTI AHMAD FESOL

Date : .....

## **APPROVAL**

I hereby declare that I have read this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signature : .....

Supervisor Name : PROF. TS. DR. SAZILAH BINTI SALAM

Date : .....

## **DEDICATION**

### ***Dear God***

*I devoted my life and death to You. May my life be within your guidance.*

### ***Dear Mum and Dad***

*Thank you for your sacrifice, prayer and endless love. There is no retaliation except God.*

### ***Dear beloved Husband and Children***

*Thank you for your continuous love, support, patience and encouragement that give me the strength to finish this study. May God bless us, guide us and protect us to be a good person.*

### ***Dear Supervisors***

*Thank you for all the knowledge and guidance throughout this journey. May God blessed you all.*

### ***Dear Siblings***

*Thank you for your motivation and love.*

### ***Dear Friends***

*Thank you for all the knowledge, guide and encouragement and love. May our friendship last forever and blessed by God.*

## ABSTRACT

The low completion rate issue in MOOC has become one of the main highlights by researchers. It is reported that only 10 to 15 per cent of the students able to complete the MOOC. This low completion rate was due to the students are less engaged with the MOOC content causing them to demotivate to complete the whole MOOC. Engaging students in a MOOC environment especially for non-technical subjects was achievable. However, for a technical MOOC it involved significant challenges. Researches highlighted that one of the requirements for designing an engaging practice-based MOOC or technical MOOC is to include practice-oriented learning mode into its course structure. Therefore, the aim of this study is to develop a framework to engage student's learning in technical MOOC using wearable technology. This study adopted the case study methodology approach with qualitative and quantitative analysis which conducted at UTeM. The instruments used in this study include technical MOOC, wearable technology, and student engagement items. A total of 375 engineering students involved in this study and the data were analysed using descriptive and parametric testing. The survey results reflected that the learning materials produced by wearable technology do contribute towards positive effect in increasing the level of student's engagement with the learning process. Among key recommendations for future study are to implement the proposed framework to design and develop other engineering and technical courses and to further explore other potential elements of wearable technology to enhance student engagement in online learning.

## **ABSTRAK**

*Isu kadar penyelesaian yang rendah di MOOC telah menjadi salah satu penonjolan utama oleh penyelidik. Dilaporkan bahawa hanya 10 hingga 15 peratus pelajar dapat melengkapkan MOOC. Kadar penyelesaian yang rendah ini disebabkan oleh pelajar kurang terlibat dengan kandungan MOOC yang menyebabkan mereka kurang bermotivasi untuk menyelesaikan keseluruhan MOOC. Melibatkan pelajar dalam persekitaran MOOC terutama untuk subjek bukan teknikal adalah sangat sesuai. Walau bagaimanapun, untuk MOOC teknikal ia melibatkan cabaran yang ketara. Penyelidikan menekankan bahawa salah satu keperluan untuk merekabentuk MOOC berasaskan praktik yang berpangkalan atau MOOC teknikal adalah untuk memasukkan mod pembelajaran berorientasikan latihan ke dalam struktur kursusnya. Oleh itu, matlamat kajian ini adalah untuk membangunkan rangka kerja untuk melibatkan pembelajaran pelajar dalam MOOC teknikal menggunakan teknologi boleh dipakai. Kajian ini menggunakan pendekatan metodologi kajian kes dengan analisis kualitatif dan kuantitatif yang dijalankan di UTeM. Instrumen yang digunakan dalam kajian ini termasuk MOOC teknikal, teknologi boleh dipakai dan penglibatan pelajar. Sejumlah 375 pelajar kejuruteraan yang terlibat dalam kajian ini dan data dianalisis menggunakan ujian deskriptif dan parametrik. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa bahan pembelajaran yang dihasilkan oleh teknologi boleh dipakai menyumbang kepada kesan positif dalam meningkatkan tahap penglibatan pelajar dengan proses pembelajaran. Antara cadangan utama untuk kajian masa hadapan adalah untuk melaksanakan rangka kerja yang dicadangkan untuk merekabentuk dan membangunkan kursus kejuruteraan dan teknikal lain dan untuk meneroka lagi potensi lain teknologi boleh dipakai untuk meningkatkan penglibatan pelajar dalam pembelajaran atas talian.*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisors Professor Ts. Dr. Sazilah binti Salam and Professor Madya Dr. Norasiken binti Bakar for their valuable personal and professional guidance. Their wealth of knowledge, continuous advice, and encouragement has made my doctoral endeavour all possible.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Aliza binti Che Amran, Mrs. Intan Mastura binti Saadon, Mrs. Amalia Aida binti Abd Halim, Mrs. Emy Zairah binti Ahmad, and Mrs. Nurbahirah binti Nordin for their valuable advice and support throughout the prototype design, development and testing activities involved in this study.

I gratefully acknowledge the funding received towards my PhD from the Centre for Graduate Studies, UTeM under UTeM Zamalah Scheme.

I also acknowledge with deep sense of reverence, my gratitude towards my parents Mrs. Siti Noliah binti Osman and Mr. Ahmad Fesol bin Osman, my beloved husband Mr. Muhammad Hanif bin Abdul Azis, my children Hadi and Muhammad Hafy, and member of my family, who has always supported me morally as well as economically.

At last but not least gratitude goes to all my friends who directly and indirectly helped me to complete this study.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>DECLARATION</b>	
<b>APPROVAL</b>	
<b>DEDICATION</b>	
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	i
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	ii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	iii
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	iv
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	vii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xi
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	xvi
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xvii
<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>	xix
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Research overview	1
1.2 Background of study	3
1.3 Preliminary study	6
1.3.1 Identify technical students' learning style preference	7
1.3.2 Current engagement tools used in teaching and learning	8
1.3.3 Lecturers' perception on wearable technology in teaching and learning	9
1.3.4 Subject chosen for MOOC teaching	10
1.4 Research problems	11
1.5 Research objectives	15
1.6 Research questions	15
1.7 Research hypothesis	16
1.8 Research approach	18
1.9 Research scope	20
1.10 Significant of study	21
1.11 Research contribution	21
1.12 Definition of terms	22
1.13 Thesis organisation	25
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>26</b>
2.1 Introduction	26
2.2 Learning style	27
2.2.1 Learning style models	28
2.2.1.1 Kolb experiential learning theory	29
2.2.1.2 Honey and Mumford learning styles	32
2.2.1.3 Gregorc learning style model	35
2.2.1.4 Dunn and Dunn learning style model	37
2.2.1.5 Neil Fleming's learning style model	39
2.2.2 Gen-Y preferred learning style	42
2.2.3 The implication of learning style to the research	44
2.3 Massive Open Online Course (MOOC)	46
2.3.1 MOOC classification	48

2.3.2	MOOC retention dimensions	51
2.3.3	MOOC and technology engagement tools	56
2.3.4	MOOC and video production	60
2.3.5	The implication of MOOC to the research	63
2.4	Instructional design	64
2.4.1	Gagne's nine events of instructions	65
2.4.2	Merrill's principles of instruction	68
2.4.3	ADDIE model	71
2.4.4	Dick and Carey model	73
2.4.5	The implication of learning design to the research	75
2.5	Wearable technology	76
2.5.1	History of wearable technology	77
2.5.2	Application of wearable technology	78
2.5.2.1	Wearable technology in healthcare and medical	79
2.5.2.2	Wearable technology in oil and gas industry	81
2.5.2.3	Wearable technology in manufacturing industry	82
2.5.2.4	Wearable technology in education	83
2.5.3	Feasibility study of action camera	88
2.5.4	Wearable technology dimensions	92
2.5.5	The implication of learning design to the research	96
2.6	Student engagement	97
2.6.1	Student engagement and learning outcomes	98
2.6.2	Student engagement instruments	101
2.6.3	Student engagement assessment	103
2.6.4	The implication of student engagement to the research	104
2.7	Summary	108
<b>3.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>110</b>
3.1	Introduction	110
3.2	Research design	111
3.2.1	Purpose of study and type of investigation	111
3.2.2	Study setting	114
3.2.3	Population of study	114
3.2.4	Time horizon	115
3.2.5	Unit of analysis	115
3.3	Theoretical framework	115
3.3.1	Independent variables (IV)	116
3.3.2	Dependent variable (DV)	117
3.3.3	Moderator variable (MV)	118
3.4	Development of PEE MOOC	118
3.4.1	Analysis phase	122
3.4.2	Design phase	126
3.4.2.1	MOOC E-Content design	132
3.4.2.2	MOOC E-Activity design	137
3.4.2.3	Wearable technology learning materials design	140
3.4.2.4	MOOC assessment	142
3.4.2.5	Summary of technical MOOC learning materials	142
3.4.3	Development phase	143
3.4.3.1	Technology-assisted tools used	143
3.4.3.2	Finalized of PEE MOOC prototype	145

3.4.3.3	Finalized of circuit training glassware prototype	149
3.4.3.4	PEE MOOC testing	150
3.4.4	Implementation phase	151
3.4.4.1	Training session	152
3.4.5	Evaluation phase	152
3.4.5.1	First evaluation stage	153
3.4.5.2	Second evaluation stage – pilot testing	154
3.5	Population and sampling	155
3.5.1	Respondents for the preliminary study	155
3.5.2	Respondents for pilot testing	157
3.5.3	Respondents for final testing	157
3.6	Research instrument and measurement	159
3.6.1	Pre-post-test	159
3.6.2	Technical MOOC survey	159
3.7	Data collection method	164
3.7.1	Data collection for the preliminary study	164
3.7.2	Data collection for pilot and final testing	165
3.8	Data analysis techniques	166
3.8.1	Reliability test	166
3.8.2	Validity test	167
3.8.3	Assumption test	169
3.8.4	Parametric test: Pearson product-moment correlation analysis	172
3.8.5	Parametric test: Multiple regression analysis	173
3.9	Summary	176
<b>4.</b>	<b>ANALYSIS AND RESULT</b>	<b>177</b>
4.1	Introduction	177
4.2	Preliminary results	177
4.2.1	Identify students' preferred learning style	178
4.2.2	Current engagement tools used in teaching and learning	180
4.2.3	Lecturers' perception on wearable technology in teaching and learning	183
4.2.4	Subject chosen for mooc teaching	184
4.2.5	Pre-post-test results	186
4.3	Respondent's ICT competency results	187
4.4	Reliability and validity test	188
4.4.1	Reliability and validity result (pilot testing)	189
4.4.2	Reliability and validity result (final testing)	192
4.5	Research questions analysis and results	192
4.5.1	Research question 1	192
4.5.1.1	Student engagement dimensions	192
4.5.1.2	MOOC learning retention dimensions	193
4.5.1.3	Learners' learning style for technical MOOC course	195
4.5.2	Research question 2	196
4.5.3	Research question 3	199
4.5.4	Research question 4	200
4.5.5	Research question 5	201
4.5.6	Research question 6	204

4.5.7	Research question 7	209
4.5.7.1	Assumption testing	210
4.5.7.2	Parametric: Pearson product-moment correlation	214
4.5.8	Research question 8	217
4.5.8.1	Assumption testing	219
4.5.8.2	Parametric: Multiple regression analysis	223
4.5.9	Research question 9	232
4.5.9.1	Assumption testing	235
4.5.9.2	Parametric: Multiple regression analysis	237
4.6	Summary	246
<b>5.</b>	<b>DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>247</b>
5.1	Introduction	247
5.2	Research discussion	247
5.2.1	Discussion for RO1: To identify factors that can engage students' learning in technical MOOC learning	248
5.2.2	Discussion for RO2: To perform a meta-analysis in determining the dimensions of wearable technology that can be used to support in engaging technical MOOC learning	249
5.2.3	Discussion for RO3: To design technical MOOC framework that engages students' learning using wearable technology	250
5.2.4	Discussion for RO4: To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed framework for engaging students' learning in technical MOOC using wearable technology	252
5.3	Research contribution	255
5.3.1	Contribution to dimensions that build-up the proposed framework development	255
5.3.2	Technical MOOC learning design contribution	256
5.3.3	Contribution to technical MOOC guideline implementation	257
5.3.4	Contribution to the design study	257
5.3.5	Contribution to research instruments	257
5.3.6	Provide alternative in teaching method	258
5.4	Research implication	259
5.5	Research limitation	260
5.5.1	Limited number of hardware and a high cost of wearable technology	260
5.5.2	Limited number of human expertise	261
5.6	Future recommendation	261
5.7	Summary	262
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>264</b>
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>309</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1.1	Students learning style result by overall respondent	7
1.2	Respondents' summary feedback on wearable technology	10
1.3	Relationship of research objectives, research questions, and research hypotheses	17
1.4	Summary of research objective, question, hypothesis, data collection method, and data analysis	18
2.1	Kolb's learning style	30
2.2	Activities that accommodate Kolb learning processes	31
2.3	Honey and Mumford's learning style, characteristics, and activities	34
2.4	Activities accommodate Gregorc learning style	36
2.5	Elements of learning style from the Dunn and Dunn model	38
2.6	List summary of learning style inventory and its composite sorted by year	41
2.7	Review of MOOC dimensions from year 2014 to 2018	55
2.8	Explanation of each MOOC dimension adapted from Hew (2016)	55
2.9	Review of current technology cooperated with online learning	59
2.10	Summary of Gagne's Nine Events of Instructions	67
2.11	Summary of Merrill's Principles of Instruction	69
2.12	Summary of Dick and Carey model	74

2.13	Literature review on application of wearable technology in education	87
2.14	Review of wearable technology dimensions from year 2013 until 2018	93
2.15	Explanation of wearable technology construct	94
2.16	Review of students' self-report assessments for three engagement indicators	103
2.17	Review of student engagement dimension with MOOC learning dimension	105
2.18	Review of student engagement dimension with wearable technology dimension	106
3.1	Division of wearable technology based on learning materials Overall	126
3.2	PEE MOOC learning design	130
3.3	Summary of video design production of PEE MOOC	135
3.4	Respondents' distribution by faculty in UTeM	156
3.5	Respondent distribution by gender	158
3.6	Summary of survey constructs	163
4.1	Respondents distribution by faculty in UTeM	178
4.2	Students' learning style result by overall respondent	179
4.3	Respondents' summary feedback on wearable technology	183
4.4	List of subjects offered by UTeM in Ulearn and student enrolment	186
4.5	Pre-post-test student's results	187
4.6	Cronbach alpha value for each of the constructs (pilot)	189
4.7	KMO and Bartlett's test value for each of the constructs (pilot)	190
4.8	Cronbach alpha value for each of the constructs (final)	191
4.9	KMO and Bartlett's test value for each of the constructs (final)	191
4.10	Engagement dimensions and instruments	193

4.11	Explanation of technical MOOC dimensions adopted in this study	194
4.12	Result of technical students learning style by overall respondent	196
4.13	Explanation of wearable technology dimensions used in this study	198
4.14	Combination of wearable technology and student engagement dimension	199
4.15	Details of learning materials production based on the wearable technology	203
4.16	The screenshot of PEE MOOC learning materials	205
4.17	Test of normality by Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk	213
4.18	Test of normality by skewness and kurtosis	214
4.19	Pearson product-moment correlation between technical MOOC and students' engagement variables	215
4.20	Correlation results between WT and technical MOOC learning variables	225
4.21	Details information of models used in RQ8	225
4.22	Results of model summary	225
4.23	Coefficient results for model 1 for RQ8	227
4.24	Coefficient results for model 2 for RQ8	228
4.25	Coefficient results for model 3 for RQ8	230
4.26	Coefficient results for model 4 for RQ8	231
4.27	Correlation results between WT and students' engagement variables	238
4.28	Details information of models used in RQ9	239
4.29	Results of model summary for RQ9	240
4.30	Coefficient results for model 1 for RQ9	241
4.31	Coefficient results for model 2 for RQ9	243





## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Distribution of current engagement tools in teaching and learning process	9
2.1	Five prominent model of learning style explained in this study	29
2.2	Kolb experiential learning model (Sources: Kolb, 1984; Hawk & Shah, 2007)	31
2.3	Combination of Kolb's and Honey and Mumford's cycle of learning styles (Source: Honey & Mumford, 2000)	32
2.4	Gregorc learning style model (Source: Gregorc, 1985)	36
2.5	Dunn and Dunn learning style model (Source:Dunn & Dunn, 1972)	37
2.6	VARK model (Source: Fleming,2001)	40
2.7	Course distribution by subject for year 2017 (Source: Shah, 2018)	47
2.8	xMOOC (Source: Yousef, et al., 2014)	49
2.9	cMOOC (Source: Yousef, et al., 2014)	50
2.10	Classification on MOOC criteria (Source: Yousef, et al., 2014)	53
2.11	Classification of MOOC video production	62
2.12	Phases of effective instruction (Source: Merrill, 2002)	69
2.13	The traditional ADDIE model (left) and revised version of the ADDIE model (right) (Source: Allen, 2006)	73

2.14	Dick and Carey instructional design model (Source: Dick & Carey, 2000)	73
2.15	History of wearable technology (Source: Labus, et al., 2015)	78
2.16	Children on the autism spectrum using and exploring the Glass Enterprise Edition device during a testing session at Brain Power (Source: Sahin, et al., 2018)	80
2.17	Example application of wearable technology in the oil and gas industry adopted by Schlumberger (Source: Ungerleider, 2014)	81
2.18	AGCO factory worker, Erickson, uses Google Glass on the assembly line (Source: Shamma, 2017)	83
2.19	Google Glass hardware breakdown (Source: Sapargaliyev, 2015)	84
2.20	An overview of wearable technology in e-education (Source: Labus, et al., 2015)	85
2.21	Model for applying wearable computing in e-education (Source: Labus, et al., 2015)	85
2.22	Original captured image from video clip of devices (A, Google Glass; B, GoPro Hero 4 Silver, and C, Panasonic HX-A100) as uncompressed TIFF file and corresponding magnified (400%) cropped image (Source: Lee, et al., 2017)	91
2.23	Comparison of photo frame capture from 1P (left) vs 3P video (right). Note the 1P vantage offers better visualization of the operative field but fails to include the ultrasound screen image in this image, as video capture is dictated by the operator's head position (Source: Evans, et al., 2016)	91

2.24	A model of student engagement organized around SDT (Source: Hew, 2015)	102
2.25	Conceptual framework	108
3.1	The case study research design (Source: Cavana, et al., 2001)	111
3.2	Research design framework	113
3.3	Overall theoretical framework	116
3.4	An ADDIE model (Source: Ahmad, 2013)	121
3.5	Important milestones in each ADDIE phase	121
3.6	The analysis phase	125
3.7	The design phase	127
3.8	A model of technical MOOC (adapted from Hew, 2016)	128
3.9	Malaysia' MOOC development flow chart guideline (Source: Jabatan Pendidikan Tinggi, 2017)	128
3.10	Technical MOOC design structure	130
3.11	Electrical & Electronic Lab 1, FTK, UTeM	135
3.12	One of the PEE MOOC lecturer recording for circuit tutorial solution videos at iStudio, PSTP, UTeM	135
3.13	Screenshot of the OpenLabs Electronics Laboratory	140
3.14	The development phase	143
3.15	The PEE MOOC homepage	146
3.16	The PEE MOOC course outline page	146
3.17	The learning materials included in Chapter 1	147
3.18	The learning materials included in Chapter 2	147
3.19	The learning materials included in circuit tutorial section	148
3.20	The learning materials included in remote laboratory section	148

3.21	Page of PEE MOOC Circuit Clinic section	149
3.22	Page of PEE MOOC Extra Activities section	149
3.23	Page of PEE MOOC Announcement section	149
3.24	Glassware cards of Circuit Tutorial application	150
3.25	Implementation phase	152
3.26	Evaluation phase	154
3.27	Lecturers' distribution by faculties in UTeM	155
3.28	Respondents' distribution by faculty in UTeM (in %)	156
3.29	Table for determining sampling size from a given population	158
4.1	Respondents' distribution by faculty in UTeM (in %)	178
4.2	Learning style results distribution by overall in UTeM (in %)	179
4.3	Respondents' distribution by faculties	181
4.4	Distribution of current engagement tools in teaching and learning process	182
4.5	ICT competence literacy distribution	188
4.6	Proposed framework to engage students' learning in technical MOOC using wearable technology	202
4.7	The proposed technical MOOC learning design structure	204
4.8	List of variables involved in RQ7	209
4.9	Matrix of scatterplots results between technical MOOC learning design (Y-axis) and students' engagement variables (X-axis)	210
4.10	Scatterplots results between technical MOOC learning design variables and students' engagement variables	212
4.11	List of variables involved in RQ8	218

4.12	Matrix of scatterplots results between wearable technology variables (Y-axis) and technical MOOC learning design variables (X-axis)	220
4.13	Scatterplots results between wearable technology variables and technical MOOC learning design variables	221
4.14	Normal P-P plot between wearable technology variables and technical MOOC learning design variables	222
4.15	List of variables involved in RQ9	233
4.16	Matrix of scatterplots results between wearable technology variables (Y-axis) and student engagement variables (X-axis)	235
4.17	Matrix of scatterplots results between wearable technology variables and student engagement variables	236
4.18	Normal P-P plot between wearable technology variables and student engagement variables	237

## LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Survey Questionnaire for Learning Style	309
B	Interview Questions Form	310
C	List of Expert	311
D	Framework Expert Validation Form	313
E	Survey Questionnaire Validation Form	320
F	Steps to Register and Used Open Learning	336
G	Main Coding for Developing Glassware Application	338
H	Pre-Post-Test Questions (Pilot testing)	341
I	Technical MOOC Survey Form	344
J	Details of Reliability Result (for final testing)	349
K	Details of Validity Result (for final testing)	353
L	Summary of Experts' Feedback	358

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AE	-	Affective engagement
AL	-	Active learning
AR	-	Augmented Reality ability
BE	-	Behavioural engagement
CE	-	Cognitive engagement
CI	-	Course information
CM	-	Communicating with large infrastructure
cMOOC	-	Connectivist Massive Open Online Course
CR	-	Course resources
DV	-	Dependent variables
FP	-	First-person view
IV	-	Independent variables
LI	-	Learning interaction
MC	-	Meaningful connection
ML	-	Monitoring of learning
MOOC	-	Massive Open Online Course
MTUN	-	Malaysian Technical University Network
MV	-	Moderating variables
N	-	Navigation
PEE	-	Principles of Electrical and Electronic
PL	-	personalize learning
pMOOC	-	Project-based Massive Open Online Course
PO	-	Program outcome
PR	-	Pattern recognition
RA	-	Recording ability
RT	-	Real-time interaction
SA	-	Student assessment

TVET	-	Technical and vocational education and training
UTeM	-	Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka
VISIR	-	Virtual Instrument System in Reality
WT	-	Wearable technology
xMOOC	-	Content-based Massive Open Online Course