

Hakcipta © tesis ini adalah milik pengarang dan/atau pemilik hakcipta lain. Salinan boleh dimuat turun untuk kegunaan penyelidikan bukan komersil ataupun pembelajaran individu tanpa kebenaran terlebih dahulu ataupun caj. Tesis ini tidak boleh dihasilkan semula ataupun dipetik secara menyeluruh tanpa memperolehi kebenaran bertulis daripada pemilik hakcipta. Kandungannya tidak boleh diubah dalam format lain tanpa kebenaran rasmi pemilik hakcipta.



**UUM**  
Universiti Utara Malaysia

**KESAN PENGGUNAAN PETA KONSEP TERHADAP  
PENCAPAIAN SAINS PELAJAR TINGKATAN SATU**



**SHAHIRIL BIN NORDIN**

**UUM**  
Universiti Utara Malaysia

**MASTER OF EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA  
2016**

**KESAN PENGGUNAAN PETA KONSEP TERHADAP  
PENCAPAIAN SAINS PELAJAR TINGKATAN SATU**

**SHAHRIL BIN NORDIN  
(812306)**



**TESIS SARJANA YANG DIKEMUKAKAN KEPADA  
*UUM COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,*  
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA SEBAGAI KEPERLUAN  
UNTUK  
IJAZAH SARJANA PENDIDIKAN**

**UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA  
2016**

## **Kebenaran Mengguna**

Penyerahan tesis ini ialah sebagai keperluan untuk pengijazahan Sarjana Pendidikan daripada Universiti Utara Malaysia. Saya bersetuju menjadikan tesis ini sebagai bahan rujukan di perpustakaan. Saya juga bersetuju bahawa kebenaran untuk membuat salinan keseluruhan atau sebahagian daripadanya bagi tujuan akademik mestilah mendapat kebenaran daripada Dekan UUM *College of Arts and Sciences*. Sebarang bentuk penyalinan, penerbitan atau penggunaan secara keseluruhan atau sebahagian daripada tesis ini bagi tujuan komersial adalah tidak dibenarkan tanpa kebenaran bertulis daripada penyelidik. Pernyataan rujukan kepada penyelidik dan Universiti Utara Malaysia mestilah dinyatakan dalam bentuk rujukan yang terdapat dalam tesis ini.

Kebenaran untuk penyelidikan atau lain-lain kegunaan sama ada secara keseluruhan atau sebahagiannya boleh dilakukan dengan menulis kepada:

Dekan of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

UUM College of Arts and Sciences

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok.

## Abstrak

Fenomena penghafalan fakta memberi impak kepada ketidakberkesanan dalam amalan pengajaran dan pembelajaran, dan telah mendapat perhatian ramai ahli psikologi pendidikan. Keadaan ini, turut menyumbang kepada berlakunya salah faham konsep dalam kalangan pelajar dalam pelbagai bidang sains termasuk sains alam sekitar. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk membandingkan pengajaran menggunakan kaedah peta konsep yang berasaskan teori konstruktivisme dengan pengajaran menggunakan kaedah tradisional (transparensi OHP) bagi tajuk 'Udara di Sekeliling Kita' dalam subjek sains tingkatan satu. Kajian ini menggunakan pendekatan secara kuantitatif dan kualitatif. Kajian secara kuantitatif menggunakan reka bentuk kuasi eksperimen ujian pra dan pos dengan kumpulan kawalan. Dua kelas telah dipilih secara rawak daripada sebelas kelas yang terdapat di lokasi kajian. Saiz sampel adalah seramai 60 orang pelajar iaitu 30 orang pelajar dalam kumpulan eksperimen dan 30 orang pelajar dalam kumpulan kawalan. Temu bual separa struktur secara bersemuka telah digunakan untuk mengutip data kualitatif di mana seramai lapan orang responden telah dipilih secara bertujuan, iaitu empat orang daripada kumpulan eksperimen dan empat orang daripada kumpulan kawalan. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa mereka yang diajar dengan menggunakan peta konsep menunjukkan prestasi yang lebih baik berbanding pelajar yang didedahkan dengan kaedah tradisional. Hasil kajian juga menunjukkan bahawa mereka yang telah diajar dengan menggunakan peta konsep dapat membuat hubungan antara konsep dan telah menunjukkan persepsi yang positif terhadap penggunaan peta konsep untuk mempelajari topik 'Udara di Sekeliling Kita'. Kajian ini menyumbang kepada bidang pendidikan sains dalam aspek pemahaman dan pembinaan konsep sains dalam kalangan pelajar sekolah menengah rendah. Kajian juga memberikan implikasi kepada perlunya pendidik sains di sekolah menengah mempelbagaikan kaedah pengajaran konsep sains seperti yang disarankan oleh Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.

**Kata Kunci:** Peta konsep, Pendidikan Sains, Kaedah pengajaran, Kuasi-eksperimen, Transperansi OHP.

## Abstract

The phenomena of memorizing facts impacted the effectiveness of teaching and learning practises, and had caught the attention of many educational psychologists. This situation had also contributed to misconceptions in various areas in science including environmental science. This study aims to compare teachings using concept map approach based on constructivisme theory with teachings using traditional approach (OHP transparencies) on the topic of 'Air Around Us' in form one science subject. This study used both quantitative and qualitative approach. For the quantitative approach, the pre test and post test control group quasi-experiment research design was employed. Two classes were randomly selected from 11 classes within the research site. The sample size for the quantitative approach was 60 students whereby 30 students were in the experimental group and 30 students in the control group. Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were used to collect the qualitatave data whereby eight respondents were purposively selected, four were from the experimental group and four from the control group. The findings show that students who were exposed to concept maps performed better than students who were exposed to to traditional approach. The findings also show that students who were taught using concept maps were able to relate the concepts and shown positive perceptions towards the use of concept maps in learning the topic of 'Air Around Us'. This study contributes to the field of science education within the context of understanding and construction of science concepts among lower secondary school students. The study also implies that there is a need for science educators in secondary schools to vary their approaches in teaching science concepts as proposed by the Ministry of Education.

Keywords: Concept maps, Science Education, Teaching method, Quasi-experiemnt, OHP transparencies.

## Penghargaan

Alhamdulillah dengan izin, dan rahmatnya penulisan tesis ini telah berjaya disiapkan. Tesis ini tidak akan terhasil dengan usaha saya secara sendirian, tanpa pelbagai interaksi. Terima kasih yang tidak terhingga kepada mereka yang telah menyumbang komen, idea dan sokongan umum. Ucapan terima kasih ini saya tujukan khusus kepada: Penyelia saya, Prof. Madya Dr. Ruzlan bin Md. Ali di atas sikap keterbukaan, semangat dan sokongan yang diberikan dari mula hingga akhir. Isteri saya, Harlinda binti Ahmad atas sokongan dan galakkan yang diberi, serta kesabaran dalam mendidik anak, bagi membolehkan saya untuk memulakan kerja dan menyelesaikannya. Anak-anak (Nur Aqilah, Muhammad Aiman, Muhammad Akif dan Nur Madihah yang seringkali bertanya “Bilakah tesis ini akan disiapkan?” Sesungguhnya Abad ke-21 ini menjanjikan banyak pengalaman pembelajaran. Guru-guru yang terlibat di mana saya telah mengganggu kehidupan mereka. Pelajar-pelajar yang telah saya mengajar di mana daripada mereka saya telah banyak belajar dan tidak lupa kepada abah, mak yang telah membesarkan dan mendidik saya tanpa jemu, tanpa doa, kasih sayang, sokongan, nasihat, kesabaran dan galakan daripada mereka, tahap ini tidak mungkin dapat saya capai.

## Isi Kandungan

Kebenaran Mengguna .....	i
Abstrak.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Penghargaan.....	iv
Isi Kandungan.....	v
Senarai Jadual.....	ix
Senarai Rajah.....	x
BAB SATU: PENGENALAN .....	1
1.1 Latar Belakang Masalah Kajian .....	1
1.2 Minat dan Keperihatinan Peribadi Penyelidik .....	5
1.3 Tajuk “Udara di Sekeliling Kita” .....	8
1.4 Penyataan masalah .....	9
1.5 Objektif Kajian.....	12
1.6 Tujuan Kajian.....	13
1.7 Soalan Kajian .....	13
1.8 Hipotesis Kajian.....	14
1.9 Kerangka Teori.....	14
1.10 Kepentingan Kajian.....	18
1.11 Definisi Operasi .....	20
1.11.1 Konsep .....	20
1.11.2 Garisan penghubung (“ <i>proposition</i> ”) .....	20
1.11.3 Pemahaman konseptual.....	20
1.11.4 Subsumsi .....	20
1.11.5 “ <i>Integrative reconciliation</i> ” .....	20
1.11.6 Pembelajaran superordinat .....	21
1.11.7 Pembezaan Progresif.....	21
1.11.8 Pembelajaran hafalan .....	21
1.11.9 “ <i>Advance Organizer</i> ” .....	21
1.11.10 Peta konsep .....	21
1.11.11 Metakognisi.....	22



1.11.12 Salah faham.....	22
1.11.13 Subsumsi .....	22
1.11.14 Pengajaran secara konvensional.....	22
1.12 Limitasi Kajian.....	22
1.13 Ringkasan.....	24
<b>BAB DUA: KAJIAN LITERATUR .....</b>	<b>25</b>
2.1 Pengenalan .....	25
2.2 Teori Pembelajaran Kognitif.....	25
2.3 Peta Konsep dan Kajian .....	28
2.4 Pengetahuan Sedia Ada dan Pembelajaran Konseptual .....	42
2.5 Perspektif Kognitif Pembelajaran .....	49
2.6 Model Pemprosesan Maklumat.....	51
2.7 Peranan Salah Faham dan Pembelajaran.....	56
2.8 Rasional untuk Perubahan Konseptual.....	60
2.9 Kesimpulan Kajian Literatur.....	62
<b>BAB TIGA: METODOLOGI .....</b>	<b>64</b>
3.1. Pengenalan .....	64
3.2 Reka bentuk kajian.....	64
3.3 Pemboleh Ubah .....	67
3.4 Kaedah Persampelan dan Sampel kajian.....	67
3.5 Sesi dan Jangka masa Rawatan .....	68
3.6 Rawatan kepada Kumpulan Eksperimen dan Kumpulan Kawalan.....	68
3.7 Instrumentasi dan Bahan .....	70
3.8 Ujian Pra dan Ujian Pos .....	70
3.9 Kesahan dan Kebolehpercayaan .....	72
3.10 Soalan Objektif dan Struktur bagi Ujian Pra dan Ujian Pos. ....	73
3.11 Prosedur .....	73
3.11.1 Sesi dan Masa Rawatan.....	73
3.11.2 Rawatan untuk Kumpulan Kawalan.....	74
3.11.3 Rawatan untuk Kumpulan Peta Konsep.....	74
3.11.4 Ujian Statistik Parametrik .....	75
3.11.5 Teknik Statistik untuk Ujian Hipotesis .....	76

3.12 Kesimpulan.....	77
3.13 Pengenalan .....	77
3.14 Fokus Analisis kajian .....	78
3.15 Temu bual dalam kajian .....	78
3.15.1 Temu bual separa struktur .....	79
3.15.2 Soalan temu bual separa struktur .....	80
3.16 Kajian rintis.....	81
3.17 Prosedur Persampelan .....	81
3.18 Lokasi Temu bual.....	83
3.19 Prosedur .....	83
3.20 Pengumpulan Data .....	83
3.21 Analisa Data.....	84
3.22 Ringkasan.....	86
<b>BAB EMPAT: ANALISIS DATA DAN DAPATAN KAJIAN.....</b>	<b>87</b>
4.1 Analisis Data Kuantitatif.....	87
4.1.1 Hipotesis 1.....	87
4.1.2 Hipotesis 2.....	87
4.2 Analisis Data Kualitatif.....	88
4.2.1 Analisis hasil kerja kumpulan peta konsep .....	88
4.2.2 Kesimpulan .....	95
4.2.3 Analisis Temubual .....	96
4.3 Ringkasan.....	124
<b>BAB LIMA: PERBINCANGAN DAN KESIMPULAN .....</b>	<b>125</b>
5.1 Pengenalan .....	125
5.2 Perbincangan .....	125
5.3 Refleksi - Proses Menjalankan Kajian .....	140
5.4 Implikasi kajian.....	143
5.4.1 Implikasi ke Atas Pelajar .....	143
5.4.2 Implikasi ke Atas Pendidik .....	144
5.4.3 Implikasi ke Atas Praktis .....	146
5.4.4 Implikasi ke Atas Teori.....	146

5.5 Cadangan untuk Penyelidikan Masa Hadapan.....	148
5.6 Kesimpulan .....	149
5.7 Penutup.....	152
RUJUKAN.....	153
LAMPIRAN A1 .....	173
LAMPIRAN A2 .....	174
LAMPIRAN B.....	175
LAMPIRAN C.....	176
LAMPIRAN D: KEPUTUSAN UJIAN PRA DAN POS.....	177
LAMPIRAN D (sambungan) .....	178
LAMPIRAN E: UJIAN NORMALITI .....	179
LAMPIRAN F: UJIAN LEVENE'S .....	180
LAMPIRAN G: UJIAN-T SAMPEL BERPASANGAN BAGI KUMPULAN EKSPERIMEN DAN KUMPULAN.....	181
LAMPIRAN H: RANCANGAN MENGAJAR.....	182
LAMPIRAN I: PANDUAN MENGAJAR PETA KONSEP .....	188
LAMPIRAN J: SOALAN UJIAN PRA.....	200
LAMPIRAN K: SOALAN UJIAN POS.....	216
LAMPIRAN L: PENGESAHAN SOALAN UJIAN PRA DAN POS .....	232
LAMPIRAN M : KELULUSAN MENJALANKAN KAJIAN .....	235
LAMPIRAN N : JADUAL SPESIFIKASI UJIAN (JSU).....	237
LAMPIRAN O : JADUAL SPESIFIKASI ITEM (JSI) .....	238
LAMPIRAN P: KEPUTUSAN <i>INTER-RATER RELIABILITY</i> UJIAN PRA DAN POS .....	239

## Senarai Jadual

Jadual 3.1. Peringkat-peringkat semakan soalan ujian pra dan pos.....	72
Jadual 3.2. Andaian Data Berparameter .....	75
Jadual 3 3. Subjek dan Nama Samaran dalam Temu bual.....	82
Jadual 3 4. Fasa-fasa Analisis Tematik.....	84



**UUM**  
Universiti Utara Malaysia

## Senarai Rajah

Rajah 1.3: Model pemrosesan maklumat (sumber: Biehler dan Snowman,1990)....	15
Rajah 1.4: Kerangka konseptual kajian.....	40
Rajah 2.1: Teori asimilasi Ausubel, 1968 (sumber: cmapinternal.ihmc.us).....	42
Rajah 4.1: Peta Konsep Kumpulan 1.....	89
Rajah 4.2: Peta Konsep Kumpulan 2.....	91
Rajah 4.3. Peta Konsep Kumpulan 3.....	92
Rajah 4.4: Peta Konsep Kumpulan 4.....	94
Rajah 4.5: Perkara paling disukai tentang peta konsep dan hubungannya.....	98
Rajah 4.6: Perkara paling tidak disukai tentang peta konsep dan hubungannya.....	101
Rajah 4.7: Peta Konsep dalam Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran.....	105
Rajah 4.8: Perkara yang paling disukai tentang Transparensi OHP dan hubungannya.....	112
Rajah 4.9: Perkara paling tidak disukai tentang Transparensi OHP dan hubungannya,.....	114
Rajah 4.10: Transparensi OHP dalam Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran.....	118

# **BAB SATU**

## **Pengenalan**

### **1.1 Latar Belakang Masalah Kajian**

Kejayaan pelajar berkait rapat dengan aktiviti pengajaran dan pembelajaran yang menekankan tentang bagaimana untuk menyusun atur, menyimpan, dan mengingati semula maklumat yang tersimpan di dalam otak (Meyer, 2001). Proses tersebut memerlukan kemahiran bagi menggalakkan pemindahan pengetahuan melalui proses pengajaran dan pembelajaran yang diperoleh dalam bilik darjah (Ausubel, 2000). Situasi ini melibatkan keupayaan seseorang untuk mendapatkan ilmu pengetahuan dan mengaplikasikannya (Ausubel, 2000; Novak & Canas, 2008).

Sejak beberapa dekad yang lalu, penemuan yang konsisten telah wujud melalui penyelidikan kognitif berkaitan dengan pengetahuan sedia ada yang berfungsi sebagai asas penyatuan kepada maklumat baru yang diperoleh (Hale, 2006; Murphy & Alexander, 2004). Pengetahuan sedia ada boleh ditakrifkan sebagai asas pengetahuan yang menyatukan maklumat yang tersimpan dengan pengalaman baru yang diperoleh oleh pelajar. Pelajar yang menghubungkan pembelajaran baru dengan apa yang sudah diketahui, akan secara tidak langsung mewujudkan pembelajaran yang lebih bermakna (Ausubel, 2000).

Pengkaji-pengkaji seperti Marzano (2007), Ormrod (2007), Thompson dan Zamboanga, (2004) telah menemui kesan positif pengetahuan sedia ada terhadap pencapaian pembelajaran dari segi pemahaman dan ingatan dalam mata pelajaran sains.

The contents of  
the thesis is for  
internal user  
only

## RUJUKAN

- Abdull Sukor Shaari (2010). *Guru berkesan: Petua dan panduan*. Penerbit Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Agresti, A., & Finlay, B. (2008). *Statistical methods for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Altmann, G. T. (2002). Learning and development in neural networks: The importance of prior experience. *Cognition*, 85(2), 43-50.
- Amundsen, C., Weston, C., & McAlpine, L. (2008). Concept mapping to support university academics' analysis of course content. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(6), 633.
- Anastasi, A. (1988). *Psychological testing*. New York. MacMillan.
- Anderson, T. H., & Huang, S. C. C (1989). *On using concept maps to assess the comprehension effect of reading expository text*. Centre for the study of Reading Tech. Rep. No.483. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Anserson, R. C. (1984). Some reflection in acquisition of knowledge. *Educational Research*, 13(9), 5-6.
- Ariew, A. (2003). Ernst mayr's 'ultimate/proximate' distinction and reconstructed. *Biol Philos*, 18(4),553-565.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Sorenson, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Group.
- Asan, A. (2007). Concept mapping in science class: A case study of fifth grade students. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(1), 186-195.
- Atieno, O. (2009). An analysis of the strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. *Problems of Education in the 21st century*, 13, 13-18.
- Attali, Y., & Powers, D. (2009). Immediate feedback and opportunity to revise answers to open ended questions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(1), 22- 35. doi: 10.1177/0013164409332231
- Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. NY: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- Ausubel, D. P. (2000). *The acquisition and retention of knowledge: A cognitive view*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Ausubel, D. P., & Robinson, F.G. (1969). *School learning: An introduction to educational psychology*. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.



- Awatif Ahmad & Norizan Esa. (2011). Kesan penggunaan perisian kursus (courseware) dengan peta konsep terhadap pencapaian pelajar. *Asia Pasific Journal of Educators and Education*, 26 (1), 51-70.
- Aziz Nordin & Jenny Wee Chin Siok (2010). Hubungan sikap terhadap mata pelajaran sains dengan penguasaan konsep asas sains pelajar tingkatan dua. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 13, 21-43.
- Barke, H. D., Hazari, A., & Yitbarek, S. (2009). *Misconceptions in chemistry: Addressing perceptions in chemical education*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin: Heidelberg.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bausell, R. B. (1994). *Conducting meaningful experiments: 40 steps to becoming a scientist*. Carlifornia 91320: SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Biehler, R. F., & Snowman, J. (1990) *Psychology applied to teaching*. Princeton, N.J: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Boeije, H. (2010), *Analysis in qualitative research*, Sage Publications, London.
- Bonestroo, W. J., & De Jong, T. (2012). Effects of planning on task load, knowledge, and tool preference: A comparison of two tools. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 20, 141–153. Information Age.
- BPK.(2011). Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah KPM.
- BPPDP (1989a). *Dasar Pendidikan Berasaskan Sains dan Teknologi: Ke arah pencapaian nisbah penyertaan 60:40 Sains: Sastera*. Kuala Lumpur: BPPDP.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2). pp. 77-101. ISSN 1478-0887.
- Brophy, J. (2002). *Social constructivist teaching: Affordance and constraints*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science
- Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
- Bruner, J., Goodnow, J.J., & Austin, G.A. (1967). *A study of thinking*. New York: Science Editions.
- Bruning, R., Norby, M., & Schraw, R. (2010). *Cognitive psychology and instruction*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall.
- Buldu, M. & Buldu, N. (2010). Concept mapping as a formative assessment in college classrooms: Measuring usefulness and student satisfaction. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 2099-2104.

- Bunting, C., Coll, R. K., & Campbell, A. (2006). Students view of concept mapping used in introductory tertiary Biology classes. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 4,641- 668.
- Burke, K. A., Greenbowe, T.J., & Windschitl, M. (1998). Developing and using conceptual computer animation for chemistry instruction. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 75(12), 1658-1661.
- Burns, R. B. (1998). *Introduction to research methods*. Sydney: Longman.
- Buzan, T. (2010). *The mind maps book*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Buzan, B., & Buzan, T. (2000). *The mind map book*. Great Britain: Buttler & Tanner.
- Bynes, J. P., & Gunthrie. J. T. (1992). Prior knowledge and textbook search. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 17, 8-29.
- Campbell, L. M., & Campbell, B. (2008). *Mindful learning: 101 proven strategies for student and teacher success*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oakes, CA: SAGE.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental design for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cangelosi, J. S. (1982). *Measurement and evaluation*. Dubuque: WMC Brown.
- Cannon, R., & Newble, D. (2000). *A handbook for teacher in universities and colleges*. London: Kagan Page.
- Cantu, E., Schroeder, N. & da Silva, D. Z. P. (2010). Using concept maps as a synthesis tool to construct integrated curriculum. In J. Sanchez, A. J. Canas & J. D. Novak (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Concept Mapping*. Vina del Mar, Chile. [viewed 1 Apr2012] .
- Chen, A. P., Kirkby, K. C., & Morin, P. J. (2006). Uphill water flow: An example of the crucial role of student's prior knowledge in geoscience education. *American Geophysical Union*. Retrieved from <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2006AGUFMED53A0847C>
- Chi, M. T. H., & Roscoe, R. D. (2002). The process and challenges of conceptual change. In M. Limon & L. Mason (Eds.), *Restructuring conceptual change: Issues in theory and practice*, (pp. 3-27). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Chi, M. T. H., & Roscoe, R. D. (2002). The process and challenges of conceptual change. In M. Limon & L. Mason (Eds.), *Restructuring conceptual change: Issues in theory and practice*, (pp.3-27). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Chin, D. B., Dohmen, I. M., Cheng, B. H., Oppezzo, M. A., Chase, C. C., & Schwartz, D. L. (2010). Preparing students for future learning with teachable agents. *Educational Technology, Research and Development*, 58(6), 649. doi: 10.007/s11423-010-9154-5

- Chiou, C. C. (2008). The effect of concept mapping on students' learning achievements and interests. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 45(4), 375-387.
- Chularut, P., & DeBacker, T. K. (2004). The influence of concept mapping on achievement, self regulation, and self efficacy in students of English as a second language. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 29, 248-263.
- Clarianna, R. B., & Koul, R. (2008). The effects of learner prior knowledge when creating concept maps from a text passage. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 35, (2), 229.
- Clark, R. C. & Lyons, C. (2010). *Graphics for learning: Proven guidelines for planning, designing, and evaluating visuals in training materials*. (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cliburn, J. W. (1990). Concept map to promote meaningful learning. *Journal of College Science Teaching*. 19(4):212-217.
- Coffey, J. W., Carnot, M. J., Feltovitch, P., Hoffman, R. R., Feltovitch, J. & Cañas, A. J., (2003). *A summary of literature pertaining to the use of concept mapping techniques and technologies for education and performance support*. Pensacola, FL: The Institute for Human and Machine Cognition.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research method in education*. New York: Routledge Falmer
- Conradty, C. & Bogner, F. X. (2010). Implementation of concept mapping to novices: Reasons for errors, a matter of technique or content. *Educational Studies*, 36 (1), 47.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field setting*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Coon, D. (2008). *Introduction to psychology: Gateways to mind and behavior with concept maps and reviews*. (12th ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: A qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oakes, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed) Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Curwen, M. S., Miller, R. G., Smith, K. A. W., & Calfee, R. C. (2010). Increasing teachers' metacognition develops students' higher learning during content area literacy instruction: Findings from the read-write cycle project. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 19(2), 127.
- Daniel, E., & Idris, N. (2007). Malaysia science and mathematics education : Reflection and Reinvention. *Masalah Pendidikan*, 30(2), 65–83.

- Dasar 40:60 sastera-sains belum tercapai. (2009, Mac 27). *Utusan Malaysia*.
- Davies, M. (2010). Mind mapping, concept mapping, argument mapping: what are the differences and do they matter? *High Educ.* doi: 10.1007/s10734-010-9387-6
- Davis, B. G. (2009). *Tools for teaching* (2nd ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Diamond, R.M. (2008). *Designing and accessing courses curricula: A practical guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dimitrov, D. M., & Rumrill, P. (2003). Pretest-posttest designs in rehabilitation research. *Work: A Journal of Prevention, Assessment, & Rehabilitation*, 20(2), 159-165.
- Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Buehl, M. M. (1999). The relationship between assessment practices and outcomes of studies: The case of research on prior knowledge. *Review of the Educational Research*, 69(2), 145-148.
- Dochy, F. J. R. C. (1994). Investigating the use of knowledge profiles in a flexible learning environment: Analyzing students' prior knowledge states. In S. Vosniadou, E. De Corte, & H. Mandl (Eds.), *Psychological and educational foundations of technology-based learning environments*. NATO ASI Series F, Special Programme AET. Berlin, NY: Springer Verlag.
- Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Buehl, M. M. (1999). The relationship between assessment practices and outcomes of studies: The case of research on prior knowledge. *Review of the Educational Research*, 69(2), 145-148.
- Driscoll, M. P. (2005). *Psychology of learning for instruction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Duit, R., & Treagust, D. F. (2003). Conceptual change: A powerful framework for improving science teaching and learning. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(6), 671-688.
- Dupigny-Giroux, L. (2008). Introduction - Climate literacy: A state of the knowledge overview. *Physical Geography*, 29(6), 483-486.
- Edmonson, K. M. (1995). Concep mapping or the development of medical curricula. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. 32(7): 777-793.
- Englebrecht, A. C., Mintzes, J.J., Brown, L. M., & Kelso, P. R. (2005). Probing, understanding in physical geology using concept maps and clinical interviews. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 53(3), 263-270.
- Eppler, M. J. (2006). A comparison between concept maps, mind maps, conceptual diagrams, and visual metaphor as complementary tools or knowledge construction and sharing. *Information Visualization* (2006), 5, 202-210.

- Erdogan, Y. (2009). Paper-based and computer-based concept mappings: The effects on computer achievement, computer anxiety and computer attitude. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 40(5), 821-836.
- Fatin Aliah Phang, Mohd. Salleh Abu, Mohammad Bilal Ali & Salmiza Salleh. (2012). *Faktor penyumbang kepada kemerosotan penyertaan pelajar dalam aliran sains: Satu analisis sorotan tesis*. UKM & USM.
- Fisher, K. M., Wandersee, J. H., & Wideman, G. (2000). *Enhancing cognitive skills for meaningful understanding of domain specific knowledge*. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Gagne, R. M., & Driscoll, M. P. (1988). *Essential of learning for instruction*. Englewood Cliffs. N. J: Prentice-Hall
- Garner, B. K. (2007). *Getting to got it: Helping students learn how to learn*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gautier, C., Deutsch, K., & Rebich, S. (2006). Misconceptions About the Greenhouse Effect. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 54(May), 386–395.
- Gazzaniga, M. S. (2008). *Human: The science behind what makes us unique*. NY: Ecco.
- Georghiades, P. (2004). Making pupils' conceptions of electricity more durable by means of situated cognition. *International Journal of Science*, 85(15), 92-98.
- Georgia Department of Education. (2009). *Criterion-reference competency test*. Albany, GA: Georgia Department of Education.
- Given, L. M., (ed.) (2008), *The Sage encyclopaedia of qualitative research method: Volumes 1 & 2*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California.
- Gonsalves, B. D., & Cohen, N. J. (2010). Brain imaging, cognitive processes, and brain networks. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 5, 744-752.
- Good, G., & Brophy, J. (2000). *Looking in classroom* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Gravetter, F. J ., & Wallnau, L. B. (2000). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Gredler, M. E. (2005). *Learning and instruction: Theory into practice* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Green, B. A. (2010). Understand schema, understand difference. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 37(2).
- Griffin, M. M., & Robinson, D. H. (2005). Does spatial or visual information in maps facilitate recall: Evidence against the conjoint retention hypothesis? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53, 23-26.

- Gronlund, N. E. (1985). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching*. New York: MacMillan.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research*. In.
- Gurlitt, J., & Renkl, A. (2010). Prior knowledge activation: How different concept mapping tasks lead to substantial differences in cognitive processes, learning outcomes, and perceived self-efficacy. *Instructional Science*, 38(4), 417. doi: 10.1007/s11251-008-9090-5
- Haaften, V. V. (2007). Conceptual change and paradigm change: What's the difference? *Theory and Psychology*, 17(1), 59-85. doi: 10.1177/0959354306070531
- Hale, C. A. (2006). *A problem: Teaching to brain based mind in the classroom*. 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia. Sydney. NSW, 1, 1-10.
- Hamza, K. M. & Wickman, P. O. (2008). Describing and analyzing learning in action: An empirical study of the importance of misconceptions in learning science. *Science Education*, 92, 141-164.
- Hassan, A. (2006). An analysis of school teachers' attitudes on the importance of environmental education goals. *Malaysian Journal of Analytical Sciences*, 10(2), 303-312.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Hay, D., Kinchin, I., & Baker, L. (2008). Making learning visible: the role of concept mapping in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3), 295-311.
- Haystead, M. W. & Marzano, R. J. (2009). *Meta-analytic synthesis of studies conducted on instructional strategies*. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- Haugwitz, M., Nesbit, J. & Sandmann, A. (2010). Cognitive Ability and the Instructional Efficacy of Collaborative Concept Mapping. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20 (5), 536-543. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2010.04.004
- Healy, V. C., (1989). The Effect of Advance Organizer and Prerequisite Knowledge Passages on the Learning and Retention of Science Concept. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. 26(7):627-642.
- Heinze-Fry, J. A., & Novak, J. D. (1990). Concept map Bring Long-Term Movement Towards Meaningful Learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. 22(7): 663-673.

- Hungerford, H. R. dan Volk T. L. (1990). Changing learner behavior through environmental Education *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 21(3), 8–21.
- Hollenbeck, K., Twyman, T., & Tindal, G. (2006). Determining the exchangeability of concept map and problem-solving essay scores. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*. 31, 51-68.
- Horton, P. B., McConney, A.A., Gallo, M., Woods, A. L., Senn, G. J., & Hamelin, D. (1993). An investigation of the effectiveness of concept mapping as an instructional tool. *Science Education*, 77, 95-99.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). NY: McGraw Hill.
- Hyerle, D. (1995b). *Thinking maps: tools for learning*. Cary, NC: Innovative Learning Group.
- Hyerle, D., Suddreth, S., Suddreth, G. (2004-2008). *Thinking maps*. February 26, 2008, <http://www.thinkingmaps.com>.
- Idris, N. (2010). *Penyelidikan dalam Pendidikan*. McGraw Hill Education.
- Ifenthaler, D. (2010). Relational, structural, and semantic analysis of graphical representations and concept maps. *Educational Technology, Research and Development*, 58(1), 81. doi: 10.1007/s11423-008-9087-4.
- Iksan, Z. I., Halim, L., & Osman, K. (2006). Sikap terhadap sains dalam kalangan pelajar sains di peringkat menengah dan matrikulasi. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum.* 14(2): 131-147 (2006) ISSN:, 14(2), 131–147.
- International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) (2000), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).
- International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) (2004), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).
- International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) (2008), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).
- International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) (2012), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).
- Isaac, S., & Micheal.(1983). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. Carlifornia: EdITS
- Iuli, R. J., & Helden, G. (2004). Using concept maps as a research tool in science education research. In AJ Cañas, J.D. Novak, & F.M. Gonzalez (Eds.), *First International Conference on Concept Mapping*. Pamplona, Spain.

- Jabatan Alam Sekitar, Kementerian Sumber Asli dan Alam Sekitar dengan kerjasama Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.* (2004). Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Jabatan Alam Sekitar (1996). *Laporan Tahunan 1995*. Putrajaya: Kementerian Sains, Teknologi dan Alam Sekitar. Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. (2003).
- Jabatan Perdana Menteri Malaysia (1991). *Malaysia: The Way Forward*. Vision 2020.
- Jamilah Haji Ahmad, Hasrina Mustafa, Hamidah Abdul Hamid & Juliana Abdul Wahab (2011). Pengetahuan, Sikap dan Amalan Masyarakat Malaysia terhadap Isu Alam Sekitar (Knowledge, Attitude and Practices of Malaysian Society regarding Environmental Issues). *Akademika* 81(3), 103–115.
- Jonassen, D. (2000). *Computers as mind tools for schools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice Hall.
- Jones, A., Todorova, N., & Vargo, J. (2000). *Improving teaching effectiveness: Understanding and leveraging prior knowledge for student learning*. Brisbane,Australia: International Academy for Information Managers.
- Jones, L. W., & Caston, M. (2006). Attitudes of undergraduate education majors on web-enhanced and traditional education at Fayetteville State University. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 33(2), 77-86.
- Kalhor M., Mehrand, G., Goodarz Shakibaei, G. (2012). The effect of concept mapping on English language academic achievement and meaningful learning of high school student. *Journal of American Science* , 8 (10), 247-253.
- Kamarudin Hj. Kachar (1989). *Perkembangan Pendidikan di Malaysia*. K.L: Teks Publishing.
- KanKKunen, M. (2001). Concept mapping and Peirce's semiotic paradigm meeting inelementary classroom environment. *Learning Environment Research*, 4, 287-324.
- Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia. (2012). *Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013 - 2025*. (KPM, Ed.).
- Kendeou, P., & Broeck, P.V. (2007). The effects of prior knowledge and text structure on comprehension processes during reading of scientific texts. *Memory & Cognition*, 35(7), 1567.
- Kerlin, S. C., McDonald, S. P., & Kelly, G. J. (2009). Mapping a science inquiry unit. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 43(2), 4.
- Kern, C., & Crippen, K. J. (2008). Mapping for conceptual change. *The Science Teacher*,75(6), 32.
- Kim, P., & Olaciregui, C. (2008). The effects of concept map based information display in an electronic portfolio system on information processing and retention in a fifth grade science class covering the Earth's atmosphere. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. 39, 700-714.



- Kinchin, I. M. (2000b). From 'ecologist' to 'conceptual ecologist': The utility of the conceptual ecology for teachers of biology. *Journal of Biological Education*, 34(4), 178-183.
- Kinchin, I. M. (2001). If concept mapping is so helpful to learning biology, why aren't we all doing it? *International Journal of Science Education*, 23(12), 1257-69.
- Kinchin, I. M. & Cabot, I. B. (2007). Using concept mapping principles in powerpoint. *European Journal of Dental Education*, 11(4), 194-199.
- Kinchin, I. M., De-Leij, F. A. A., & Hay, D. B. (2005). The evolution of a collaborative concept mapping activity for undergraduate microbiology students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 29(1), 1-14.
- King, C. (2008). Geoscience education: An overview. *Studies in Science Education*, 44(2), 187.
- Klausmeier, H. J., Ripple R. E. (1971). *Learning and Human Abilities*. N.Y: Harper & Row Publishing.
- KPM (2004b). *National Education Policy*. Kuala Lumpur: KPM.
- KPM (2001b). *Educational Development Plan 2001-2010*. Kuala Lumpur: KPM.
- KPM (2012). *Program i-Think*. Kuala Lumpur. PPK.
- Kokkatas, P., & Vlacos, I. (1998). Teaching the topic the particulate nature o matter in prospective teachers training course. *International Journal o Science Education*, 20 (3), 291-303.
- Koswer pengajaran sains tingkatan 1: The air Around Us* (CDROM 7). Kuala Lumpur: Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Kollmuss, A. & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3), 239-260.
- Köse, S. (2008). Diagnosing student misconceptions: Using drawings as a research method. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 3(2), 283–293. Retrieved from [http://idosi.org/wasj/wasj3\(2\)/20.pdf](http://idosi.org/wasj/wasj3(2)/20.pdf)
- Kwon, S. Y. & Cifuentes, L. (2007). Using computers to individually-generate vs. collaboratively generate concept maps. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(4), 269-280.
- Laura, A. W., (2011). *The Effect of Thinking Maps on Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills*. California State University, Northridge.

- Lim, H. (2011). Concept maps of Korean EFL student teachers' autobiographical reflections on their professional identity formation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 969-981.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publication.
- Linden, D. E. J., (2007). The working memory networks of the brain. *Neuroscientist*, 13(3), 257-267.
- Liu, P., Chen, C. & Chang, Y. (2010). Effects of a computer-assisted concept mapping strategy on EFL college students' English reading comprehension. *Computers & Education*, 54(2), 436-445.
- Lutz, S. T., & Huitt, W. E. (2003). *Information processing and memory: Theory and applications*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University.
- Mahathir Mohamad (1991). *Malaysia: The Way Forward*. Working Paper presented at the inaugural meeting of the Malaysian Business Council, Kuala Lumpur, 28 February. Reprinted in New Straight Times, 2 March 1991.
- Malaysia 1971. *Rancangan Malaysia Kedua 1971-1975*. Percetakan Kerajaan Malaysia.
- Markham, K. M., & Mintzes, J. J. (1994). The Concept Map as Research and Evaluation Tool : Further Evidence of Validity. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. 31(1): 91-101.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What work in school: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement: Research on what works in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mason, C. L. (1992). Concept Mapping: A Tool to Develop Relective Science Instruction. *Science Education*. 76(1): 51-63.
- Matnor Daim. (1995). Memanfaatkan Sumber Manusia Ke Arah Meningkatkan Martabat Negara Bangsa. *Kertas Kerja Seminar Kebangsaan Matrikulasi/Asasi I*, 22-23 November 1995, UKM.
- Mayo, J. A. (2010). Graphing organizers as learning and assessment tools. *American Psychological Association*, 93-111.

- McKinsey & Company. (2007). *How the World's Most Improved School System Keep Getting Better*.
- Mei, T. A. (2010). *Panduan kerja kursus ilmu pendidikan: Idea, contoh dan aplikasi teori*. Petaling: Oxford University Press.
- Mei, T. A. (2010) *Pentaksiran berasaskan sekolah (PBS) di Malaysia: Kesediaan guru, isu dan pelaksanaan*. Kuala Lumpur: Gerak budaya Enterprise.
- Meira, L., (2002). Mathematical representations as systems of notations-in-use. In K. Gravemeijer, R. Lehrer, B. V. Oers, & L. Verschaffel (Eds.), *Symbolizing, modeling and tool use in mathematical education*. (pp. 87-103). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merrill, M. D. (2001). *First principles of instruction*. Educational Technology Research and Development. Utah State University.
- Meyer, B. J. F., & Poon, L. W. (2001). Effects of structure strategy training and signaling on recall of text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 141–159.
- Meyer, R. E., (1983). What have We Learn About The Increasing In Meaningfulness of Science Prose? *Science Education*. 67(2): 223-237.
- Miller, A. H., Imrie, B. W., & Cox, K. (1998). *Student assessment in high education. Handbook for assessing performance*. London: Kogan Page.
- Miller, G., (2007). A surprising connection between memory and imagination. *Science*, 315(5810), 312 -315.
- Miller, K. J., Koury, K. A., Fitzgerald, G. E., Hollingsead, C., Mitchem, K. J., Tsai, H. H., & Park, M. K. (2009). Concept mapping as a research tool to evaluate conceptual change related to instructional methods. *The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 32(4), 365-378.
- Mintzes, J., Wandersee, L., & Novak, J, (Eds) (1998). *Teaching Science for Understanding A human constructivist view*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Mohamad Fadzil Che Amat, (2005). Kesan kaedah pengajaran dan pembelajaran menggunakan paradigma behaviorisme ke atas pencapaian sains sekolah-sekolah kebangsaan di Malaysia satu analisis prestasi UPSR separa dekad. *Prosiding seminar penyelidikan dan penilaian MPTAR 2005*. 40-45.
- Mohamed Zohir Ahmad, & Sharifah Norhaidah Syed Idros, (2005). "Kesediaan guru pelatih USM dalam menangani isu pembangunan lestari". Paper presented at Seminar Kebangsaan JPPG 2005, "Education for Sustainable Development" at Shangri-La, 28-30 August, 2005.

- Mulligan, N. W., & Wiesen, C. (2003). Using the analysis of covariance to increase the power of priming experiments. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 57, 152-166.
- Murphy, P. K., & Alexander, P. A. (2004). A motivated exploration of motivation terminology. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 3-53.
- Murphy, P. K., & Alexander, P. A. (2004). A motivated exploration of motivation terminology. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 3-53.
- N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- National Research Council. (2000). *Inquiry and the national science education standards: A guide for teaching and learning*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Nawi, N. H. (2011). Pengajaran dan pembelajaran: Penelitian semula konsep-konsep asas menurut perspektif gagasan islamisasi ilmu moden. *Kongres Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran UKM*.
- NEAC (2010). *New Economic Model for Malaysia: Part 1*. Percetakan National.
- Neidenthal, P. M. (2007). Embodying emotion. *Science*, 316, 1002-1005.
- Nesbit, J. C., & Adescope, O. O. (2006). Learning with concept and knowledge maps: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(3), 413-448.
- Nor Hayati Alwi. (2004). Peta konsep alat menyusun isi kandungan pengajaran secara bermakna. *Masalah Pendidikan*. Jilid 27. 195-212.
- Nor Hisham Md Nawi. (2011). *Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran: Penelitian semula konsep-konsep asas menurut perspektif gagasan islamisasi ilmu moden*. Kongres Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran UKM 2011. 1-15.
- Novak, J. D. (1977a). *A theory of education*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Novak, J. D. (1990). Concept Maps and Vee Diagrams : Two Tool To Facilitate Meaningful Learning. *Instructional Science*. 19: 29-52.
- Novak, J. D. (1993). How do we learn our lesson? *Science Teacher*. 60(3), 50-55.
- Novak, J. D. (2005). Results and implications of a twelve-year longitudinal study of science concept learning. *Research in Science Education*, 35(1), 24-40.
- Novak, J. D. (2010). *Learning, creating, and using knowledge: Concept maps as facilitative tools in schools and corporations*. (2nd ed.) NY: Routledge.
- Novak, J. D. (2005). Results and implications of a twelve-year longitudinal study of science concept learning. *Research in Science Education*, 35(1), 24-40.

- Novak, J. D. (2010). *Learning, creating, and using knowledge: Concept maps as facilitative tools in schools and corporations*. (2nd ed.) NY: Routledge.
- Novak, J. D., & Cañas, A. J. (2006). *The origins of the concept mapping tool and the continuing evolution of the tool*. Pensacola, FL: Florida Institute for Human and Machine Cognition.
- Novak, J. D., & Cañas, A.J. (2008). *The theory underlying concept maps and how to construct and use them*. Pensacola, FL: Florida Institute for Human and Machine Cognition.
- Novak, J. D., & Gowin, R. (1984). *Learning How To Learn*. N.Y: Cambridge University Press.
- Odom, A. L., & Kelly, P. (2001). Making learning meaningful. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 65(4), 33-37.
- O'Donnell, A. M., Dansereau, D. F., & Hall, R. H. (2002). Knowledge maps as scaffolds for Cognitive processing. *Educational Psychology Review*, 14(1), 71-86.
- Okebukola, P. A. (1990). Attaining Meaningful Learning of Concept In Genetics and Ecology. An Examination of Potency of the Concept Mapping Technique. *Jurnal of Research In Science Teaching*. 27(5). 493-504.
- Okebukola, P. A. (1993). Making college science transparent through the use of concept maps. *Making College Science Transparent Through the Use of Concept Maps*.
- O'Reilly, T., & McNamara, D.S. (2007). The impact of science knowledge, reading skill, and reading strategy knowledge on more traditional “high-stakes” measures of school students’ science. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1),161-196.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2009), programme for International Student Assessment (PISA).
- Ormrod, J. E. (2007). *Human learning* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Othman Talib. (1999). *Keberkesanan kaedah penyepaduan peta konsep dalam pengajaran kimia terhadap pencapaian pelajar matrikulasi*. Tesis Sarjana. Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang.
- Othman Talib. (2007). *Computer Animated Instruction and Students’ Conceptual Change in Electronical*. Tesis PhD. University of Adelaide, Australia.
- Ozel, A. (2009). The practice of information processing model in the teaching of cognitive strategies. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 36(1), 1-9.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual*. Victoria: Allen & Unwin.

- Pankratius, W. J. (1990). Building an Organized Knowledge Base: Concept Mapping and Achievement In Secondary School Physic. *Journal of Chemical Education*. 67 (3): 254-255.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002), *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, 3rd edn, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Parker, L. D. (2003), “Qualitative research in accounting and management: The emerging agenda”, *Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 2: pp. 15-30.
- Partington, J. (1994). Double-marking students' work. *Assessment and Evaluation in High Education*, 19, 57-60.
- Piaw, C. Y. (2012). *Buku 4 :Univariat dan Multivariat*. Shah Alam: McGraw-Hill.
- Piaw, C. Y. (2014). *Buku 2 :Asas Statistik Penyelidikan*. Shah Alam: McGraw-Hill.
- Pinto, M., Doucet, A. V., & Fernandez-Ramos, A. (2010). Measuring students' information skills through concept mapping. *Journal of Information Science*, 36(4), 464- 480.
- Pintrich, P. R., Max, R. W., & Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivation beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 167-199.
- Plummer, K. (2008). *Concept map assessments*. VDM Verlag Dr. Mueller e.k.
- Polito, E., Tanner, K. D., & Monteverdi, J. P. (2008). *Assessing middle school and college students conceptions about tornadoes and other weather phenomena*. The Hilton Desoto Hotel. Savannah: GA.
- Pugh, K. J., & Bergin, D. A. (2006). Motivational influences on transfer. *Educational Psychologists*, 41(3), 147-160.
- Quinn, H. J., Mintzes, J. J., & Laws (2004). Successive concept mapping. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 33(3), 12-17.
- Radcliffe, R., Caverly, D., Hand, J., & Franke, D. (2008). Improving reading in a middle school science classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 51(5), 398.
- Rawson, K. A., & Kintsch, W. (2002). How does background information improve memory for text content? *Memory and Cognition*, 30(5), 768-778.
- Rebich, S., & Gautier, C. (2005). Concept mapping to reveal prior knowledge and conceptual change in a mock summit course on global climate change. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, (53), 5-16.

- Recht, D. R., & Leslie, L. (1998). Effect of prior knowledge on good and poor readers' memory of text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(1), 16-20.
- Reif, F. (2010). *Applying cognitive science to education: Thinking and learning in scientific and other complex domains*. MIT Press.
- Renuka Kaliaperumal & Sharifah Norhaidah. (2008). Kesan penggunaan peta konsep bersama koswer pengajaran sains tingkatan1 (Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia) dalam meningkatkan pengetahuan dan kesedaran Alam Sekitar. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 23, 69-80.
- Ricon, T. (2010). Using concept maps in cognitive treatment for children with developmental coordination disorder. *Health*, 2(7).
- Ritchie, D., & Volkl, C. (2000). Effectiveness of two generative learning strategies in the science classroom. *School Science and Mathematics*, 100(2), 83-89.
- Robley, W. A., Whittle S. R., & Murdoch-Eaton, D. G. (2005). Mapping generic skills curricula: A recommended methodology. *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 29, 221-231.
- Roediger, H. L., & Wertsch, J. V. (2008). Creating a new discipline of memory studies. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 9-22.
- Roth, W. M., & Bowen, G. M. (2001). Professionals read graphs: A semiotic analysis. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 32(2), 159-194.
- Rowles, C., & Brigham, C. (2005). Strategies to promote critical thinking and active Learning. In D. M. Billings, & J. A. Halstead, (Eds.), *Teaching in nursing: A guide for faculty* (2nd ed.), 283-315. Saint Louis, MO: Elsevier.
- Ruzlan Md. Ali. (2006). *Teachers' Indication and Pupils' Construal and Knowledge of Fractions: The Case of Malaysia*. PhD Thesis. University of Warwick, United Kingdom.
- Sarantakos, S. (2005), *Social Research*, 3rd edn, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009), *Research Methods for Business Students*, Pearson Education, London.
- Schaal, S. (2010). Enriching traditional biology lectures-digital concept maps and their influence on achievement and motivation. *World Journal on Educational Technology*, 2(1), 42-54.
- Schochet, P. Z. (2010). The late pretest problem in randomized control trials of education interventions. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 35(4), 379-406.
- Schwendimann, B. A. (2009). Mapping biological ideas: Concept maps as knowledge integration tools for evolution education. *Ph.d Thesis in Science and Mathematics Education* . University of California, Berkeley.

- Seco, G. V., Gras, J. A., & Garcia, M. A. (2007). Comparative robustness of recent methods for analyzing multivariate repeated measures designs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 67(3), 410-432. doi: 10.1177/0013164406294777.
- Shah, H. K. Overhead Projector - A Versatile Teaching Tool. *Indian Journal of Community Med* 2006;31. Available article id=942&action=article. Accessed from <http://www.indmedica.com/journals.php?journalid=7> & issued=73 June 10, 2010.
- Shallcross, D. E, Harrison T. G. Lectures: electronic presentations versus chalk and talk – a chemist’s view. *Chem Educ Res Pract* 2007;8:73-9.
- Sharifah Maimunah Syed Zain & Lewin K. M. (1993). Insight into Science Education: Planning and Policy Priorities In Malaysia. *Laporan Kajian Bersama Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia dan International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO*. Paris: IIPP’s Printshop.
- Shavelson, R. J. (1988). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London: SAGE.
- Sistem Pendidikan Negara, Kumpulan Penyelidik Institusi Pengajian Tinggi Awam.*
- Smith, S. J. & Okolo, C. (2010). Response to intervention and evidence based practices: Where does technology fit? *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 33(4),
- Snead, D., & Young, B. (2003). Using concept mapping to aid african students’ understanding in middle grade science. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 72(30), Washington, DC: Howard University
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Strangeman, N., & Hall, T. (2004). *Background knowledge*. Wakefield, MA: National Center for Accessing the General Curriculum.
- Svinicki, M. D. (2004). *Learning and motivation in the post-secondary classroom*. Anker.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.) Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tanner, K., & Allen, D. (2005). Approaches to biology teaching and learning: understanding the wrong answers- teaching toward conceptual change. *Cell Biology Education* 4, 112-117.
- Taylor, G. R., & MacKenney, L. (2008). *Improving human learning in the classroom: Theories and teaching practices*. Rowan & Littlefield Publishing Group Inc.



- Tekkaya, C. (2003). Remediating high school students' misconceptions concerning diffusion and osmosis through concept mapping and conceptual change text. *Research in Science and Technological Education*, 21(1), 5-16.
- Terry, S. (2006). *Learning and memory: Basic principles, processes, and procedure* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- The Committee on Undergraduate Science Education (1997). *Science teaching reconsidered: A handbook*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Thompson, R. A., & Zamboanga, B. L. (2004). Academic aptitude and prior knowledge as predictors of student achievement in introduction to psychology. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(4), 778-784.
- Tobias, S. (1994). Interest, prior knowledge, and learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(1), 37-54.
- Tobin, K. (1993). *The practice of constructivism in science education*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Toffler, A. (1991). *Powershift: knowledge, wealth, and violence in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. NY: Bantam Books.
- Trianto. 2010. *Mendesain model pembelajaran inovatif-progresif konsep, landasan, dan implementasinya pada kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP)*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Trochim, M. K., & Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). *Concept mapping for planning and evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Tsien, J. Z. (2007). The memory. *Scientific American*, 52-59.
- Tsien, J. Z. (2007). The memory. *Scientific American*, 52-59.
- UNCED (1992). *Agenda 21, the United Nations programme of actions from Rio*. New York: UN Department of Public Information.
- UNESCO. (2005). *United nations decade of education for sustainable development, 2005–2014. International implementation scheme*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations. (2002). *World summit on sustainable development*. Johannesburg, South Africa, 26 August–4 September.
- Vacek, J. E. (2009). Using a conceptual approach with concept mapping to promote clinical thinking. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 148(1).
- Vacek, J. E. (2009). Using a conceptual approach with concept mapping to promote clinical thinking. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 148(1).
- Vaughn, S. & Edmunds, M. (2006). Reading comprehension for older readers. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 41(3), 131-137.

- Venville, G. J. (2008). Knowledge acquisition as conceptual change: The case of a theory of biology. *Contemporary Perspectives on Science and Technology in Early Childhood Education*, 41-63. Eds. O. N. Sancho & B. Spodek. North Carolina:
- Vosniadou, S. (2002). On the nature of naïve physics. In M. Limon & L. Mason (Eds.), *Reconsidering conceptual change: Issues in theory and practice*, 61-76. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wallace, J., & Mintzes, J. (1990). The concept map as a research tool: Exploring conceptual change in biology. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 27(10),
- Weasenforth, D., Biensenbach-Lucas, S. & Meloni, C. (2002). Realizing constructivist objectives through collaborative technologies: Threaded discussions. *Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(3); 58-86
- Wehry, S. & Goudy, L. (2006). *Concept mapping in middle school mathematics*. Florida Institute of Education at the University of North Florida.
- Wendling, B. J., & Mather, N. (2009). *Essentials of evidence-based academic Interventions: Essentials of psychological assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: JohnWiley & Sons.
- Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Willerman, M., & MacHarg, R. A. (1991). The concept map as an advance organizer. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 28(8), 705-711.
- Willerman, M. (1994). The Concept Map as an Advance Organizer. *Journal of Research In Science Teaching*. 27(10): 1033- 1052.
- Wilson, B. G., & Cole, P. (1991). *A review of cognitive teaching models educational technology research & development*, 39(4), 47-63.
- Winer, G. A., Cottrell, J. E., Gregg, V., Fournier, J. S., & Bica, L. A. (2002). Fundamentally misunderstanding visual perception: Adults' belief in visual emissions. *American Psychologist* 57, 417-424.
- Wittwer, J., & Renkl, A. (2008). Why instructional explanations often do not work: A framework for understanding the effectiveness of instructional explanations. *Educational Psychologists*, 43(1), 49-64.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and Social Formation of Mind*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2009), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, (4th ed.). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

- Yin, R. K. (2012), *Applications of Case Study Research*, (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Yin, R. K., Y., Vanides, J., Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Ayala, C. C., & Shavelson, R. J. (2005). Comparison of two concept-mapping techniques: Implications for scoring, interpretation, and use. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 42(2), 166-184.
- Zain, Z. M., Malan, I. N. B., Noordin, F., & Abdullah, Z. (2013). Assessing Student Approaches to Learning: A Case of Business Students at the Faculty of Business Management, UiTM. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90(0), 904–913. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.167>
- Zhao, Y. (2003). *The use of a constructivist teaching model in environmental science at Beijing Normal University*. The China Papers, July 2003, (July).
- Zuhara Aziz & Nurliah Jair. (2009). Penggunaan peta konsep untuk meningkatkan pencapaian mata pelajaran sejarah bagi pelajar tingkatan dua. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia* , 34 (1), 3-15.
- Zwiep, S. G. (2008). Elementary teachers' understanding of students' science misconceptions: Implications for practice and teacher education. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 19(5), 437. (Mei, 2010).
- <http://cmapsinternal.ihmc.us/rid=1FYDDGZ61-LXN6V-6BK/Q>
- [http://cmapinternal.ihmc.us/rid=1114439324882\\_906854293\\_10580/Properties of air, 90-94.](http://cmapinternal.ihmc.us/rid=1114439324882_906854293_10580/Properties_of_air,90-94)
- [http://cmapspublic2.ihmc.us/rid=1114802406671\\_587085978\\_12688/pollution.cmap](http://cmapspublic2.ihmc.us/rid=1114802406671_587085978_12688/pollution.cmap)
- <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/encyc-of-research-design/n472.xm>
- <http://www.alleydog.com/glossary/definition.php?term=InformationProcessing>
- Model.
- [https://www.google.com/search?q=mckinsey+co+report+2007&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8.](https://www.google.com/search?q=mckinsey+co+report+2007&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8)
- [http://www.moe.gov.my/v/pelan-pembangunan-pendidikan-malaysia-2013-2025.](http://www.moe.gov.my/v/pelan-pembangunan-pendidikan-malaysia-2013-2025)
- [http://www.utusan.com.my/utusan/Rencana/20130109/re\\_02/Meramaikan-pelajar-aliran-Sains-di-sekolah.](http://www.utusan.com.my/utusan/Rencana/20130109/re_02/Meramaikan-pelajar-aliran-Sains-di-sekolah)
- <http://www.utm.my/news-clipping/2012/03/29/persepsi-negatif-punca-pelajar-tidak-minat-sains/1>
- [www.science-west.ca/GettingAround](http://www.science-west.ca/GettingAround)