EFL Students' Self-Regulation in Online Interactions with Lecturers and Peers

Nurvira Wardayani[1*], Machdalena Vianty[2], Sofendi[3], Zahra Alwi[4], Didi Suhendi[5] 🆔

[1,2,3,4,5] English Education Department, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: nurviraw@gmail.com

Abstrak

Pembelajaran online jelas menguntungkan dalam situasi saat ini. Berkat teknologi, proses belajar mengajar dapat terus berlangsung meskipun mahasiswa dan pengajar/dosen berada di tempat yang berbeda. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memahami regulasi diri mahasiswa dalam pembelajaran online khususnya untuk interaksi dengan dosen dan teman sebayanya. Untuk menjawab tujuan penelitian digunakan metode kualitatif dengan pendekatan naratif. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner terbuka yang berfokus pada regulasi diri dalam interaksi online dengan dosen dan teman sebaya. Partisipan dalam penelitian ini adalah 12 mahasiswa dari Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. Analisis data menggunakan analisis tematik. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa siswa tidak melihat perbedaan yang signifikan antara pembelajaran tatap muka dan pembelajaran online. Mereka secara teratur berinteraksi dengan dosen dan rekan-rekan mereka selama pembelajaran sinkron dan asinkron. Mereka secara aktif menginisiasi interaksi dengan dosennya dengan bertanya atau menjawab pertanyaan dan memberikan pendapat. Mereka juga aktif berinteraksi dengan teman sebaya dengan mendiskusikan proyek dan tugas akademik. Terlepas dari jenis interaksi (mahasiswa-dosen dan mahasiswa-mahasiswa), sebagian besar mahasiswa menunjukkan upaya aktif mereka dalam mengatur interaksi mereka dengan dosen dan teman sebaya dalam pembelajaran online.

Kata kunci: Pembelejaran Daring, Regulasi Diri, Interaksi dalam Pembelajaran Daring, Regulasi Interaksi

Abstract

Online learning is definitely advantageous in this current situation. Due to the technology, the teaching and learning process can continue despite the students and instructor/lecturer located in different places. This study aims to understand student's self-regulation in online learning particularly for interactions with their lecturer and their peers. To answer the research objectives, qualitative method with narrative approach was applied. The data were collected through open-ended questionnaire focused on self-regulation in online interactions with lecturers and peers. The participants in this study were 12 students from English Education Study Program. The data were analyzed by using thematic analysis. The results revealed that students did not notice a significant difference between face-to-face learning and online learning. They regularly interacted with their lecturer and their peers during synchronous and asynchronous learning. They actively initiated the interactions with their lecturer by asking or answering questions and giving opinions. They also actively interacted with peers by discussing academic projects and assignments. Regardless of the type of interactions (student-lecturer and student-student), most of the students showed their active efforts in regulating their interactions with lecturer and peers in online learning.

Keywords: Online Learning, Self-Regulation, Interactions in Online Learning, Interaction Regulation

1. INTRODUCTION

The outbreak of Covid-19 has affected every aspect of people's lives around the globe. The pandemic has had a significant impact on sectors as business, governance, transportation, and education. In terms of the educational sector, there must be an alternative method of conducting teaching and learning in order for academic activity to continue as usual while also reducing the risk of the corona virus spreading (Adnan, 2020; Churiyah et al., 2020; Jena, 2020). Therefore, on March 24th 2020, the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture issued an educational policy which require the education process during this pandemic is carried out via online to prevent the spread of Covid-19 (Handayani et al., 2021; Ismail et al., 2021; Mu'awanah et al., 2021). Although some of the education institutions

within areas in Indonesia are beginning to conduct face-to-face learning and blended learning, online learning is still being conducted in most of the institutions considering the uncertain situation of Covid-19. Therefore, online learning is the option for conducting the teaching and learning process during the pandemic in addition to the face-to-face meeting.

Online learning is not a novel concept in education, particularly in higher education. Universities all over the world have incorporated online learning, also known as e-learning, into their teaching and learning (Englund et al., 2017; Fatonia et al., 2020; Sadikin & Hamidah, 2020). Online learning as instructional environments aided by the internet, and it includes a wide range of programs that use the internet both inside and outside of school walls to provide access to instructional materials and to facilitate interaction between instructor and students (Kundu & Bej, 2021; Mardiana, 2020; Qekaj-Thaqi & Thaqi, 2021). There are two type of learning occasions/environments in online learning; synchronous and asynchronous learning. Synchronous learning is a type of learning environment in which the learning process happens in real time while asynchronous does not (Mpungose, 2021; Rigo & Mikuš, 2021). It depends on the institution policy to decide the time allocation for each type.

Due to the technology, the teaching and learning process can continue despite the students and instructor/lecturer located in different places (Mardiana, 2020; Patricia Aguilera-Hermida, 2020; Renes & Strange, 2010). However, it also implies that interaction in online learning is limited, whereas interaction with lecturers and peers is critical in any learning environment, particularly online learning. The quantity and quality of interaction between student-lecturer and student-student is often directly related to the success of online learning (Picciano, 2002). In order to have a successful online learning experience, student's interaction in online learning with lecturer and other students should be meaningful and beneficial to their intellectual growth (Coman et al., 2020; Dou et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2019). Furthermore, demonstrate that interaction, such as feedback from lecturers and peers, is essential for students (Ahea, 2016; Georgieva, 2019; Stovner & Klette, 2022). Students clearly value the opportunities to interact with lecturers and peers and believe they are critical to their success in online learning. As a result, in order to regulate their interaction with the lecturer and peers in online learning, students must make active efforts (Liu et al., 2017; Zheng et al., 2017).

Self-regulation is essential in all learning environments, including online learning. D Self-regulation is, self-generated thoughts, feelings, and behaviors aimed at achieving goals (Zimmerman, 2002). Previous study discovered that self-regulated students outperform those who are not (Bakar et al., 2017). This implies that the greater a students use of self-regulated learning strategies, the better his or her academic performance. It is consistent with previous research opinion that found higher achievers use self-regulated learning strategies more successfully than lower achievers (Kosnin, 2007). To be a self-regulated student, one must manage, plan, and be responsible for everything related to their academic activity, which includes having to interact with others in class, whether virtual or non-virtual. There are three types of interaction in online learning: interaction between students and content, interaction between students and instructor, and interaction between students and other students (Moore, 1989). All three types of interaction have been found to be important for students' success in online learning (Hiltz & Goldman, 2005). However, very few studies, particularly in online learning, focus on self-interaction with others (student to student and student to teacher/lecturer). One of a few studies that investigated self-regulation in terms of students' interactions with others (lecturer and peers), and they highlighted the student's active role in initiating the interaction (Cho & Cho, 2017). Therefore, this study aims to explore about the ways students regulate their interactions with lecturers and also with peers in online learning settings.

2. METHODS

This study applied qualitative method. Qualitative research is a research method characterized by an interpretative paradigm that focuses on subjective experiences and the meanings they hold for an individual (Starman, 2013). This study employed a narrative approach in order to collect the necessary data. Narrative inquiry is a type of qualitative research in which the stories themselves become the raw data (Creswell, 2013). As a result, this method is appropriate for this research. The participants of this study were 12 tertiary students of the English Education Study Program of a reputable state university in Palembang, South Sumatera. This study using open-ended questionnaire that focuses on students' self-regulation in online interactions with lecturers and peers. The participants were given an open-ended questionnaire as a way to collect the data. In narrative study, participants' narratives can be collected either orally or in writing (McCoy & Dunlop, 2016). Interview methods allow for follow-up questioning, which results in more elaborated narratives.

The data collection procedure began with the participants receiving the open-ended questionnaire via WhatsApp Group. There were four questions about students' self-regulation during online interactions with lecturers and five about students' self-regulation during online interactions with peers. The participants had one week to complete the questionnaire. The reason for that was with that amount of time, it is hoped that they were able to express themselves freely without being constrained by a time limit. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data from the open-ended questionnaire. To analyze data using thematic analysis, there are six steps including: familiarize yourself with the data, generate initial codes, search for themes, review themes, define and name themes, and produce the report/manuscript (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis is not concerned with identifying unique and idiosyncratic meanings and experiences found only within a single data item.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results
Students' Perspective of Student-Lecturer Interaction in Online Learning Settings

According to the data, the majority of them stated that interaction in online learning is similar to interaction in face-to-face learning to some extent. The primary distinction was that the interactions took place virtually. Given that the majority of participants believed there were only minor differences between online and face-to-face interaction, the majority of them stated they tried to be active during online learning. They interacted with lecturers by using platform features like raising hands, chat box, and microphone (Zoom, Google Meet, and Big Blue Button). However, there were also some participants who were not as active as the others in terms of interacting in class with lecturer. Based on the data presented above, it can be indicated that each participant's interaction with the lecturer in online learning was different. The majority of study participants stated that they actively attempted to interact with lecturers in online settings, while others preferred to be passive. Furthermore, there were two types of online interactions with the lecturer: synchronous and asynchronous learning.

Student-Lecturer Interaction in Synchronous Learning

The interactions between student and lecturer in online learning varied between synchronous and asynchronous learning. The majority of the interaction occurred when students were having difficulty understanding the material/assignment and needed clarification from the lecturer. In synchronous learning, participants stated that they usually ask the lecturer directly during the virtual meeting.

In addition to directly asking the lecturer, the majority of participants stated that they usually discuss the question with their peers beforehand. They could share knowledge about the topic and possibly understand it by discussing it with peers before asking the lecturer directly. If both parties have the same problem, they will ask the lecturer during the questions and answers section. They revealed that lecturers provided time for students to ask questions during the questions and answers section, and they took advantage of the opportunity to ask questions/interact during that time. Interestingly, one participant mentioned that the interaction between student-lecturer also occurred when the lecturer initiated the interaction. When the lecturer asked questions to the class, the participant revealed that he/she interacted with the lecturer, and they responded to the lecturer's questions.

Student-Lecturer Interaction in Asynchronous Learning

In terms of asynchronous learning, participants revealed that they usually interacted with lecturers in the forum discussion in the university's e-learning platform and via WhatsApp. Furthermore, some participants revealed that their interaction with the lecturer occurred when the lecturer provided feedback in asynchronous learning, specifically in the forum discussion. According to the data, participants actively interacted with lecturers in online learning settings, both synchronous and asynchronous learning. By asking/answering questions and offering opinions during the lecture, they demonstrate that they attempted and made an effort to initiate the interaction. Although the majority of participants in this study initiated the interaction, the lecturer also plays an important role in student-lecturer interaction in online learning.

Students' View of Student-Student Interaction in Online Learning Settings

According to the data, the majority of participants said that because of factors like similar age ranges and established friendships, interacting with peers was easy. The data implies that, despite the limited face-to-face interaction, students consider their interactions with peers as natural. Nevertheless, the majority of participants stated that they actively tried to maintain their interaction with peers by mostly discussing materials, assignments, and anything related to class. This demonstrated that, besides developing friendships with peers, the participants consistently made efforts to maintain the interaction. Furthermore, there were two online opportunities/environments where participants interacted with other students: synchronous and asynchronous learning.

Student-student Interaction in Synchronous Learning

All of the participants in this study stated that they interacted with their peers on a regular basis. Participants in synchronous learning revealed that they interacted with their peers during the presentation by asking questions and providing answers. They either ask the presenter directly or type their questions into the chat box. Aside from asking and answering questions during presentations, participants revealed that interaction during synchronous learning was limited and that they preferred to interact with peers during asynchronous learning.

Student-student Interaction in Asynchronous Learning

Most participants stated that they interacted more in asynchronous learning because they had to pay attention to the lecture and also interact with the lecturer; asynchronous learning made it easier for them to interact with peers. Participants revealed that their interactions with peers during asynchronous learning were all about academic projects, assignments, and material. They interacted in either a WhatsApp group or a personal chat. These interactions were usually about encouraging one another or working together to better

understand the learning material. This suggests that the participants had positive and beneficial interactions with their peers. By frequently interacting with peers both inside and outside of the online class, it was clear that these participants had formed relationships with their peers and were not afraid to contact one another. All of the interactions mentioned by the participants appeared to be motivated primarily by the task's requirements. Participants mentioned that, in addition to texting individually or in groups via WhatsApp, they also call or video conference to discuss group assignments.

Discussion

Based on the results, several points need to be discussed. First, it was implied that interaction in online learning differs for each student. Some students prefer to be active, whereas others prefer to be passive. Moreover, feedback is one of the most important aspects of any type of communication, particularly learning. Feedback is especially important in online learning due to the lack of face-to-face interaction (Yengin et al., 2010). This is demonstrated when one participant stated that he or she felt encouraged after receiving feedback from the lecturer. It demonstrates the significance of mutual communication between student and lecturer.

Previously, researchers highlight that student interaction must be reciprocal (Cho & Jonassen, 2009). However, the findings of this study indicate that all social interactions in online learning should be reciprocal. Feedback in the educational field informs us about the truth or falsity of human behavior while also allowing student teachers to improve their own teaching performance and correct their errors (Paccapaniccia, 2002). Feedback can be described as a door that student teachers can open to obtain a variety of data about themselves through their own and others' eyes. As a result, feedback from lecturers is essential in student-lecturer interaction, particularly in online learning where interaction is limited. Furthermore, the data indicated that there appeared to be a balance between student and lecturer effort in terms of initiating and maintaining interaction in online learning.

Second, the data indicates that the participants had positive relationships with their peers. Maintaining interaction with peers provides numerous benefits to students. According to studies, student-student interaction has a positive impact on online learning. Student-to-student interaction is critical for fostering community in an online environment, which promotes productive and satisfying learning while also assisting students in developing problem-solving and critical thinking skills (Kolloff, 2011). Furthermore, other previous study claims that students in an online course with a high level of interaction outperformed students in a similar online course with a moderate level of interaction (Beaudoin, 2002). The most advantageous aspect of peer interaction is that students can learn from each other's experiences. Given that all of the participants in this study were high achievers, it is possible that peer relationships were one of the factors contributing to the success of their online learning.

As previously mentioned before, interaction in online learning does not happen naturally, especially in higher education. Both the lecturer and the students must attempt to interact and maintain that interaction in this setting. In this context, student interaction with lecturers and peers is classified as social interaction in online learning. Regulating social interaction in online learning is critical because interaction with lecturers and peers is a common task in this setting (Dabbagh & Kitsantas, 2005). Students are expected to form social relationships with their peers and instructors, participate in group discussions, and initiate interactions in learning processes such as asking questions, posting messages, providing help, or seeking help in online learning (Lim & Yunus, 2021).

Most of the participants made interacting with the lecturer in online learning by doing the following activities: asking and answering questions in synchronous learning, responding

to forum discussions and WhatsApp group in asynchronous learning. Meanwhile, they interacted with peers by asking and answering questions in presentation during synchronous learning, and discussing learning materials and assignments through WhatsApp in asynchronous learning. Moreover, most of the participants were active in student-lecturer and student-student interaction during synchronous and asynchronous learning. The research was conducted under the situation of Covid-19 pandemic which made it limited in some aspects. Therefore, future researchers could explore self-regulation in online interactions with different approaches to enrich the literature in this topic.

4. CONCLUSION

Face-to-face interactions between student-lecturer and student-student are primarily synchronous, meaning they occur naturally. Meanwhile, online interactions could be in synchronous and asynchronous. Although, it seems like the interactions in online learning and face-to-face learning might be different, most of the students reveal the opposite. They state there was only a slight difference between online interaction and face-to-face interaction which was the interaction happened virtually. In other words, despite the lack of face-to-face interaction in online learning, it does not really affect students' interaction with lecturer and peers. In synchronous learning, students interact with lecturer and peers by asking and answering questions during virtual meeting. Meanwhile, in asynchronous learning the interactions occured through university e-learning platform and WhatsApp. Most of the students reveal they regularly interact with lecturer and peers. They actively tried to interact by initiating the interaction and maintaining it in both synchronous and asynchronous learning. It shows that these students regulate their online interactions with lecturer and peers. The data also highlighted the importance of feedback in online interaction. Feedback from lecturer and peers are crucial in online interactions for students. It implies the importance of reciprocity in both online interaction (student-lecturer and student-student).

5. REFERENCES

Adnan, M. (2020). Online learning amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Students perspectives. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, *1*(2), 45–51. https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.2020261309.

Ahea, M. (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(16), 38–41. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1105282.

Bakar, N. A., Shuaibu, A., & Bakar, R. A. (2017). Correlation of self-regulated learning and academic achievement among Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin (UniSZA) undergraduate students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *7*(4), 254–268. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i4/2804.

Beaudoin, M. F. (2002). Learning or lurking?: Tracking the "invisible" online student. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *5*(2), 147–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(02)00086-6.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Cho, M. H., & Cho, Y. J. (2017). Self-regulation in three types of online interaction: A scale development. *Distance Education*, *38*(1), 70–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2017.1299563.

Cho, M. H., & Jonassen, D. (2009). Development of the human interaction dimension of the Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire in asynchronous online learning

environments. *Educational Psychology*, *29*(1), 117–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802516934.

Churiyah, M., Sholikhan, S., Filianti, F., & Sakdiyyah, D. A. (2020). Indonesia education readiness conducting distance learning in Covid-19 pandemic situation. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *7*(6), 491–507. https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i6.1833.

Coman, C., Țîru, L. G., Meseșan-Schmitz, L., Stanciu, C., & Bularca, M. C. (2020). Online teaching and learning in higher education during the coronavirus pandemic: Students' perspective. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *12*(24), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410367.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches* (3rd ed). Sage.

Dabbagh, N., & Kitsantas, A. (2005). Using web-based pedagogical tools as scaffolds for self-regulated learning. *Instructional Science*, *33*, 513–540. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-005-1278-3.

Dou, R., Brewe, E., Potvin, G., Zwolak, J. P., & Hazari, Z. (2018). Understanding the development of interest and self-efficacy in active-learning undergraduate physics courses. *International Journal of Science Education*, *40*(13), 1587–1605. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1488088.

Englund, C., Olofsson, A. D., & Price, L. (2017). Teaching with technology in higher education: understanding conceptual change and development in practice. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *36*(1), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1171300.

Fatonia, N. A., Nurkhayatic, E., Nurdiawatid, E., Fidziahe, G. P., Adhag, S., Irawanh, A. P., Julyantoj, O., & Azizik, E. (2020). University students online learning system during Covid-19 pandemic: Advantages, constraints and solutions. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, *11*(7), 570–576. https://www.sysrevpharm.org/articles/university-students-online-learning-system-during-covid19-pandemic-advantages-constraints-and-solutions.pdf.

Georgieva, S. (2019). The role of feedback when training pre-service native language teachers. *V International Forum on Teacher Education*, *1*, 323–337. https://doi.org/10.3897/ap.1.e0196.

Handayani, M., Perdana, N. S., & Ukhlumudin, I. (2021). Readiness of Teachers and Students to Take Minimum Competency Assessments. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Assessment and Policy (ICEAP 2020)*, *545*, 73–79. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210423.067.

Hiltz, S. R., & Goldman, R. (2005). Learning together online: Research on asynchronous learning networks. *Education and Information Technologies*, *14*, 103–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-006-9023-3.

Ismail, F., Muis, A., Pawero, D., & Umar, M. (2021). Education Planning and Its Implications for Education Policy during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, *3*(2), 110–115. https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v3i2.4441.

Jena, P. K. (2020). *Impact Of Pandemic COVID-19 on Education In India*. *12*(7), 12582–12586. https://doi.org/DOI- http://journalcra.com/article/impact-pandemic-covid-19-education-india.

Kolloff, M. (2011). *Strategies for effective student/student interaction in online courses*. Madison.

Kosnin, A. M. (2007). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement in Malaysian undergraduates. *International Education Journal*, *8*(1), 221–228. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ841762.

Kundu, A., & Bej, T. (2021). Experiencing e-assessment during COVID-19: an analysis of Indian students' perception. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, *15*(2), 114–134. https://doi.org/10.1108/heed-03-2021-0032.

Lim, T. M., & Yunus, M. M. (2021). Teachers' perception towards the use of Quizizz in the teaching and learning of English: A systematic review. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *13*(11). https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116436.

Liu, X., Li, L., & Zhang, Z. (2017). Small Group Discussion as a Key Component in Online Assessment Training for Enhanced Student Learning in Web-based Peer Assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1324018.

Mardiana, H. (2020). Lecturers' Adaptability To Technological Change And Its Impact On The Teaching Process. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, *9*(2), 275. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v9i2.24595.

Martin, F., Ritzhaupt, A., Kumar, S., & Budhrani, K. (2019). Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Course design, assessment and evaluation, and facilitation. *Internet and Higher Education*, *42*(March), 34–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2019.04.001.

McCoy, T. P., & Dunlop, W. L. (2016). Contextualizing narrative identity: A consideration of assessment settings. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *65*, 16–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.08.006.

Moore, M. G. (1989). Three types of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *3*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923648909526659.

Mpungose, C. B. (2021). Lecturers' reflections on use of Zoom video conferencing technology for e-learning at a South African university in the context of coronavirus. *African Identities*, *00*(00), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2021.1902268.

Mu'awanah, N., Sumardi, S., & Suparno, S. (2021). Using Zoom to Support English Learning during Covid-19 Pandemic: Strengths and Challenges. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar*, *5*(2), 222. https://doi.org/10.23887/jisd.v5i2.35006.

Paccapaniccia, D. (2002). Making the most of assessment feedback. *Healthcare Executive*, *17*(1), 60–60. https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=6032388.

Patricia Aguilera-Hermida, A. (2020). College students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning due to COVID-19. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *1*(July), 100011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100011.

Picciano, A. G. (2002). Beyond student perceptions: Issues of interaction, presence, and performance in an online course. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *6*(1), 21–40. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.98.6506&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

Qekaj-Thaqi, A., & Thaqi, L. (2021). The Importance of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) during the COVID-19—Pandemic in Case of Kosovo (Analytical Approach of Students Perspective). *OALib*, *08*(07), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1106996.

Renes, S. L., & Strange, A. T. (2010). Using Technology to Enhance Higher Education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(3), 203–213. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9167-3

Rigo, F., & Mikuš, J. (2021). Asynchronous and synchronous distance learning of English as a foreign language. *Media Literacy and Academic Research*, *4*(1), 89–106.

http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-817e667f-71c4-4fda-8f1c-187c82669197.

Sadikin, A., & Hamidah, A. (2020). Pembelajaran Daring di Tengah Wabah Covid-19. *Biodik*, *6*(2), 109–119. https://doi.org/10.22437/bio.v6i2.9759.

Starman, A. (2013). The case study as a type of qualitative research. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, *64*(1), 28–43.

Stovner, R. B., & Klette, K. (2022). Teacher feedback on procedural skills, conceptual understanding, and mathematical practices: A video study in lower secondary mathematics classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *110*, 103593. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103593.

Yengin, I., Karahoca, D., Karahoca, A., & Yucel, A. (2010). Roles of teachers in e-learning: How to engage students & how to get free e-learning and the future. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 5775–5787. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.942.

Zheng, L., Cui, P., Li, X., & Huang, R. (2017). Synchronous Discussion between Assessors and Assessees in Web-based Peer Assessment: Impact on Writing Performance, Feedback Quality, Meta-cognitive Awareness and Self-efficacy. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1370533.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2.