

Analysis of the Interrelatedness of Self -Regulation, Learners' Engagement, and Self-Perceived Development in a Synchronous Online EFL Reading Course

Alanazi. Zaha¹

¹ Majmaa University, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Alanazi. Zaha, Majmaa University, Saudi Arabia.

The research is partially financed by (Majmaa University)

Received: August 6, 2022

Accepted: September 9, 2022

Online Published: September 26, 2022

doi:10.5430/wjel.v12n8p39

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n8p39>

Abstract

Self-regulated learning (SRL) and engagement have been postulated as important traits for success in online learning. However, little is known about how these constructs and their subconstructs are related and how they impact learners' self-perceived success particularly with receptive English skills in EFL contexts. This study was conducted to address this gap in the literature through assessing the impact of SRL on 55 EFL Saudi learners' levels of engagement in and self-reported satisfaction with an online EFL course. Results from regression and correlation analyses revealed the importance of self-regulatory skills in enhancing learners' engagement and perceived success in an online reading course. The results also highlighted the importance of considering the subconstructs of both engagement and self-regulation in understanding their relationship and their overall relatedness to self-reported success in an online course on reading comprehension. The findings also point to the need for a unified definition of the two constructs and the significance of considering the distinct contribution of their subconstructs. Pedagogical and theoretical implications are discussed in light of the study's findings.

Keywords: online learning, reading comprehension, self-regulation, satisfaction, engagement

1. Introduction

The last decade has witnessed an increasing growth in distance education (DE) whether as hybrid, complementary, or fully online courses (Olson & Wisher, 2002). Distance learning is defined as "planned learning that normally occurs in a different place from teaching and, as a result, requires special techniques of course design, special instructional techniques, special methods of communication by electronic and other technology, as well as special organizational and administrative arrangements" (Moore & Kearsley, 1996, p. 2). Distance learning can be implemented in purely online, blended, or hybrid courses. Online courses can be conducted synchronously or asynchronously. The synchronous type is offered in real time with a relatively rigid time schedule and with live interaction and discussion with the course instructors. To the contrary, asynchronous learning is more flexible, as the materials, assignments, and videos are posted online and learners can submit their work in a more flexible fashion. Research has pointed to various benefits of online learning including time, place, pace, flexibility, and the capability of reaching geographically dispersed regions, hence saving money and time (Plous, 2000).

However, research findings suggest that not all learners are able to meet the demands and responsibilities of self-directed online learning environments (Dyran, Cate & Rhee, 2008) and that success in online platforms demands more self-regulated learning and engagement on learners' parts. While these constructs have no unified definition across various studies, they generally maintain common components regardless of their operationalized definition. Self-regulation generally involves the ability to plan, manage time, and monitor cognitive and behavioral activities to achieve personal goals (Gazzaniga, Heatherton & Halpern, 2010; Zimmerman, 2000), while engagement is globally defined as the "individual effort and involvement in the academic, interpersonal, and extracurricular offerings on a campus" (Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005, p. 62). Findings from numerous studies revealed that self-regulation can largely influence learners' perceived satisfaction with and performance in cyberspace (Blake, 2012; Gilbert 2001). Literature on self-regulation has pointed out that motivation, a major component of the construct of self-regulation, has significant impacts on not only learners' satisfaction, but also their course performance and the rate of failing/passing a course (Lee et al., 2013). The lack of experience with self-directed learning, however, mainly with lower language proficiency level students, has been shown to contribute to poor performance in online classes compared to face-to-face ones (Kuama & Intharaksa, 2016; Xu & Jaggars, 2013) and to reported dissatisfaction with and the increasing rates of attrition in some web-based courses (Carr, 2000; Chang, 2005). In addition to self-regulation, engagement and participation in course activities are crucial for language learning in general and for skill-based courses in particular. Interactive language skills, such as reading, require more active roles from learners and also more creativity from instructors in designing interactive learning tasks.

Despite a multitude of research-based publications on the role self-regulation skills and engagement in the success of online learning experiences, there is a dearth of investigations on how these constructs are related. A cursory review of the current literature, as will be

shown in the literature review, suggests no unified definition of these constructs, making it difficult to generalize research findings to all learning contexts. Considering the nature of online learning of language, there is a need for investigating the role of SRL and engagement in the learning of language, particularly for lower proficiency level students. Teaching language courses wherein both the subject and language are new to learners and wherein the “subject matter is communication” can be more challenging online; this is especially true for learners of lower proficiency levels where more focus on both the form of interaction and the content is needed (Hampel & Stickler, 2005, p. 312). Another limitation of SRL research is the scant research on how these skills affect learners’ perceived progress in language courses that are interactive by nature, namely, reading comprehension. Therefore, this study attempts to address this gap by examining how the relationship between self-regulated learning (SRL), engagement, and self-perceived success in an online reading comprehension course. This line of research can help institutions and language teachers to evaluate the needs of online language learners and the effectiveness of English language courses from learners’ perspectives and so they may modify their teaching and course materials in online courses accordingly. Bearing this in mind, the current study attempts to answer the following questions:

RQ1. To what extent do self-regulatory strategies, including subconstructs, predict female Saudi EFL learners’ engagement in online learning?

RQ2. To what extent do self-regulation and engagement predict learners’ self-perceived success in an online reading course?

Answering the above questions necessitates a review of the related literature and knowledge gaps requiring further exploration. The first section provides a discussion of the significance of learners’ self-regulation skills and engagement for success in the online learning process. The second part describes the need for assessing learners’ self-satisfaction in online learning contexts by reviewing the relevant literature. The online EFL course under investigation and the methodology employed to answer the study’s research questions will be the focus of the third section. The findings will then be presented along with a discussion of implications for online teaching of English, especially among EFL beginners.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Self-regulation and Engagement in Online Learning

Research on online learning has examined learner characteristics that are needed for establishing a successful, online educational setting. One of the most significant personal traits of successful e-learners is their ability to be autonomous and to self-direct their learning process (Ross & Schulz, 1999; Wang et al., 2013). Compared to traditional classrooms, where the learning process is mainly teacher-centered, online learning emphasizes a learner-centered approach. In other words, learners are expected to take more responsibility in their learning process. They need to set up their goals, monitor and evaluate their learning process, manage their time effectively, and seek help from peers and instructors when needed. According to Zimmerman (2000), self-regulation is featured mainly through the following skills:

- (a) setting specific proximal goals for oneself, (b) adopting powerful strategies for attaining the goals, (c) monitoring one’s performance selectively for signs of progress, (d) restructuring one’s physical and social context to make it compatible with one’s goals, (e) managing one’s time use efficiently, (f) self-evaluating one’s methods, (g) attributing causation to results, and (h) adapting future methods (p. 66).

In addition to physical adaptive behaviors, Zimmerman’s (2000) definition includes the use of metacognitive strategies, which refer to strategies for monitoring or controlling one’s cognition. Pintrich, et al., (1991) limited their definition to only metacognitive processes that include planning, monitoring, and organizing skills. Others, such as Schoenfeld (1992), included both metacognitive and cognitive strategies in their definitions of the self-regulation construct. Cognitive strategies refer to the behavioral learning strategies that learners utilize to obtain or process information such as elaboration, rehearsal, and organizational strategies. Self-regulation has also been referred to as the ability and motivation to implement, monitor, and evaluate learning strategies for the purpose of enhancing one’s knowledge (Ertmer, 1995).

It can be noted that, despite the various definitions of self-regulation (see Panadero 2017 for a further review), one common assumption is that the self-regulatory construct is multidimensional and that self-regulated learners are able to regulate their motivations, manage time and tasks, set achievable goals, monitor their progress, and seek help when needed (Zeidner, et al., 2000). In other words, the two main components in the self-regulation construct are motivation and learning strategies, and this is the part of the definition that will be adopted in the current study.

Previous research examined the importance of self-regulation from different angles, including the relationship between self-regulation and personal characteristics and the relationship between self-regulation strategies and learning outcomes, drop or fail rate, or perceived satisfaction of the course. Research on self-regulation suggests that integrating self-regulatory instruction in a web-based course promotes a positive correlation between self-regulation level and the perceived self-efficacy and task value in web-based course (Chang, 2005) and that learners with more experience with online courses are more able to self-regulate their learning and, hence, show more satisfaction with their online courses (Wang et al., 2013). Furthermore, the overall research revealed that possessing self-directed strategies is associated with a decreased rate of online course attrition (Lee, et al., 2013) and with perceived satisfaction and usefulness of online courses (Landrum, 2020; Puziferro, 2006; Zimmerman, 1990). Nevertheless, some other studies (e.g., Kuo et al., 2014) found self-regulation to be related to, yet not a statistically significant predictor of, learners’ satisfaction.

In addition to the ability to monitor and evaluate behavioral and affective learning processes, engagement with the course content, peers, and instructors is an important condition for academic success and provides an indication of learners' behaviors and activities during class, especially in online contexts (Ryle & Cumming, 2007). The literature in higher education offers various definitions for the construct of engagement. Some researchers define it globally in terms of learners' engagement in institutional activities and projects (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges & Hayek (2007). Bomia, et al., (1997) limited engagement to activities with direct relevance to general learning process: "students' willingness, need, desire, and compulsion to participate in, and be successful in, the learning process" (p. 294). Another commonly cited model (see Briggs, 2015) that provides more of a local definition is that of Moore (1989,) which describes engagement in terms learners' level of interest in and interaction with the course subject including materials, peers, and instructors. Given that the current study focus is on factors affecting learners' self-satisfaction and engagement in an online course, the micro-level definition of engagement adopted by Moore (1989) will be used.

The level of learners' engagement has been found to be a sign of learning progress (Kuh, 2003) and a main factor in evaluating the effectiveness of online learning (Axelson & Flick, 2010; Chen, et al., 2010). Research also found that the level of engagement can statistically be predicted by environmental factors such as the use of technology (Junco, 2012), class size, and teachers' verbal immediacy (Zepke & Leach, 2010; Marx, et al., 2016). In addition, the level of engagement was found to be positively correlated with academic achievement or learning outcomes (Jaggars & Xu 2016; Schaufeli et al., 2002) and course satisfaction (Tinto, 2012; Wefald & Downey, 2009; Zyngier, 2008). Kuo et al. (2014) found that the combination of the variables of interaction or engagement, internet self-efficacy, and self-regulated learning accounted for about 50% of the variance in learners' satisfaction. Nevertheless, when examining the three factors individually, engagement, particularly in terms of course interaction, was the only statistically significant predictor of learners' level of satisfaction.

Overall, the review of the literature on the constructs of self-regulation and engagement points to their significance in promoting learning experience. However, the literature on the interplay between these constructs is still limited in many aspects. First, with the lack of a unified definition and the various models adopted in previous studies, little is known about how learning strategies and motivational beliefs and practices in the two major components of the self-regulation construct are related to engagement and satisfaction levels in an online course. Similarly, the variations of the definition of engagement, many of which are limited to participation mainly in institutional activities rather than actual interaction with the course itself, make it difficult to generalize findings to the context of online learning of language. Last but not the least, a large proportion of previous studies were conducted within L1 contexts (Kuh, 2003; Tinto, 2012; Wefald & Downey, 2009; Zyngier, 2008) and /or with heterogenous samples, like participants from different genders and or from a combination of different online courses (e.g., Chang, 2013; Wang, et al., 2013). These limitations of previous research may not be helpful in generalizing the findings across different instructional settings and different online courses. Therefore, further research is needed to shed light on the importance self-regulatory skills and engagement in teaching English skills for EFL learners. This need becomes more pressing when teaching interactive language skills, such as reading comprehension, online to relatively low proficiency learners of language. It is also deserving of mention that receptive skills, such as reading, are interactive by nature and, thus, can be more challenging to master when taught online. The findings from this strand of research can help institutions and educators develop more effective teaching strategies for increasing learners' engagement in their learning process and adopt appropriate instructional strategies for facilitating the development of the traits and characteristics needed for a more engaged self-directed learning.

3. Methodology

3.1 The Online Reading Course

The online reading course used to recruit study participants is offered to first-year students in a public university in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). The online reading course is a mandatory online language course for Saudi EFL freshmen majoring in English and is a prerequisite for two advanced face-to-face reading classes. It is offered along with three face-to-face courses in grammar, writing, and listening. The course includes pre-prepared materials (passages and questions supplied by a text reader) covering five units. The course lasts 14 weeks and the students meet with teachers every other week. During the no-meeting weeks, teachers supervise students' progress through assignments, written discussions, and embedded online reading practice. The main objectives of this course based on the curriculum description include identifying main ideas and supporting details and using contextual clues to identify the meaning of words and the relationship among ideas.

3.2 Participants

The participants in this study are Saudi female EFL students enrolled in an online reading comprehension course. The students are English major freshmen who passed the preparatory-level courses required for majoring in English. Learners who pass the preparatory level are generally categorized as high beginners to low intermediate. Students who are able to show evidence of their English language proficiency (equivalents of a score of 4 and above in IELETs exam) need not take the preparatory semester. Participants' ages are between 19 and 22 and they have studied English in public schools for approximately six years. Invitations for participation were sent via email to all students enrolled in the online reading course. Only students who have completed the survey (55 female students) were selected.

3.3 Instruments

A survey questionnaire was administered to capture survey learners' level of self-regulation, engagement, and perceived success in the online reading course. In this survey questionnaire, a six-point Likert-like measurement scale was employed ranging from strongly disagree

“1” to strongly agree “6”. The items cover two major constructs of self-directed learning: motivational beliefs (items 3-8) and language learning strategies (items 9-20). The second part was meant to measure learners’ engagement (items 21-28). The last part (items 29-33) addressed learners’ perceived success in the reading comprehension course. The survey items (see Appendix A) were adapted and modified from the relevant literature; specifically, self-regulation items were adapted from the manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Pintrich et al., (1991) and by Kocak (2003). Items addressing learners’ engagement were derived from existing instruments used by Handelsman, Briggs, Sullivan & Towler (2005). The survey items were then translated (see Appendix B) and distributed to learners in their mother tongue (Arabic). Two English language instructors whose L1 is also Arabic were invited to provide comments on the validity, clarity, and appropriateness of the survey items.

4. Results and discussion

RQ1. To what extent do self-regulatory strategies, including subconstructs, predict female Saudi EFL learners’ engagement in online learning?

To investigate the extent to which self-regulatory strategies can predict students’ perceived engagement in the reading comprehension course, a simple linear regression analysis was conducted. The results, as shown in Table 1, revealed that self-regulatory strategies are statistically significant predictors of learners’ engagement with the online course: $F(1,53) = 18.063, p < .05$. The use of self-regulatory strategies account for about 25% of the variation in students’ level of engagement with the online reading course. To further understand whether the two dimensions of the construct of self-regulation demonstrate a similar strength of association with engagement, the Pearson correlation coefficient test was conducted. The results showed that the use of learning strategies has a strong and large correlation with the level of engagement with $r = .6$ compared to the moderate association $r = .3$ between engagement and motivational beliefs.

Table 1. The Effect of Self-Regulation on Learners’ Perceived Engagement

Regression Statistics						
Multiple R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of Estimates			
0.50416477	0.25418211	0.24011008	3.82342023			
ANOVA						
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
Regression	1	264.053623	264.053623	18.0629244	8.6935E-05	
Residual	53	774.78274	14.6185423			
Total	54	1038.83636				
Regression Coefficients						
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	18.7648942	4.5211205	4.15049637	0.00012085	9.6966749	27.8331136
SRL score	0.21873559	0.05146659	4.25004992	8.6935E-05	0.11550668	0.3219645

RQ2. To what extent do self-regulation and engagement predict learners’ self-perceived success in an online reading course?

To investigate which skills (i.e., self-regulation or engagement) are statistically significant predictors of learners’ satisfaction with the online course, a regression analysis was conducted with self-regulation and engagement as predictors. The results of the regression analysis, as shown in Table 2, indicated that the two predictors explained 63% of the variance in learners’ perception of success and that possessing self-regulation is a statistically significant predictor of learners’ perceived success in the online reading course when controlling for engagement scores ($R^2 = .63, F(F(2, 52) = 17.778, p < .05$). In other words, with each one-point increase in learners’ self-regulation level, their satisfaction with the course increases by .27 controlling for the scores of engagement.

Table 2. The Effect of Self-regulation and Engagement on Learners’ Perceived Satisfaction

Regression Statistics						
Multiple R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error			
0.6372563	0.4060956	0.38325312	3.62024622			
ANOVA						
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
Regression	2	466.005774	233.002887	17.7780894	1.3081E-06	
Residual	52	681.521499	13.1061827			
Total	54	1147.52727				
Regression Coefficients						
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	-2.1328062	4.9277096	-0.432819	0.66693622	-12.020979	7.75536657
SRL score	0.27202311	0.05642806	4.82070669	1.2853E-05	0.15879193	0.38525429
engagement scores	0.07809482	0.13006131	0.60044619	0.55081702	-0.1828923	0.33908194

Given that self-regulation is a complex construct with two main sub-components, it was necessary to further understand not only its overall effect, but also the impact of its main dimensions, namely motivational practices and adopted learning strategies, on learners’ perceived satisfaction. Another multiple linear regression with motivational-based skills and learning strategies as predictors of self-perceived success

was run. The findings pointed to the significance of using learning strategies in increasing the level of course satisfaction. As demonstrated in Table 3 below, learning strategies were shown to be a statistically significant predictor for students' belief about their own success in the course. $F(2, 52) = 2.4811, p < .05$, indicating that with each one-point increase in learners' use of self-learning strategies, their self-reported satisfaction increases by .28 when holding the variable of engagement constant.

Although the results of the multiple regression model pointed to self-regulation as a statistically significant predictor of learners' self-assessed success, this should not relegate the association between engagement and learners' satisfaction, as revealed by the Pearson correlation coefficients ($r = .4$), indicating positive and moderate correlation between the two parameters.

Table 3. Effect of Learning Strategies and Motivation on Learners' Perceived Satisfaction

Regression Statistics						
Multiple R	0.63402392					
R Square	0.40198634					
Adjusted R Square	0.37898581					
Standard Error	3.63274898					
Observations	55					
ANOVA						
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
Regression	2	461.290284	230.645142	17.4772674	1.5649E-06	
Residual	52	686.236989	13.1968652			
Total	54	1147.52727				
Regression Coefficients						
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	-0.7016489	4.47688989	-0.1567269	0.87606705	-9.6851857	8.28188794
Mot score	0.29334608	0.16345852	1.79462091	0.07852773	-0.0346574	0.62134961
LS score	0.28626383	0.11537746	2.48110706	0.01636904	0.05474202	0.51778564

Contrary to Kuo et al., (2014) and in line with some previous research findings (Landrum, 2020; Puzziferro, 2008; Zimmerman, 1990), the results of this study point to the significance of self-regulation in predicting the level of learners' engagement in and self-perceived satisfaction with the online reading course. Learners who show more desire for learning the English language and are able to adopt different strategies for monitoring their learning process are more likely to show higher levels of engagement with their course, peers, and instructors and to be more satisfied with their online language learning experience. In addition, although the findings conform with that of Tinto (2012) and Zyngier (2008), showing that engagement is positively correlated with the perceived learners' satisfaction, they run contrary to Kuo et al., (2014), showing that engagement is not a statistical predictor of learners' level of satisfaction. One possible explanation for the contradictory results to that of Kuo et al., (2014) is the differences in the sample and the courses involved. While the sample of the current study is limited to undergraduate EFL learners categorized as high beginners to low intermediate level learners in an online EFL course, Kuo et al., (2014) study included both graduates and undergraduates, mainly L1 learners from various age groups, that were enrolled in different online courses, none of which was a language course.

Overall, the findings suggest that possessing effective learning and reading strategies plays a far more important role than the perceived level of engagement in shaping EFL learners' attitudes toward the success of their online experience. One explanation for the overriding impact of learning strategies on learners' perceived success is the nature of online learning that favors self-autonomous learners. The reading course is designed to be more learner-centered, with the teacher's main role being supervising and guiding learners through the required tasks of the course. Also, the course under examination does not require content knowledge but rather general English knowledge that, for some students, can be autonomously acquired. Another potential explanation is the impact of the classroom size. The current course has around 55 students, which, depending on previous research findings (Marx, Simonsen, & Kitchel, 2016; Zepke & Leach, 2010), can have negative effects on learners' levels of engagement. This raises the question of whether online language learning courses with relatively large numbers of students can offer enough opportunities for learners to interact with the course materials, their peers, and instructors and whether learners with low self-regulatory skills are able to meet the expectations of online language courses.

The study findings also point to the need for considering the fact that affective and behavioral components of the self-regulation construct may not have the same impact on learners' level of engagement and perceived satisfaction. Affective or motivational based beliefs and practices tend to be of less significance compared to the use of effective language learning strategies in promoting EFL learners' level of satisfaction and engagement in online English courses.

5. Implications and Limitations

Overall, the findings have several theoretical and pedagogical implications. Theoretically, studies on the impact of self-regulation and engagement need to consider not only the overall impact of self-regulation and engagement constructs but also the dimensions of the construct being examined. The variations in the literature definitions of these constructs, though insightful, may not be helpful in reaching a full understanding of what specific traits self-regulatory and engaged learners have and whether the relevant weight of these characteristics is influenced by the requirements and the nature of an online course. Also, contextual factors, such as class size, need to be taken into consideration when examining issues related to engagement in online classrooms. From a pedagogical perspective, this suggests that

maintaining active engagement, a crucial component of online language learning, necessitates careful consideration of classroom size. The findings also indicate that helping learners develop effective self-regulatory skills can promote their engagement and perceived satisfaction in online language courses with relatively large numbers. Explicit instruction on how learners monitor and evaluate their learning during and after reading comprehension activities in an online setting is crucial for enhancing their autonomy and satisfaction with the learning outcomes. Surveying learners' awareness and actual use of learning strategies can be used to evaluate learners' readiness for online learning experiences. Another implication for this study is that although motivation is significant for any learning process, let alone learning a language, the effective use of language learning strategies tends to be an overriding force in the learning of EFL.

This study is not free of limitations. As the findings are based on a sample of 55 female learners, researchers are invited to investigate larger and more diverse samples with different parameters (lower vs. high proficiency levels, learners of content-based subjects vs. language courses) and in different language courses (receptive vs. productive skills). Gender differences in the use of self-regulating strategies in EFL context and its relatedness to their engagement and perceived satisfaction with a skill-based course is another interesting area worthy of future investigation. In addition, the current study findings are based on learners' responses to a survey and, since satisfaction is a crucial, yet not a sufficient indicator of actual achievement, an avenue for upcoming research is to examine the impact of self-regulation and engagement not only on self-perceived success but also academic achievement. The current paper investigated the constructs of self-regulation and engagement based on students' self-reports; it would be insightful to triangulate findings with actual observation of learners' self-regulatory behaviors and patterns of engagement through extensive examination and monitoring of online activities (e.g., emails, log files, discussion board posts). Another area worth investigating is whether findings, particularly those pertinent to engagement, in this study apply to similar contexts with smaller class sizes (e.g., less than 30 students).

6. Conclusion

This study was conducted to enrich the literature on the teaching of language courses online with a particular focus on teaching reading comprehension. The paper examined the relatedness between the level of self-directedness, engagement, and learners' satisfaction and perceived development. The study consolidated the role self-regulatory skills plays in promoting learners' interaction in, participation in, and satisfaction with online language courses. The findings, nevertheless, highlighted the need for further research on the affective and behavioral aspects of self-regulatory skills and the level of their contribution to increasing learners' engagement in and self-reported satisfaction with online reading courses.

List of abbreviations

EFL (English as a foreign language), SRL (self-Regulated Learning)

Availability of Data and Materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing Interests

The author declares that there are no competing interests.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Deanship of Scientific Research at Majmaah University for supporting this work under Project Number No. R-2022-273.

References

- Axelson, R. D., & Flick, A. (2010). Defining student engagement. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 43(1), 38-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2011.533096>
- Blake, R. (2012) Best practices in online learning: is it for everyone? In F. Rubio and J. J. Thoms (Eds.), *Hybrid language teaching and learning: Exploring theoretical, pedagogical and curricular issues*. Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning. 10-26.
- Bomia, L., Beluzo, L., Demeester, D., Elander, K., Johnson, M., & Sheldon, B. (1997). *The Impact of Teaching Strategies on Intrinsic Motivation*. Champaign, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.
- Briggs, A. (2015). Ten ways to overcome barriers to student engagement online. *Online Learning Consortium*.
- Carr, M. (2014). The Online University Classroom: One Perspective for Effective Student Engagement and Teaching in an Online Environment. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, 14(1), 99-110.
- Carr, S. (2000). As distance education comes of age, the challenge is keeping the students. [Electronic version]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(23), 39-41.
- Chang, M. M. (2005). Applying self-regulated learning strategies in a web-based instruction—An investigation of motivation perception. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18, 217-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220500178939>
- Chen, P. S. D., Lambert, A. D., & Guidry, K. R. (2010). Engaging online learners: The impact of Web-based learning technology on college student engagement. *Computers & Education*, 54(4), 1222-1232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.11.008>
- Dynan, L., Cate, T., & Rhee, K. (2008). The Impact of Learning Structure on Students' Readiness for Self-Directed Learning. *The Journal of*

- Education for Business*, 84, 96-100. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.84.2.96-100>
- Ertmer, P. A. (1995). *Learning from case-based instruction: The role of perceived value, learning orientation, and reflective self-regulation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Gazzaniga, M., Heatherton, T. & Halpern, D. (2010). *Psychological Science* (3rd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Gilbert, S. (2001). *How to be a successful online student*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2005). New skills for new classrooms: Training tutors to teach languages online. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(4), 311-326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220500335455>
- Handelsman, M. M., Briggs, W. L., Sullivan, N., & Towler, A. (2005). A measure of college student course engagement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(3), 184-192. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.98.3.184-192>
- Jaggars, S. S., & Xu, D. (2016). How do online course design features influence student performance? *Computers & Education*, 95, 270-284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.014>
- Junco, R. (2012). The relationship between frequency of Facebook use, participation in Facebook activities, and student engagement. *Computers & education*, 58(1), 162-171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.08.004>
- Koçak, A. (2003). *A study on learners' readiness for autonomous learning of English as a foreign language* (Doctoral dissertation, METU).
- Kuama, S., & Intharaksa, U. (2016). Is Online Learning Suitable for All English Language Students? *PASAA*, 52.
- Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35, 24-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380309604090>
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2007). Piecing together the student success puzzle: Research, propositions, and recommendations. *ASHE Education Report, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass*, 32(5), 1181.
- Kuo, Y. C., Walker, A. E., Schroder, K. E. E., & Belland, B. R. (2014). Interaction, internet self-efficacy, and self-regulated learning as predictors of student satisfaction in online education courses. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 20, 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.10.001>
- Landrum, B. (2020). Examining students' confidence to learn online, self-regulation skills and perceptions of satisfaction and usefulness of online classes. *Online Learning*, 24(3), 128-146. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i3.2066>
- Lee, Y., Choi, J., & Kim, T. (2013). Discriminating factors between completers of and dropouts from online learning courses. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(2), 328-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2012.01306.x>
- Marx, A., Simonsen, J., & Kitchel, T. (2016). Undergraduate Student Course Engagement and the Influence of Student, Contextual, and Teacher Variables. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 57, 212-228. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2016.01212>
- Moore, M. G. (1989). Three types of interactions. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(2), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923648909526659>
- Moore, M., & Kearsley, G. (1996). *Distance education: A systems view*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Olson, T. M., & Wisher, R. A. (2002). The Effectiveness of Web-Based Instruction: An Initial Inquiry. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v3i2.103>
- Oxford, R. (2001). Language learning strategies. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 166-172). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667206.025>
- Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1991). *A manual for the use of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ)*. National center for research to improve postsecondary teaching and learning, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Plous, S. (2000). Tips on Creating and Maintaining an Educational World Wide Web Site. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27, 63-70. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328023TOP2701_13
- Puzziferro, M. (2008). Online technologies self-efficacy and self-regulated learning as predictors of final grade and satisfaction in college-level online courses. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 22(2), 72-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923640802039024>
- Ross, J., & Schulz, R. (1999). Can computer-aided instruction accommodate all learners equally? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(1), 5-24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8535.00087>
- Ryle, A., & Cumming, K. (2007) Reflections on Engagement in Online Learning Communities. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 3(3), 35-46. <https://doi.org/10.5172/ijpl.3.3.35>

- Schaufeli, W. B., Martinez, I., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 33, 464-481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005003>
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1992). Learning to think mathematically: Problem solving, metacognition, and sense making in mathematics. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on Mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 334-368). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Tinto, V. (2012). Enhancing student success: Taking the classroom success seriously. *The International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 3(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.5204/intjfyhe.v3i1.119>
- Wang, C. H., Shannon, D., Ross, M. (2013). Students' characteristics, self-regulated learning, technology self-efficacy, and course outcomes in online learning. *Distance Education* 34(3), 302-323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2013.835779>
- Wefald, A. J., & Downey, R. G. (2009). Construct dimensionality of engagement and its relation with satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(1), 91-112. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.143.1.91-112>
- Xu, D., & Jaggars. (2013). Adapt- ability to Online Learning: Differences across types of students and academic subject areas. *CCRC Working Paper Community Center*, 54.
- Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M., & Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Self-regulation: Directions and challenges for future research. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 749-768). London: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50052-4>
- Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(3), 167-177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787410379680>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: an overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2501_2
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451-502). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zyngier, D. (2008). (Re)conceptualizing student engagement: Doing education not doing time. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1765-1776. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.09.004>

Appendix A.

Learners' Reading Survey (English Version of the Survey)

1. Do you agree to take this survey? Yes/No
2. Gender : Male/Female
3. Learning English is enjoyable for me.
4. I want to continue studying English for as long as possible.
5. The most satisfying thing for me in this course is trying to understand the content as thoroughly as possible.
6. When I have the opportunity in this class, I choose course assignments that I can learn from even if they don't guarantee a good grade.
7. If I can, I want to get better grades in this class than most of the other students.
8. My main concern in this class is getting a good grade
9. I read English written materials to improve my English (e.g., English magazines, books, newspapers)
10. I listen to English materials to improve my English. (e.g., English songs, news)
11. I intentionally apply English that I have learned for communication. (e.g., speaking, writing)
12. I make lists of important terms for this course and memorize the Lists
13. When I study for this class, I practice saying the material to myself over and over.
14. During class, I make use of any opportunity to take part in activities such as pair/group discussion.
15. When reading for this course, I make up questions to help focus my reading.
16. If course materials are difficult to understand, I change the way I read the material.
17. Before I study new course material thoroughly, I often skim it to see how it is organized
18. I ask myself questions to make sure I understand the material I have been studying or reading .
19. I try to change the way I study in order to fit the course requirements and instructor's teaching style.
20. When I study for this class, I set goals for myself in order to direct my activities in each study period.
21. I Integrate my own views with that of others when learning the course material
22. I Prepare study notes to understand the course material
23. I study for this course on regular basis
24. I do all required assignments
25. I discuss academic performance and other matters related to the achievement of academic goals with my instructors
26. I understand difficult concepts and content better after interacting with instructors
27. I Interact with peers on mastering the course material.
28. I regularly participate in class discussions in most of my classes
29. I am pleased with what I learned in the course.
30. The course helped me to increase my vocabulary knowledge.
31. The course helped me to read fast (e.g., I read chunks of words instead of individual words).
32. The course activities improved my ability of identifying the main idea of a text.
33. I learned skills that will help me in my future English courses.

Appendix B

Learners' Reading Survey (Arabic Version)

1. هل توافق على المشاركة بهذا الاستبيان
2. الجنس
3. تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية ممتع بالنسبة لي .
4. أرغب في مواصلة دراسة اللغة الإنجليزية لأطول فترة ممكنة
5. أكثر ما يشعرني بالرضا هو محاوله فهم المقرر علي اكمل وجه ممكن
6. عندما تتاح لي الفرصة في هذا المقرر ، أختار المهام التي يمكنني التعلم منها حتى لو كانت لا تضمن لي درجة جيدة
7. اذا كان بإمكانني ، فأنا أرغب في الحصول على درجات أفضل في هذا المقرر من معظم الطلاب الآخرين
8. أهم ما يشغلني في هذا المقرر هو الحصول على درجة جيدة
9. اقرأ مواد مكتوبة باللغة الإنجليزي لتحسين لغتي الإنجليزية مثل المجلات والكتب والصحف الإنجليزيه
10. لتحسين لغتي الإنجليزية أستمع إلى المواد الإنجليزية على سبيل المثال ، الأغاني ، والأخبار
11. أطبق اللغة الإنجليزية التي تعلمتها بقصد التواصل على سبيل المثال في التحدث والكتابة
12. أقوم بعمل قائمة بالكلمات الهامة في هذا المقرر واقوم بمراجعتها
13. عندما أذاكر لهذا المقرر فأبني اتدرب علي ترديد المحتوى شفويا مرارا وتكرار ا
14. أستغل أي فرصة للمشاركة في أنشطة الفصل مثل المناقشات الثنائية او الجماعية
15. أثناء القراءة لهذا المقرر، أطرح على نفسي اسئلة لتساعدني على التركيز
16. عندما أواجه صعوبة في فهم المقرر فأبني أقوم بتغيير طريقتي في القراءة
17. قبل ان أتعمق في قراءة نص جديد أقوم بداية بقراءته سريعا لمعرفة كيف تم تقسيمه وتنظيمه
18. اطرح علي نفسي اسئلة لأتحقق من فهمي لما أذاكر أو أقرأ
19. أحاول تغيير طريقتي في المذاكرة لتتناسب مع متطلبات المقرر وطريقه الأستاذ بالتدريس
20. عندما أدرس لهذا المقرر ، أضع لِنفسي أهدافا لتحديد وتوجيه مهام في كل فترة دراسية .
21. أجمع ما بين آرائي و آراء الآخرين لفهم وتعلم المقرر .
22. أستخدم دفتر تدوين الملاحظات لمساعدتي في فهم محتوى المقرر .
23. أدرس وأراجع لهذا المقرر بانتظام
24. أقوم بعمل جميع التكاليف والواجبات المطلوبة مني في هذا المقرر
25. أقوم بمناقشة أدائي الأكاديمي والأمور الأخرى المتعلقة بتحقيق الأهداف الأكاديمية مع أساتذتي
26. التواصل مع اساتذتي يساعدي علي فهم المحتوى بشكل أفضل
27. أتناقش كَثْرًا مع أصدقائي حول ما أتعلمه .
28. اشارك بانتظام في مناقشات الفصل
29. أ تشعر بالرضا عما تعلمته في هذا المقرر
30. ساعدي المقرر على زيادة معرفتي بالمفردات الإنجليزية
31. ساعدي المقرر على القراءة بشكل أسرع
32. ساعدي المقرر علي تحسين قدرتي في تحديد الفكرة الرئيسية للنص
33. لقد تعلمت في هذا المقرر مهارات ستساعدني في مقررات اللغة الإنجليزية المستقبلية

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).