



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***MOTIVATION AND SELF-REGULATION AS PREDICTORS OF
E-LEARNING EXPERIENCE AMONG UNDERGRADUATES
IN A MALAYSIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY***

CHIANG YAN CHIOU

FPP 2015 3



**MOTIVATION AND SELF-REGULATION AS PREDICTORS OF E-
LEARNING EXPERIENCE AMONG UNDERGRADUATES IN A
MALAYSIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY**

By

CHIANG YAN CHIOU

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science**

May 2015

All the materials contained within the thesis, including without limitation texts, logos, icons, photographs and all other artworks are the copyrighted materials of Universiti Putra Malaysia, unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any materials contained within the thesis for non-commercial proposes with the permission from the copyright holder. Any commercial use of the materials may only be made with express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia
In fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of Master of Science

**MOTIVATION AND SELF-REGULATION AS PREDICTORS OF E-
LEARNING EXPERIENCE AMONG UNDERGRADUATES IN A
MALAYSIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY**

By

CHIANG YAN CHIOU

May 2015

Chairman : Associate Professor Ahmad Fauzi Mohd Ayub, PhD
Faculty : Educational Studies

This study was carried out to identify the relationship between motivation and self-regulation towards e-learning experiences among undergraduates at Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). For this purpose, a total of 314 samples were selected from undergraduates in UPM. Data were collected using a questionnaire and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. A descriptive analysis was completed to obtain both mean and standard deviation of the variables. Findings from the descriptive analysis showed that students are motivated and self-regulated when using PutraLMS. Besides, students also had positive perception or were satisfied with PutraLMS.

Meanwhile, inferential analysis showed a significant positive relationship between motivation ($r = 0.589$, $p = 0.0001$) and self-regulation ($r = 0.632$, $p = 0.0001$) towards e-learning experiences. In addition, multiple linear regression analysis was also used to identify predictive factors of two independent variables that influence e-learning experience. Results showed that self-regulation ($\beta = 0.421$, $p = 0.0001$) was a better predictor for e-learning experience as compared to motivation ($\beta = 0.413$, $p = 0.0001$). The results revealed that the final two predictors model explained about 54.2% of the variation in e-learning experiences. This finding suggests that students generally view PutraLMS as an useful tool that supports them in their face-to-face classes. With an e-learning environment that supports students' motivation and self-regulation, students are likely to have a positive perception and feel satisfied to using PutraLMS. Finally, PutraLMS has been certified as a suitable tool to assist face-to-face classes in UPM, where students are satisfied with the PutraLMS environment, as shown in this study.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
Sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**MOTIVASI DAN REGULASI KENDIRI SEBAGAI FAKTOR PERAMAL
KEPADA PENGALAMAN E-PEMBELAJARAN DI KALANGAN SISWAZAH
DALAM SEBUAH UNIVERSITI AWAM MALAYSIA**

Oleh

CHIANG YAN CHIOU

Mei 2015

Pengerusi : Prof. Madya Ahmad Fauzi Mohd Ayub, PhD
Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengenalpasti hubungan antara motivasi dan regulasi sendiri terhadap pengalaman e-pembelajaran di Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). Untuk tujuan ini, sejumlah 314 orang responden telah dipilih daripada siswazah UPM. Soal selidik digunakan untuk mengumpul data kajian and data kajian tersebut dianalisa menggunakan perisian *Statistical Package for Social Sciences* (SPSS) versi 20. Selain itu, analisis deskriptif juga telah digunakan untuk mendapatkan nilai min dan sisihan piawai pembolehubah. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan responden bermotivasi dan mempunyai regulasi sendiri semasa menggunakan PutraLMS. Selain itu, analisis deskriptif juga menunjukkan pelajar secara amnya mempunyai persepsi positif atau berpuas hati terhadap penggunaan PutraLMS. Analisis inferensi menunjukkan terdapat kolerasi yang positif dan signifikan antara motivasi ($r = 0.589, p = 0.0001$) dan regulasi sendiri ($r = 0.632, p = 0.0001$) terhadap pengalaman e-pembelajaran.

Selain itu, analisis regresi linear menunjukkan kedua-dua faktor peramal (motivasi and regulasi sendiri) berpengaruh terhadap pengalaman e-pembelajaran dan pengaruh regulasi sendiri ($\beta = 0.421, p = 0.0001$) adalah lebih berpengaruh berbanding dengan motivasi ($\beta = 0.413, p = 0.0001$). Dapatan kajian kombinasi dua pengamal menerangkan 54.2% variasi dalam pengalaman e-pembelajaran. Penemuan kajian mencadangkan responden berpandangan positif terhadap penggunaan PutraLMS and bersetuju bahawa PutraLMS adalah berguna untuk menyokong pembelajaran kelas tradisi. Sekiranya PutraLMS dapat menjadikan para pelajar untuk lebih bermotivasi and mempunyai regulasi sendiri, mereka akan lebih berpersepsi positif and berpuas hati untuk menggunakannya. Akhir sekali, PutraLMS telah terbukti sebagai alat yang sesuai untuk membantu kelas tradisi di UPM kerana para pelajar berpuas hati dengan persekitarannya seperti yang telah ditunjukkan di dalam kajian ini.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmad Fauzi Mohd Ayub, for the continuous support he gave me throughout my master studies and research, for his patience, motivation, enthusiasm and immense knowledge. His guidance helped me at all the time; during the conduct of this research and writing of the thesis. My appreciation also goes to my co-supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Wong Su Luan, for her support and knowledge regarding this topic.

My deepest gratitude goes to my beloved parents; Mr. Chiang Ah Loy and Mrs. Wong Ah Moy, and also to my sisters and brother for their endless love and encouragement. Also, not forgetting my husband, Poi Kian Hee, for his love and care. To those who have indirectly contributed to this research, your kindness means a lot to me. Thank you very much.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 15 May 2015 to conduct the final examination of Chiang Yan Chiou on her thesis entitled "Motivation and Self-Regulation as Predictors of E-Learning Experience among Undergraduates in a Malaysian Public University" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Master of Science.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Tajularipin bin Sulaiman, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Shaffe Mohd Daud, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Mohd. Arif Hj. Ismail, PhD

Associate Professor
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Malaysia
(External Examiner)



ZULKARNAIN ZAINAL, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 7 July 2015

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. Members of the Supervisor Committee were as follows:

Ahmad Fauzi Mohd Ayub, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Wong Su Luan, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

BUJANG KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name and Matric No. : Chiang Yan Chiou GS 23063

Declaration by Members of Supervisor Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Name of
Chairman of
Supervisory
Committee:

Ahmad Fauzi Mohd Ayub

Name of
Member of
Supervisory
Committee:

Wong Su Luan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	Page
ABSTRAK	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
APPROVAL	iii
DECLARATION	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
CHAPTER	xiv
1	
INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Objectives	5
1.4 Research Questions	5
1.5 Significance of the Study	6
1.6 Limitations of the Study	7
1.7 Definition of Terms	8
1.7.1 E-learning	8
1.7.2 Learning Management System (LMS)	8
1.7.3 Motivation	8
1.7.4 Self-regulation	10
1.7.5 E-learning Experience	12
1.8 Conclusion	14
2	
LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 E-learning	15
2.2.1 E-learning in Malaysia	16
2.2.2 Learning Management System	17
2.3 E-learning Experience	21
2.3.1 Motivation and E-learning Experience	24
2.3.2 Self-regulation and E-learning Experience	27
2.3.3 Predictors of E-learning Experience	30
2.4 Theories Related to the Study	33
2.4.1 Self-Determination Theory of Motivation (SDT)	33
2.4.2 Zimmerman's cyclical model of self-regulation	34
2.4.3 Presage-Process-Product Model of Student Learning (3P Model)	36
2.5 Theoretical Framework	37
2.6 Conceptual Framework	39
2.7 Conclusion	40
3	
METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Introduction	41
3.2 Research Design	41
3.3 Research Population	42
3.3.1 Sampling	42

3.4 Instrumentation and Scoring	44
3.4.1 Part A: Demography	46
3.4.2 Part B: Motivation	46
3.4.3 Part C: Self-regulation	47
3.4.4 Part D: E-learning Experience	48
3.5 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument	49
3.5.1 Validity of the Instrument	49
3.5.2 Reliability of the Instrument	50
3.6 Pilot Test	50
3.7 Research Procedures	51
3.8 Data Analysis	51
3.8.1 Descriptive Statistics	52
3.8.2 Inferential Statistics	52
3.9 Research Data Analysis	55
3.10 Exploratory Data Analysis	56
3.11 Conclusion	61
4 RESULTS	
4.1 Introduction	62
4.2 Respondents' Demographic Information	62
4.2.1 Faculty Enrolled	62
4.2.2 Semester of Studies	63
4.2.3 Age	63
4.2.4 Gender	64
4.2.5 Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA)	64
4.3 Students' Motivation in Using PutraLMS	65
4.3.1 Intrinsic Motivation	66
4.3.2 Identified Regulation	67
4.3.3 External Regulation	68
4.3.4 Amotivation	70
4.4 Students' Self-regulation in Using PutraLMS	71
4.4.1 Goal Setting	72
4.4.2 Environment Structuring	73
4.4.3 Task Strategies	75
4.4.4 Time Management	77
4.4.5 Help Seeking	78
4.4.6 Self Evaluation	79
4.5 Students' E-learning Experience in Using PutraLMS	80
4.5.1 Quality of Teaching	81
4.5.2 Students Interaction and Engagement	83
4.5.3 Clarity of Goals and Setting	84
4.5.4 Quality of Online Resources	85
4.5.5 Appropriate Workload	87
4.5.6 Student Management	88
4.5.7 Overall Satisfaction with Online Experience	89
4.6 Relationship between Motivation and E-learning Experience	91
4.7 Relationship between Self-regulation and E-learning Experience	92
4.8 Predictor Factors of E-learning Experience	92

4.9 Conclusion	95
5 SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	
5.1 Introduction	96
5.2 Research Summary	96
5.3 Summary of the Analysis	97
5.4 Discussion	98
5.4.1 Motivation	98
5.4.2 Self-regulation	99
5.4.3 E-learning Experience	101
5.4.4 Relationship between Motivation and E-learning Experience	102
5.4.5 Relationship between Self-regulation and E-learning Experience	103
5.4.6 Predictor Factors of E-learning Experience	104
5.5 Implications	105
5.6 Recommendations for Future Research	106
5.7 Conclusion	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY	109
APPENDICES	
A Research Instrument	125
B Letter of Authority	131
C Credential for Panel of Experts	134
BIODATA OF STUDENT	136

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Distribution of the Table Population According to Their Faculty	44
3.2 Research Instrument	44
3.3 Items Adaption in the Questionnaire	46
3.4 Dimensions of Motivation	47
3.5 Dimensions of Self-Regulation	48
3.6 Dimensions of E-Learning Experience	49
3.7 Cronbach Alpha Value for Instrument	51
3.8 Research Action Plan	51
3.9 Interpretation of Correlation Coefficient	53
3.10 Statistics Analysis	55
3.11 Pearson's r Value, Tolerance and VIF	60
3.12 Skewness and Kurtosis for the Variables ($N = 314$)	61
4.1 Number of the Respondents Based on Faculty	62
4.2 Semester of Studies	63
4.3 Distribution of the Respondents According to Age	64
4.4 Distribution of the Respondents According to Gender	64
4.5 Distribution of the Respondents According to Their Current CGPA	65
4.6 Descriptive Data of Motivation Construct	65
4.7 Distribution of the Respondents Based on Intrinsic Motivation	66
4.8 Distribution of the Respondents Based on Identified Regulation	68
4.9 Distribution of the Respondents Based on External Regulation	69
4.10 Distribution of the Respondents Based on Amotivation	70
4.11 Descriptive Data of Self-Regulation Construct	72

4.12	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Goal Setting	73
4.13	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Environment Structuring	74
4.14	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Task Strategies	76
4.15	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Time Management	77
4.16	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Help Seeking	79
4.17	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Self Evaluation	80
4.18	Descriptive Data of E-Learning Experience Construct	81
4.19	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Quality Of Teaching	82
4.20	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Students' Interaction and Engagement	83
4.21	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Clarity of Goals and Setting	85
4.22	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Quality of Online Resources	86
4.23	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Appropriate Workload	88
4.24	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Student Management	89
4.25	Distribution of the Respondents Based on Students' Overall Satisfaction with Online Experience	90
4.26	Pearson's Correlation for Motivation and E-Learning Experience in Using PutraLMS	91
4.27	Pearson's Correlation for Self-Regulation and E-Learning Experience In Using PutraLMS	92
4.28	Coefficient Multiple Linear Regression for E-Learning Experience	94
4.29	ANOVA	94
4.30	Model Summary	95

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 The Self-Determination Continuum	34
2.2 Phases and Processes of Self-Regulation	35
2.3 The 3P Model of Learning	37
2.4 Theoretical Framework of the Study	38
2.5 Conceptual Framework of the Study	40
3.1 Boxplots for the Variables Used in Research	57
3.2 Histogram for the Variables Used in Research	58
3.3 Normal Q-Q Plots for Variables Used in Research	59
3.4 Scatterplot of Standardized Residuals for E-Learning Experience	60

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

3P Model	Presage-Process-Product Model of Student Learning
CADe	Centre for Academic Development
CGPA	Cumulative Grade Point Average
EDA	Exploratory Data Analysis
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
LMS	Learning Management System
MOE	Ministry of Education Malaysia
NTU	National Taiwan University
OSLQ	Online Self-regulated Learning Questionnaire
SEM	Structural Equation Modeling
SIMS	The Situational Motivation Scale
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science
SRL	Self-regulated learning
UiTM	Universiti Teknologi MARA
UKM	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
UPM	Universiti Putra Malaysia
USM	Universiti Sains Malaysia

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has become part of our daily life. With the flourishing advancement of ICT, it has changed our daily life in a lot of aspects including economic development, politic, social life, as well as education. ICT in education involves data collection, information processes and knowledge creation, which are the most important processes in teaching and learning (Costa, Alvelos, & Teixeira, 2012). By using ICT in education, teaching and learning methodology can be enhanced (Boon, 2010), while teaching and learning experiences can be enriched (Chow & Shi, 2014).

The incorporation of ICT in education, especially the Internet, has apparently changed the teaching and learning model (Sangra, Vlachopoulos, & Cabrera, 2012). As the use of the Internet grows, a huge number of educational applications have been developed via the Internet. Such applications are known as e-learning. E-learning delivers information for education using telecommunication technology by providing learning at any time and from any where (Sun, Tsai, Finger, Chen, & Yeh, 2007). Besides, e-learning provides the opportunity to mix the accessibility to information with the use of communication technology to create a challenging learning environment (Garrison, 2011, p. 4).

Terzieva, Ilieva and Radonova (2009) categorised e-learning based on the forms of e-learning realising such as computer-based, web-based, or internet-based teaching, web-managed courses and blended learning. Meanwhile, Bowles (2005) defined e-learning as generation and transfer of knowledge using ICTs. E-learning should not concern upon any one form of technology, while it can be more than one. Those technologies involved in e-learning can be as simple as a radio or as complex as a computer or the Internet (Bowles, 2005).

In Malaysia, e-learning is mainly developed via the government, whereby the greater part of e-learning has been implemented in higher institutions (Abubakar, Harande, & Abubakar, 2009). As mentioned by Puteh (2007), the development of e-learning in Malaysia started with Vision 2020, which was followed by the establishment of Multimedia Super Corridor in 1996. In 1999, Ministry of Education (MOE) Malaysia

introduced 'Smart School' project in selected primary and secondary schools as part of the government's plans to develop the IT-literate society in 2020 (Mondi, Woods, & Rafi, 2008).

Learning Management System (LMS) is one of the popular education application types in e-learning. It allows students to access the learning contents at any time and from any where (Dalsgaard, 2006), while improving course management, teaching practices and students' engagement supported learning in distance education and campus-based education (Coates, 2005). In addition, LMS allows students to learn more flexibly and to construct their own knowledge (Coates, 2005) and provide opportunities for instructors to explore new methods of teaching and learning (Costa *et al.*, 2012). However, to make sure that LMS is successfully adopted and implemented, there is a need to focus on students' perception towards the use of LMS (Black, Beck, Dawson, Jinks, & DiPietro, 2007).

E-learning has changed students' learning experiences across higher education sector (Barrett, Higa, & Ellis, 2012) because it is not limited only to universities with distance learning courses but it has also been integrated into campus-based universities (Ellis, Ginns, & Piggott, 2009). When e-learning becomes popular in higher education, researchers started to focus on understanding students' learning approaches and their perception of learning (Bliuc, Ellis, Goodyear, & Piggott, 2011). Similarly, Lee and Tsai (2011) stated that researchers started to describe students' e-learning experience and how it will impact on their learning outcomes. Moreover, the main focus in e-learning research has switched from comparison of academic performances between e-learning students and face-to-face class students to students' perceptions of experience in e-learning environment (Keller & Karau, 2013).

Students' autonomy in e-learning environment is different from that of other learning environments (Barnard, Lan, To, Paton, & Lai, 2009) and the interaction in e-learning environment is apparently very different from the interaction in face-to-face classes (Milligan & Buckenmeyer, 2008), where students in the e-learning environment are required to be more matured and have good self-discipline (Zhang, Zhao, Zhou, & Nunamaker, 2004). Besides, students need to be more responsible and to learn independently in e-learning environment (Terzieva *et al.*, 2009).

Evaluation of a learning environment does not only focus on students' knowledge and learning but also on the quality of learning experiences (Robinson & Hullinger, 2008). It is important to understand students' learning experience in e-learning environment because instructors' teaching skills, appropriate learning resources, appropriate

workload and student interaction are correlated with their learning experiences in the e-learning environment (Ginns & Ellis, 2007).

E-learning is said to enhance students' learning experience. However, adoption and implementation is very important so as to ensure that implementation of e-learning is able to fulfil students' need and expectation (Quinney, 2005). Thus, e-learning should not only focus on the technical innovation as the teaching methodology is more important (Goi & Ng, 2009). The best learning experiences will not be achieved without proper motivation to engage students in their teaching and learning activities (Hodges, 2004). Hence, in order to help students maintain their motivation in learning, motivational strategies should be included in instructional design for teaching and learning. Similarly, Ainley and Armatas (2006, p. 366) suggested motivation as the key to promote students' participation and involvement in e-learning environment.

Artino (2008) suggested that motivation and self-regulation are needed for students to succeed in e-learning environment. Besides, in the e-learning environment that requires students to organise their own learning, self-regulation is particularly very important (Zimmerman, 2008). Students who lack self-regulation tends to misuse the autonomy provided in e-learning and will easily drop out from the e-learning course (Barnard *et al.*, 2009). Moreover, students who are not highly motivated and self-regulated in their learning are more likely to face disadvantages in e-learning (Artino & Stephens, 2009).

Thus, this current study aimed to identify the relationships between students' motivation and self-regulation towards their e-learning experiences in using PutraLMS among undergraduates at Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). Moreover, students' motivation and self-regulation in using PutraLMS were used to evaluate the prediction to e-learning experiences.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

UPM is a traditional university that offers majority of learning courses in face-to-face classes. In face-to-face classes, the learning environment is surrounded by students, classroom and textbooks (Hartvig & Brooks, 2013, p. 127). Many students are passive listeners, where they do not ask questions or repetitions even though they have doubts about the learning content (Davies, Dean, & Ball, 2013). Moreover, students are unable to control their learning schedule because the learning pace is controlled by their instructor (Popescu, Jonoski, & Bhattacharya, 2012). On the other hand, efficient delivery of learning provided in e-learning allows students to learn at any time and

from anywhere and this enhances the teaching and learning processes which are different from face-to-face classes (Garrison, 2011, p. 52). Since the learning environment in e-learning is significantly different from face-to-face classes, there is a need to evaluate students' e-learning experiences in an e-learning environment when e-learning is integrated into the traditional face-to-face classes, especially in a traditional university like UPM.

PutraLMS was developed by Centre for Academic Development (CADE), UPM to enhance the effectiveness of teaching and learning and encourages sharing of learning materials among instructors. By using PutraLMS, instructors are able to upload course material, update students' test results, class attendance and participate in forums with their students (Hashemyolia, Asmuni, Ayub, & Daud, 2015). However, universities are having challenges related to students' abilities to create new ideas, evaluate complex information, think creatively and communicate effectively when integrating LMS into teaching and learning processes (Hashemyolia *et al.*, 2015). Many universities have integrated LMS into their teaching and learning but determining factors related to acceptance or rejection of LMS is crucial for researchers (Baleghi-Zadeh, Ayub, Mahmud, & Daud, 2014). Most of the students prefer to have paper based test and discuss problems related to their course with their instructors or peers physically than utilising the online submission and discussion provided by LMS (Rahman, Ghazali, & Ismail, 2011). The main reason why students use LMS is for their academic purpose only but they are not willing to use it even though the 'chatting' and 'messaging' tools are integrated into LMS (Raman & Don, 2013). Therefore, the reasons for students to accept or reject LMS need to be further investigated.

As highlighted by Paechter, Maier and Macher (2010), research on students' expectations and experiences in e-learning is still scarce. Furthermore, students' learning approach in e-learning environment, how and why they involve in e-learning environment remains unclear (Barrett *et al.*, 2012) and adoption of e-learning seems challenging for institutions (Costa *et al.*, 2012) because the dropout rate for e-learning classes is higher compared to face-to-face classes (Bell & Federman, 2013). Motivation is particularly critical in e-learning environment that provides full control of learning to students (Sansone, Fraughton, Zachary, Butner, & Heiner, 2011). In order to reduce high drop out rates in e-learning classes, students' motivation in e-learning environment needs to be determined and identified.

Similarity, Barnard *et al.* (2009) suggested that students who lack self-regulation tend to misuse the autonomy they have in e-learning and will easily drop out from their e-learning courses. Students who are not highly motivated and self-regulated in their learning are more likely to face disadvantages in e-learning (Artino & Stephens, 2009).

Thus, students' self-regulation in e-learning environment must be taken into consideration to prevent high drop-out rates in the e-learning environment.

In summary, students in UPM lack the experience in an e-learning environment because UPM is a traditional university where the majority of the courses are conducted in face-to-face classes. Moreover, factors related students' acceptance or rejection of LMS and students' learning approach in e-learning environment remain unclear to researchers. Motivation and self-regulation are important in e-learning environment to help students learn better. Therefore, this study was carried out to identify the relationship between students' motivation and self-regulation towards e-learning experience in using PutraLMS for teaching and learning. In this study, prediction of e-learning experience was done using motivation and self-regulation as predictors.

1.3 Objectives

The objective of this study was to identify the relationship between students' motivation and self-regulation towards e-learning experiences in using PutraLMS. Therefore, the specific objectives are as follows:

1. To determine students' motivation in using PutraLMS.
2. To determine students' self-regulation in using PutraLMS.
3. To determine students' e-learning experiences in using PutraLMS.
4. To explore the relationship between motivation and self-regulation with e-learning experiences in using PutraLMS.
5. To explore the best predictor of students' e-learning experiences in using PutraLMS.

1.4 Research Questions

The research aims of this study were addressed through the following research questions:

1. What is students' motivation in using PutraLMS?
2. What is students' self-regulation in using PutraLMS?
3. What is students' e-learning experience in using PutraLMS?
4. Is there any relationship between motivation and e-learning experience in using PutraLMS?
5. Is there any relationship between self-regulation and e-learning experience in using PutraLMS?
6. What is the best predictor of students' e-learning experiences in using PutraLMS?

1.5 Significance of Study

This study is expected to provide information on students' learning experiences in e-learning environment. Students who lack motivation and self-regulation often face disadvantages in e-learning environment. The results of this study are particularly important to stakeholders who are involved in e-learning environment such as learners, educators, instructional designer, higher institution, as well as Ministry of Higher Education that provide fund to develop integrate e-learning in higher institutions in this country.

UPM is one of the campus-based universities in Malaysia and students may lack e-learning experiences. Therefore, this study aimed to engage students in using PutraLMS and minimise the barriers for them to use it. Through these results, other students may perceive using PutraLMS as an interesting experience and this will indirectly encourage them to PutraLMS for teaching and learning.

Besides, this study provides some overview of the students' perception and satisfaction in using PutraLMS to instructors by giving suggestions instructors to enhance their teaching methodology in conducting an e-learning course. Instructors can integrate some activities that will motivate students to use PutraLMS and encourage them to regulate their own learning. This result will give instructors some ideas about how to plan for and conduct effective e-learning courses. It also can provide advice to instructors to include elements that are able to enhance students' motivation and self-regulation in e-learning environment.

By investigating students' e-learning experiences in using PutraLMS, system designers for PutraLMS will be able to gather some information related to the features provided

in PutraLMS. Thus, research findings provide some ideas to system designers to integrate features that can promote students' motivation and self-regulation in using PutraLMS so as to arouse positive e-learning experiences. In addition, students' perception will provide relevant information for system designers to modify elements in PutraLMS in order to promote students' motivation and self-regulation.

The evaluation of e-learning experience was done to determine by students' engagement, enhancement of learning experience and execution of a programme (Roffe, 2002). Since PutraLMS is a customised system supported by Centre for Academic Development (CADE), UPM, it needs to be evaluated to provide better services. Therefore, findings from this study can be used as an assessment to PutraLMS by providing consideration to UPM to make decision to integrate of e-learning as a complementary to face-to-face classes. Lastly, other higher institutions in Malaysia and Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) can use the results of this study as a guideline for them when implementing e-learning in campus-based university.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

This study investigated the factors contributing to students' experiences in using UPM's learning portal known as PutraLMS. PutraLMS was developed by the Centre for Academic Development (CADE), UPM, to facilitate and promote e-learning activities at the university. Therefore, the design of LMS may differ with other university's online learning portal. For this reason, the findings of this study cannot be generalised to all online learning portals, except for those having the same purposes with this study.

This study was conducted in UPM, Malaysia. UPM is one of the campus-based universities in Malaysia and PutraLMS is developed to assist face-to-face classes. In other words, face-to-face classes are maintained while using PutraLMS in teaching and learning. Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be generalised to any other university that is implementing e-learning to replace the traditional face-to-face classes.

There are various definitions of e-learning involving different types of ICT. Only PutraLMS, which is the LMS developed by UPM, was involved in this study. Thus, the results of this study cannot be generalised to other e-learning portals that use different types of technology, except LMS. In addition, the online materials in PutraLMS are provided by instructors and no particular subjects are specified in this study. Therefore,

the results from this study cannot generalised to any particular subjects or LMS that was developed by other researchers.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 E-learning

Bell and Federman (2013) refer to e-learning as all forms of technologies supporting teaching instruction, while Sangra *et al.* (2012) concluded e-learning as teaching and learning processes that are done via virtual space with the use of the Internet and technologies. Islam, Rahim, Liang and Momtaz (2011) defined e-learning as effective tools in education with positive effects to teaching and learning processes. In this study, e-learning is defined as learning using learning management system (LMS) to assist face-to-face classes.

1.7.2 Learning Management System (LMS)

Wichadee (2014) referred to LMS as server-based software that delivers learning material via web browser. Awang and Darus (2012) defined LMS as a software package that delivers the learning contents online and support online collaboration. Za'ba, Mamat, Isa, Aziz, Ramakrisnan and Zain (2012) defined LMS as a web-based application that allows learners to access their learning courses online, while Macfadyen and Dawson (2010) referred to LMS as a web-based platform that provides teaching materials and teaching tools to support learning. LMS, in this study, refers to PutraLMS that was developed by the Centre for Academic Development (CADE), UPM, to assist face-to-face classes.

1.7.3 Motivation

Motivation refers to students' willingness to make efforts to enhance their performance (Bukhari, Khan, Shahzadi, & Khalid, 2014). Hartnett, George and Dron (2011) stated that motivation is a complex mix of person-context interaction involving intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. Motivation is defined by Ainley and Armatas (2006, p. 366) as movement, energy, selectivity and direction in behaviour, while Guay, Vallerand and Blanchard (2000) defined motivation as individuals' experiences when they are currently engaging in an activity. In this study, motivation refers to students' motivation to use PutraLMS, and this consists of four components. Guay *et al.* (2000) suggested these four components as intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, external regulation and amotivation.

Intrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic motivation occurs when someone performs an activity by herself in order to achieve pleasure and satisfaction that are obtained from the activity (Guay *et al.*, 2000). Meanwhile, Ryan and Deci (2000) referred to intrinsic motivation as the intention to involve in an activity for the inherent satisfaction one can get from it. In this study, intrinsic motivation refers to students' motivation to use PutraLMS in order to attain pleasure and satisfaction from their engagement with it.

Identified Regulation

Identified regulation refers to the motivation that occurs when someone performs particular activities because the option is chosen by themselves (Guay *et al.*, 2000). Similarly, Hartnett *et al.* (2011) highlighted that identified regulation learners are involved in an activity because the engagement will bring them some personal values. In this study, identified regulation refers to the motivation that occurs when students decide to get engage in PutraLMS as they will benefit from this engagement.

External Regulation

External regulation is when the involvement in an activity is done to avoid any punishment (Hartnett *et al.*, 2011) and to gain external rewards (Froiland, Oros, Smith, & Hirschert, 2012). External regulation drives someone to involve in an activity to avoid any negative consequences or to obtain external rewards from the involvement (Guay *et al.*, 2000). In this study, external regulation refers to students' motivation to engage in PutraLMS to avoid any negative consequences.

Amotivation

Amotivation refers to individual behaviour that is neither intrinsically nor extrinsically motivated (Guay *et al.*, 2000). Amotivated learners lack the motivation or intention to involve themselves in an activity (Froiland *et al.*, 2012; Hartnett *et al.*, 2011). In this study, amotivation refers to the motivation that is involved when the students lack the motivation to use PutraLMS.

1.7.4 Self-regulation

Self-regulation refers to students' self-directed use and modification of their learning strategies to achieve the learning goals (Sandars & Clearly, 2011). Barnard-Brak, Lan and Paton (2010) agreed that self-regulated learners are able to act as the causal agent in their own lives. Chang (2005) concluded self-regulation as students' ability to direct their own learning process without guidance from other parties, while Zimmerman (2002) referred to self-regulation as students' ability to transform mental ability into academic skills and self-awareness, self-motivation and behavioural skills to mastery that knowledge. In this study, self-regulation refers to students' ability to regulate their involvement in PutraLMS systematically without any guidance from other parties. As suggested by Barnard *et al.* (2009), self-regulation consists of six constructs, which are goal setting, environmental structuring, task strategies, time management, help seeking and self evaluation.

Goal Setting

Schunk (1990) refers to goal setting as the ability to establish a standard to serve an action and modify it whenever needed, while Zimmerman and Pons (1986) stated that goal setting is setting and planning of educational goals. Goal setting in this study refers to students' ability to establish goals that are to be achieved in using PutraLMS.

Environment Structuring

Sharma, Dick, Chin and Land (2007) referred to environment structuring as the ability to control and avoid possible distraction during learning. Lynch and Dembo (2004) referred to environment structuring as students' ability to ensure accessibility and proficiency in using the equipment in order to study effectively, while Zimmerman and Pons (1986) referred to environmental structuring as students' initiative to arrange physical environment that encourage them to learn easier. Environment structuring in this study refer to students' ability to allocate a suitable and comfortable environment for them to access PutraLMS.

Task Strategies

Zimmerman (2002) refers to task strategies as ability to adopt and implement powerful strategies to achieve goal. Task strategies boost learning and performance by reducing a task to smaller components and reorganising those parts meaningfully (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2008, p. 19). In this study, task strategies refer to students' ability to determine learning strategies in using PutraLMS.

Time Management

Miksza (2012) refers to time management as students' ability to focus, concentrate and plan on the use of their time. Time management is defined as students' ability to manage their time, prioritising learning task and evaluating the time needed to complete a task (Lynch & Dembo, 2004). In this study, time management refers to students' ability to organise and plan on their time usage in PutraLMS.

Help Seeking

Miksza (2012) refers to help seeking as social factors with students' initiative to interact with others to get help. Pintrich, Smith, Garcia and McKeachie (1993) refer to help seeking as students' ability to seek help from their peers or instructors when needed, while Zimmerman and Pons (1986) indicated help seeking as students' initial efforts to source for help from their peers, instructors and adults. In this study, help seeking refers to students' intention to seek for help from their instructors or peers when they stumble upon obstacles in using PutraLMS.

Self Evaluation

Barnard-Brak *et al.* (2010) defined self-evaluation as students' self-evaluated outcomes of their performance. Self-evaluation refers to comparison of learning performance with standard learning outcomes which involves self-satisfaction with performance outcomes and causal attributions to their success in strategy use (Kitsantas, Reiser, & Doster, 2004). Zimmerman and Pons (1986) indicated self-evaluation as students' initiated evaluation of their quality of learning. In this study, self evaluation refers to students' ability to self-evaluate their learning outcome desire from PutraLMS.

1.7.5 E-learning Experience

Learning experience is defined as the interaction process between students and the instructional environment (Parrish, 2009). Gilbert, Morton and Rowley (2007) referred to e-learning experience as students' satisfaction about various e-learning environment features, while Ginns and Ellis (2007) defined e-learning experience as the quantity of learning arising from the learning experiences in both face-to-face and online contexts.

In this study, e-learning experience is defined as students' perception and satisfaction in using PutraLMS. As suggested by Ginns and Ellis (2007), e-learning experience in this study is formed by seven components, which are: quality of teaching, student interaction and engagement, clarify of goals and standard, quality of online resources, appropriate workload, student management and overall satisfaction with online experience.

Quality of Teaching

Quality of teaching refers to measurement of satisfaction with good e-teaching and good e-resources (Ginns & Ellis, 2007). Fenstermacher and Richardson (2005) suggested that quality of teaching as related to the teaching content and teaching method. Meanwhile, Ramsden (1991) referred to quality of teaching as the effectiveness of teaching in education. In this study, quality of teaching refers to the teaching and guidance provided by instructors in PutraLMS.

Student Interaction and Engagement

According to Garrison and Cleveland-Innes (2005), interaction refers to engagement of students in a learning community. Zhao and Kuh (2004) defined engagement as students' participation in a learning community and interaction indicating that someone is present and might interact with other students by involving in activity in an e-learning environment (Picciano, 2002). Student engagement is measured by the time and energy they put in when they involve in their learning activity (Kuh, 2001). Student engagement and interaction in this study refer to students' involvement and interaction with their peers or instructors in PutraLMS.

Clarity of Goals and Standard

Good learning environment shall provide students with clear goals and standards (Ginns & Ellis, 2007). A good learning environment must offer clear standard expectation to students (Ramsden, 1979). In this study, clarity of goals and standard refers to clear learning goals provided to students and standard instructional system design in PutraLMS.

Quality of Online Resources

As suggested by Ruiz, Mintzer and Leipzig (2006), online resources shall be managed, delivered and standardised once they are developed. Course material should be complete with standard and uniform elements in order to support and develop learning process for each individual student (Tait, 2000). In this study, quality of online resources refers to the overall rating of the quality of materials and activities provided in PutraLMS.

Appropriate Workload

Appropriateness of workload is related to online materials, online activities and regularity of updates in an e-learning environment (Ginns & Ellis, 2007). Lizzio, Wilson and Simons (2002) defined appropriate workload as students' perception of a heavy academic workload. Study workload refers to the pressure of demands of syllabus and assessment tasks that imposed on students (Ramsden, 1979). In this study, appropriate workload refers to the workload derived from online activities in PutraLMS. This workload should be appropriate so that students are able to manage it.

Student Management

Govindasamy (2002) suggested that constructive and meaningful feedback should be provided to students in e-learning environment. Likewise, Tait (2000) stated that planning and management of student support are needed in e-learning environment. Those support and management can come from cognitive area (standard and uniform course materials), affective area (supportive learning environment to enhance self-esteem) and systemic area (effective, transparent and overall student friendly learning environment). Thus, student management in this study refers to the support provided by instructors to students in PutraLMS.

Overall Satisfaction with Online Experience

Chen, Lin and Kinshuk (2008) evaluated satisfaction of e-learning course from the four aspects of administration, functionality, instruction and interaction. Palmer and Holt (2008) stated that the quality of learning outcomes is positively correlated with learners' satisfaction in e-learning environment, where assignment submission and accessibility to online resources contribute to the highest satisfaction in e-learning environment. On the other hand, content, personalization, learning community and learner interface are used to evaluate learners' satisfaction in e-learning (Wang, 2003). In this study, overall satisfaction with online experience refers to students' satisfaction of the overall quality of e-learning environment including online learning material, online activities and other features that are available in PutraLMS.

1.8 Conclusion

This chapter discusses the background of this study, problem statement, objectives, research question, significance and limitations of the study, and definition of terms used in this study. Background of the study begins with the historical background of e-learning, e-learning using LMS, evaluation of students' e-learning experiences and the factors determining students' e-learning experiences. Objectives and research questions are also given in this chapter. The following chapter will discuss the literature related to students' e-learning experiences and theories that are involved in e-learning experiences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abubakar, A. B., HarandeZ, Y. I., & Magaji, B. (2009). E-learning in Malaysia and Nigeria: A bibliometric study. In *8th European Conference on E-Learning, University of Bari, Italy, 29-30 October 2009* (p. 1). Academic Conferences Limited.
- Abuhassna, H. M., & Amin, I. M. H. (2014). Students feedback and perception regarding mobile phone application at the faculty of education in-UPM. *Decision Engineering & Technology*, 2(9), 73-80.
- Acampora, G., Gaeta, M., & Loia, V. (2011). Hierarchical optimization of personalized experiences for e-Learning systems through evolutionary models. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 20(5), 641-657. doi: 10.1007/s00521-009-0273-z
- Ainley, M., & Armatas, C. (2006). Motivational perspectives on students' responses to learning in virtual learning environment. In J. Weiss, J. Nolan, J. Hunsinger & P. Trifonas (Eds.). *The International Handbook of Virtual Learning Environment* (pp. 365-394). doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-3803-7
- Albors-Garrigos, J., & Ramos-Carrasco, J. C. (2011). The Impact of E-Learning in University Education: An Empirical Analysis in a Classroom Teaching Context. In *Enhancing Learning Through Technology. Education Unplugged: Mobile Technologies and Web 2.0* (pp. 291-304). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-22383-9_24
- Adelson, J. L., & McCoach, D. B. (2010). Measuring the mathematical attitudes of elementary students: The effects of a 4-point or 5-point Likert-type scale. *Educational and Psychological measurement*, 70(5), 796-807. doi: 10.1177/0013164410366694
- Alhabahba, M., Abu Ziden, A., Albdour, A., & Alsayyed, B. (2012). The Horse Before the Cart! The English Language Learners Experience of Using E-learning System. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 7(2), 4-12.
- Alkhanak, S. A. K., & Azmi, I. A. G. (2011). University students information technology experience and its role towards e-learning orientation. *New Educational Review*, 24(2), 230-242.
- Artino, A. R. (2008). Motivational beliefs and perceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction online training. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 24(3), 260-270. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00258.x
- Artino, A. R., & Stephens, J. M. (2009). Beyond grades in online learning: Adaptive profiles of academic self-regulation among Naval Academic Undergraduates. *Journal of Advance Academics*. 20(4), 568-601. doi: 10.1177/1932202X0902000402

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2013). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Awang, N. B., & Darus, M. Y. B. (2012). Evaluation of an open source Learning Management System: Claroline. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67, 416-426. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.346
- Baeten, M., Dochy, F., & Struyven, K. (2013). The effects of different learning environments on students' motivation for learning and their achievement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(3), 484-501. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8279.2012.02076.x
- Baleghi-Zadeh, S., Ayub, A. F. M., Mahmud, R., & Daud, S. M. (2014). Behavior intention to use of Learning Management System among Malaysian pre-service teachers: A confirmatory factor analysis. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 2(1), 29-39. doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.2n.1p.29
- Barnard-Brak, L., Lan, W. Y., Paton, V. O. (2010). Profiles in self-regulated learning in the online learning environment. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 11(1), 61-80.
- Barnard, L., Lan, W. Y., To, Y. M., Paton, V. O., & Lai, S. (2009). Measuring self-regulation in online and blended learning environment. *Internet and Higher Education*, 12(1), 1-6. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2008.10.005
- Barnard, L., Paton, V., & Lan, W. (2008). Online self-regulatory learning behavior as a mediator on the relationship between online course perception with achievement. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 9(2), 1-11.
- Barrett, B. F. D., Higa, C., & Ellis, R. A. (2012). Emerging university student experiences of learning technologies across the Asia Pacific. *Computers & Education*, 58(4), 1021-1027. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2011.11.017
- Bedi, K. (2011). A methodology for integrating traditional classroom learning with contemporary online learning. In *4th International Conference, ICHL 2011, Hong Kong, China, August 10-12, 2011* (p. 30-39). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-22763-9_4
- Bell, B. S., & Federman, J. E. (2013). E-learning in Postsecondary Education. *The Future of Children*, 23(1), 165-185. doi: 10.1353/foc.2013.0007
- Benson, R., & Palaskas, T. (2006). Introducing a new learning management system: An institutional case study. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 22(4), 548-567.
- Benta, D., Bologa, G., & Dzitac, I. (2014). E-learning platforms in higher education. Case study. *Procedia Computer Science*, 31, 1170-1176. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2014.05.373

- Biasutti, M. (2011). The student experience of a collaborative e-learning university module. *Computers & Education*, 57(3), 1865-1875. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2011.04.006
- Biggs, J. B. (1989). Approaches to the enhancement of tertiary teaching. *Higher education research and development*, 8(1), 7-25. doi: 10.1080/0729436890080102
- Biggs, J. (1993). What do inventories of students' learning processes really measure? A theoretical review and clarification. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 63(1), 3-19. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.1993.tb01038.x
- Biggs, J., & Moore, P. (1993). *The process of learning* (3rd ed.). Australia: Prentice Hall.
- Black, E.W., Beck, D., Dawson, K., Jinks, S., & DiPietro, M. (2007). The other side of the LMS: Considering implementation and use in the adoption of an LMS in online and blended learning environment. *TechTrends*, 51(2), 35-39. doi: 10.1007/s11528-007-0024-x
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2010). *How to research* (4th ed.). England: McGraw-Hill International.
- Bliuc, A. M., Ellis, R. A., Goodyear, P., & Piggott, L. (2011). A blended learning approach to teaching foreign policy: Student experiences of learning through face-to-face and online discussion and their relationship to academic performance. *Computers & Education*, 56(3), 856-864. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.10.027
- Bloomfield, J. G., & Jones, A. (2013). Using e-learning to support clinical skills acquisition: Exploring the experiences and perceptions of graduate first-year pre-registration nursing students - A mixed method study. *Nurse education today*, 33(12), 1605-1611. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2013.01.024
- Bolliger, D. U., & Erichsen, E. A. (2013). Student satisfaction with blended and online based on personality types. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 39(1), 1-23.
- Boon, J. A. (2010). Education innovation: Case studies in e-learning and face-to-face teaching in higher education: What is the best?. In U. Ehlers & D. Schneckenberg (Eds.), *Changing Cultures in Higher Education* (pp. 313-322). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-03582-1_23
- Bowles, M. (2005). Learning to e-learn project: Rediscovering the benefits of e-learning. *Malaysian Online Journal of Instructional Technology*, 2(1). EJ ISSN 1823-1144 (2005)
- Bukhari, T. Z., Khan, J., Shahzadi, I., & Khalid, A. (2014). Mediating role of motivation to learn in determining e-learning outcomes: A conceptual study. *Business and Management*, 6(2), 179-189.

- Butz, N. T., Stupnisky, R. H., Peterson, E. S., & Majerus, M. M. (2014). Motivation in synchronous hybrid graduate business programs: A self-determination approach to contrasting online and on-campus students. *Journal of Online Learning & Teaching*, 10(2), 211-227.
- Chang, M. (2005). Applying self-regulated learning strategies in a web-based instruction – An investigation of motivation perception. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(3), 217-230. doi: 10.1080/09588220500178939
- Chang, L. (1997). Dependability of anchoring labels of Likert-type scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(5), 800-807. doi: 10.1177/0013164497057005005
- Chen, K. C., & Jang, S. J. (2010). Motivation in online learning: Testing a model of self-determination theory. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(4), 741-752. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.01.011
- Chen, N. S., Lin, K. M., & Kinshuk. (2008). Analysing users' satisfaction with e-learning using a negative critical incidents approach. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 45(2), 115-126. doi:10.1080/14703290801950286
- Chow, W. S., & Shi, S. (2014). Investigating students' satisfaction and continuance intention toward e-learning: An extension of the Expectation–Confirmation Model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 1145-1149. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.193
- Chyung, S. Y. Y., & Vachon, M. (2013). An Investigation of the profiles of satisfying and dissatisfying factors in e-learning. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 26(2), 117-140. doi: 10.1002/piq.21147
- Clark-Carter, D. (2010). *Quantitative psychological research: The complete student's companion* (3rd ed.). USA: Psychology Press.
- Cleary, T. J., Callan, G. L., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2012). Assessing self-regulation as a cyclical, context-specific phenomenon: Overview and analysis of SRL microanalytic protocols. *Education Research International*, 2012. doi:10.1155/2012/428639
- Coates, H. (2005). Leveraging LMSs to enhance campus-based student engagement. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, 28(1), 66-68.
- Coates, H., James, R., & Baldwin, G. (2005). A critical examination of the effects of Learning Management Systems on university teaching and learning. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11, 19–36. doi: 10.1007/s11233-004-3567-9
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007) *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Concannon, F., Flynn, A., & Campbell, M. (2005). What campus-based students think about the quality and benefits of e-learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(3), 501-512. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2005.00482.x
- Costa, C., Alvelos, H., & Teixeira, L. (2012). The use of Moodle e-learning platform: A study in a Portuguese university. *Procedia Technology*, 5, 334-343. doi: 10.1016/j.protcy.2012.09.037
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Dalsgaard, C. (2006). Social software: E-learning beyond Learning Management Systems. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, 2006(2).
- Daniel, J. (2011). *Sampling essentials: practical guidelines for making sampling choices*. California: Sage Publications.
- Davies, R. S., Dean, D. L., & Ball, N. (2013). Flipping the classroom and instructional technology integration in a college-level information systems spreadsheet course. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 61(4), 563-580. doi: 10.1007/s11423-013-9305-6
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects*. Open University Press.
- Ding, A., & Dan, W. (2011). Factors influencing learner attitudes toward e-learning and development of e-learning environment based on the integrated e-learning platform. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*, 1(3), 264-268.
- Dziuban, C., Moskal, P., Kramer, L., & Thompson, J. (2013). Student satisfaction with online learning in the presence of ambivalence: Looking for the will-o'-the-wisp. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 17, 1-8. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.08.001
- Ellis, R. A., Ginns, P., & Piggott, L. (2009). E-learning in higher education: Some key aspects and their relationship to approaches to study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(3), 303-318. doi: 10.1080/07294360902839909
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). London: Sage publications.

- Fenstermacher, G., & Richardson, V. (2005). On making determinations of quality in teaching. *The Teachers College Record*, 107(1), 186-218. doi: /10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00462.x
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Freeze, R. D., Alshare, K. A., Lane, P. L., & Joseph Wen, H. (2010). IS success model in e-learning context based on students' perceptions. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 21(2), 173-184.
- Froiland, J. M., Oros, E., Smith, L., & Hirschert, T. (2012). Intrinsic motivation to learn: The nexus between psychological health and academic success. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 16(1), 91-100. doi: 10.1007/BF03340978
- Fryer, L. K., Nicholas Bovee, H., & Nakao, K. (2014). E-learning: Reasons students in language learning courses don't want to. *Computers & Education*, 74, 26-36. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2014.01.008
- Garrison, D. R. (2011). *E-learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Garrison, D. R., & Cleveland-Innes, M. (2005). Facilitating cognitive presence in online learning: Interaction is not enough. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 19(3), 133-148. doi: 10.1207/s15389286ajde1903_2
- Gilbert, J., Morton, S., & Rowley, J. (2007). E-learning: The student experience. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(4), 560-573. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00723.x
- Ginns, P., & Ellis, R. (2007). Quality in blended learning: Exploring the relationships between on-line and face-to-face teaching and learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10(1), 53-64. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2006.10.003
- Gecer, A., & Dag, F. (2012). A blended learning experience. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(1), 438-442.
- Gob, R., McCollin, C., & Ramalhoto, M. F. (2007). Ordinal methodology in the analysis of Likert scales. *Quality & Quantity*, 41(5), 601-626. doi: 10.1007/s11135-007-9089-z
- Goi, C. L., & Ng, P. Y. (2009). E-learning in Malaysia: Success factors in implementing e-learning program. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 237-246.
- Govindasamy, T. (2002). Successful implementation of e-learning: Pedagogical considerations. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 4(3-4), 287-299. doi: 10.1016/S1096-7516(01)00071-9

- Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2013). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences* (8th ed.). USA: Cengage Learning.
- Grob, H. L., Bensberg, F., & Dewanto, B. L. (2004). Developing, deploying, using and evaluating an open source Learning Management System. *Journal of Computing and Information Technology*, 12(2), 127-134.
- Guay, F., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. (2000). On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The Situational Motivation Scale (SIMS). *Motivation and Emotion*, 24(3), 175–213. doi: 10.1023/A:1005614228250
- Gunawardena, C. N., Linder-VanBerschot, J. A., LaPointe, D. K., & Rao, L. (2010). Predictors of learner satisfaction and transfer of learning in a corporate online education program. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 24(4), 207-226. doi: 10.1080/08923647.2010.522919
- Hamat, A., Azman, H., Noor, N. M., Bakar, K. A., & Nor, N. F. M. (2014). Evaluation of an LMS for productive language skills. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 134-139. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.018
- Hamilton, J., & Tee, S. (2009). *Extending the Biggs 3P teaching and learning model: A structural equation modeling approach*. Paper presented at The 9th International Conference on Electronic Business, Macau, 30 November – 4 December 2009 (pp. 1037 – 1042).
- Hartnett, M., George, A. S., & Dron, J. (2011). Examining motivation in online distance learning environments: Complex, multifaceted and situation-dependent. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 12(6), 20-38.
- Hartnett, M. (2012). Relationships between online motivation, participation, and achievement: More complex than you might think. *Journal of Open, Flexible and Distance Learning*, 16(1), 28-41.
- Hartvig, S. A., & Brooks, E. P. (2013). Approaches to e-learning. In C. Stephanidis & M. Antona (Eds.). *Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction. Applications and Services for Quality of Life* (pp. 127-132). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-39194-1_15
- Hashemyolia, S., Asmuni, A., Ayub, A. F. M., & Daud, S. M. (2015). Perceived Learning Management Quality Predictors to Motivation and Use of Self-Regulated Learning Strategies. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3 S1), 428-436.
- Haverila, M. J. (2012). The Biggs and Moore model in e-learning: The role of motivation and collaboration as moderators. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 13(2), 169-179.
- Hinton, P. R., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS Explained* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

- Hodges, C. B. (2004). Designing to motivate: Motivational techniques to incorporate in e-learning experiences. *The Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 2(3), 1-7.
- Hong, K. S., Cheng, J. L. A., & Liau, T. L. (2005). Effects of system's and user's characteristics on e-learning use: A study at Universiti Malaysia Sarawak. *Journal of Science and Mathematics Education in Southeast Asia*, 28(2), 1-25.
- Howell, D. (2014). *Fundamental statistics for the behavioral sciences* (8th ed.). USA: Cengage Learning.
- Hu, H., & Driscoll, M. P. (2013). Self-regulation in e-learning Environments: A remedy for community college? *Educational Technology & Society*, 16(4), 171-184.
- Ibrahim, A. A., Noraidah, S., Nor Azan, M. T., & Mutasem, A. (2010). The success of learning management systems among distance learners in Malaysian universities. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 21(2), 80-91.
- Islam, M. A., Rahim, N. A. A., Liang, T. C., & Momtaz, H. (2011). Effect of demographic factors on e-learning effectiveness in a higher learning institution in Malaysia. *International Education Studies*, 4(1), 112-121. doi: 10.5539/ies.v4n1p112
- Ismail, I., Mohd. Johari, S. S. & M. Idrus, R. (2010). Technical appliance in e-learning: Student's perception on the usage of online learning. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 5(2), 31-35. doi:10.3991/ijet.v5i2.1145
- Ituma, A. (2011). An evaluation of students' perceptions and engagement with e-learning components in a campus based university. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 12(1), 57-68. doi: 10.1177/1469787410387722
- Jackson, S. (2011). *Research methods and statistics: A critical thinking approach*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Jefferies, A., & Hyde, R. (2010). Building the future students' blended learning experiences from current research findings. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 8(2), 133-140.
- Jung, I. (2011). The dimensions of e-learning quality: From the learner's perspective. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 59(4), 445-464. doi: 10.1007/s11423-010-9171-4
- Kamarulzaman, Y., Madun, A., & Ghani, F. A. (2010). *Attitudes towards elearning using Moodle: A qualitative approach*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on e-Learning, Malaysia, 12-13 July 2010 (pp. 163-170). Academic Conferences Limited.
- Keller, H., & Karau, S. J. (2013). The importance of personality in students' perceptions of the online learning experience. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2494-2500. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2013.06.007

- Kim, K., & Frick, T. W. (2011). Changes in student motivation during online learning. *Journal Educational Computing Research*, 44(1), 1-23. doi: 10.2190/EC.44.1.a
- Kitsantas, A., Reiser, R. A., & Doster, J. (2004). Developing self-regulated learners: Goal setting, self-evaluation, and organizational signals during acquisition of procedural skills. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 72(4), 269-287. doi: 10.3200/JEXE.72.4.269-287
- Kitsantas, A., Steen, S., & Huie, F. (2009). The role of self-regulated strategies and goal orientation in predicting achievement of elementary school children. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 2(1), 65-81.
- Korkmaz, O., & Kaya, S. (2012). Adapting online self-regulated learning scale into Turkish. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 13(1), 52-67.
- Krish, P., & Wong, B. E., (2009). Malaysian learners and their perceptions towards online English language courses. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 10(2), 203-224.
- Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to student learning inside the national survey of student engagement. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 33(3), 10-17. doi: 10.1080/00091380109601795
- Kumarawadu, P. (2001). Motivation of online learners: Review of practices & emerging trends. *Sri Lanka: Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology. Lockwood*. Retrieved from <http://www2.uca.es/orgobierno/ordenacion/formacion/docs/jifpev5-doc5.pdf> on January 22, 2010.
- Kuo, Y. C., Walker, A. E., Belland, B. R., & Schroder, K. E. (2013). A predictive study of student satisfaction in online education programs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 14(1), 16-39.
- Kuo, Y. C., Walker, A. E., Schroder, K. 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. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.10.001
- Lee, S. W. Y., & Tsai, C. C. (2011). Students' perceptions of collaboration, self-regulated learning, and information seeking in the context of internet-based learning and traditional learning. *Computers in human behavior*, 27(2), 905-914. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.11.016
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2012). *IBM SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Lin, K. M. (2011). E-Learning continuance intention: Moderating effects of user e-learning experience. *Computers & Education*, 56(2), 515-526. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.09.017

- Lizzio, A., Wilson, K., & Simons, R. (2002). University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(1), 27-52. doi: 10.1080/03075070120099359
- Lynch, R., & Dembo, M. (2004). The relationship between self-regulation and online learning in a blended learning context. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 5(2), 1-16.
- Macfadyen, L. P., & Dawson, S. (2010). Mining LMS data to develop an “early warning system” for educators: A proof of concept. *Computers & Education*, 54(2), 588-599. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2009.09.008
- Matuga, J. M. (2009). Self-regulation, goal orientation, and academic achievement of secondary students in online university courses. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12(3), 4-11.
- Miksza, P. (2012). The development of a measure of self-regulated practice behavior for beginning and intermediate instrumental music students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 59(4), 321-338. doi: 10.1177/0022429411414717
- Milligan, A. T., & Buckenmeyer, J. A. (2008). Assessing students for online learning. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 7(3), 449-461.
- Min, K. S., Yamin, F. M., & Ishak, W. H. W. (2012). The usage of LMS among undergraduate students. *International Journal of Computer and Information Technology*, 1(2), 39-42.
- Mishra, S. (2002). A design framework for online learning environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(4), 493-496. doi: 10.1111/1467-8535.00285
- Mondi, M., Woods, P., & Rafi, A. (2008). A 'Uses and Gratification Expectancy Model' to predict students' perceived e-learning experience'. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 11(2), 241-161.
- Najmul Islam, A. K. M. (2014). Sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with a learning management system in post-adoption stage: A critical incident technique approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 30, 249-261. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2013.09.010
- Niemczyk, M. C., & Savenye, W. C. (2001). *The relationship of student motivation and self-regulated learning strategies to performance in an undergraduate computer literacy course*. Papers Presented at the National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Georgia, 8-12 November, 2001 (pp. 312-322). Retrieved from ERIC database (ED 470107) on July 7, 2010.

- Nemanich, L., Banks, M., & Vera, D. (2009). Enhancing knowledge transfer in classroom versus online settings: The interplay among instructor, student, content, and context. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 7(1), 123-148. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4609.2008.00208.x
- Nonis, S. A., & Fenner, G. H. (2012). An exploratory study of student motivations for taking online courses and learning outcomes. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogy*, 7, 2-13.
- Osborne, J. W., & Overbay, A. (2014). *Best practices in data cleaning*. USA: Sage Publication.
- Owen, D., Hudson, B., & Tervola, T. (2006). Open and flexible learning? An evaluation of student and tutor experiences in a European e-learning community. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 15(3), 291-306. doi: 10.1080/14759390600923642
- Owston, R., York, D., & Murtha, S. (2013). Student perceptions and achievement in a university blended learning strategic initiative. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 18, 38-46. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.12.003
- Paechter, M., Maier, B., & Macher, D. (2010). Students' expectations of, and experiences in e-learning: Their relation to learning achievements and course satisfaction. *Computes & Education*, 54(1), 222-229. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2009.08.005
- Paechter, M., & Maier, B. (2010). Online or face-to-face? Students' experiences and preferences in e-learning. *The internet and higher education*, 13(4), 292-297. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.09.004
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th ed.). England: McGraw-Hill International.
- Palmer, S. R., & Holt, D. M. (2008). Examining student satisfaction with wholly online learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 25(2), 101-113. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2729.2008.00294.x
- Panadero, E., & Alonso-Tapia, J. (2014). How do students self-regulate? Review of Zimmerman's cyclical model of self-regulated learning. *Anales de Psicología*, 30, 450-462. doi: 10.6018/analesps.30.2.167221
- Parrish, P. E. (2009). Aesthetic principles for instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 57(4), 511-528. doi: 10.1007/s11423-007-9060-7
- Pelgrum, W. J., & Law, N. (2003). *ICT in education around the world: Trends, problems and prospect*. Paris: Unesco, International Institute for Educational Planning.

- 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.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of educational psychology*, 82(1), 33-40.
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T., & Mckeachie, W. J. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 801-812. doi: 10.1177/0013164493053003024
- Popescu, I., Jonoski, A., & Bhattacharya, B. (2012). Experiences from online and classroom education in hydroinformatics. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 16(11), 3935-3944. doi:10.5194/hess-16-3935-2012
- Puteh, M. (2007). *E-learning in Malaysia public universities: Case studies of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*. Paper presented at the 1st International Malaysian Educational Technology Convention, Malaysia, 2-5 November 2007 (pp. 825-834).
- Puzziferro, M. (2008). Online technologies self-efficacy and self-regulated learning as predictors of final grade and satisfaction in college-level online courses. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 22(2), 72-89. doi: 10.1080/08923640802039024
- Quinney, A. (2005). 'Placements online': Student experiences of a website to support learning in practice settings. *Social Work Education*, 24(4), 439-450. doi: 10.1080/02615470500096951
- Raman, A., & Don, Y. (2013). Preservice teachers' acceptance of Learning Management Software: An application of the UTAUT2 model. *International Education Studies*, 6(7), 157-164. doi: 10.5539/ies.v6n7p157
- Rahman, K. A., Ghazali, S. A. M., & Ismail, M. N. (2011). The effectiveness of learning management system (LMS) case study at Open University Malaysia (OUM), Kota Bharu Campus. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Computing and Information Sciences*, 3, 73-79.
- Rakes, G. C., & Dunn, K. E. (2010). The impact of online graduate students' motivation and self-regulation on academic procrastination. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 9(1), 78-93.
- Ramsden, P. (1979). Student learning and perceptions of the academic environment. *Higher Education*, 8(4), 411-427. doi: 10.1007/BF01680529
- Ramsden, P. (1991). A performance indicator of teaching quality in higher education: The Course Experience Questionnaire. *Studies in Higher Education*, 16(2), 129-150. doi: 10.1080/03075079112331382944

- Robinson, C. C., & Hullinger, H. (2008). New benchmark in higher education: Student engagement in online learning. *The Journal of Education for Business*, 84(2), 101-109. doi: 10.3200/JOEB.84.2.101-109
- Roffe, I. (2002). E-learning: Engagement, enhancement and execution. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 10(1), 40-50. doi: 10.1108/09684880210416102
- Rowe, F. A., & Rafferty, J. A. (2013). Instructional design interventions for supporting self-regulated learning: Enhancing academic outcomes in postsecondary e-learning environments. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 9(4), 590-601.
- Ruiz, J. G., Mintzer, M. J., & Leipzig, R. M. (2006). The impact of e-learning in medical education. *Academic medicine*, 81(3), 207-212. doi: 10.1097/00001888-200603000-00002
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1020
- Saade, R. G., He, X., Kira, D. (2005). Exploring dimensions to online learning. *Computer in Human Behavior*, 23, 1721-1739. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2005.10.002
- Salyers, V., Carter, L., Carter, A., Myers, S., & Barrett, P. (2014). The search for meaningful e-learning at Canadian universities: A multi-institutional research study. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 15(6), 313-337.
- Samruayruen, B., Enriquez, J., Natakatoong, O., & Samruayruen, K. (2013). Self-regulated learning: A key of a successful learner in online learning Environments in Thailand. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 48(1), 45-69. doi: 10.2190/EC.48.1.c
- Sanders, J., & Cleary, T. J. (2011). Self-regulation theory: Applications to medical education: AMEE Guide No. 58. *Medical teacher*, 33(11), 875-886. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.595434
- Sangra, A., Vlachopoulos, D., & Cabrera, N. (2011). The conceptual framework of e-learning: A view from inside. *International Journal of Learning*, 18(4), 93-104.
- Sansone, C., Fraughton, T., Zachary, J. L., Butner, J., & Heiner, C. (2011). Self-regulation of motivation when learning online: The importance of who, why and how. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 59(2), 199-212. doi: 10.1007/s11423-011-9193-6
- Schraw, G., Crippen, K. J., & Hartley, K. D. (2006). Promoting self-regulation in science education: Metacognition as part of a broader perspective on learning. *Research in Science Education*, 36(1-2), 111-139. doi: 10.1007/s11165-005-3917-8

- Schraw, G. (2007). The use of computer-based environments for understanding and improving self-regulation. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2(2), 169-176. doi: 10.1007/s11409-007-9015-8
- Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 71-86. doi: 10.1207/s15326985ep2501_6
- Schunk, D. H. (1996). Goal and self-evaluative influences during children's cognitive skill learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(2), 359-382.
- Sharma, S., Dick, G., Chin, W., & Land, L. P. W. (2007). *Self-regulation and e-learning*. Paper presented at the Fifteenth European Conference on Information Systems, Switzerland, 7-9 June 2007 (pp. 383-394).
- Shih, H. F., Chen, S. H. E., Chen, S. C., & Wey, S. C. (2013). The relationship among tertiary level EFL students' personality, online learning motivation and online learning satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103(26), 1152-1160. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.442
- Smart, K. L., & Cappel, J. J. (2006). Students' perceptions of online learning: A comparative Study. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 5, 201-219.
- Strickland, S. (2009). The effectiveness of blended learning environments for the delivered of respiratory care education. *Journal of Allied Health*, 38(1), e11-e16.
- Sun, P. C., Tsai, R. J., Finger, G., Chen, Y. Y., & Yeh, D. (2007). What drives a successful e-Learning? An empirical investigation of the critical factors influencing learner satisfaction. *Computers & Education*, 50(4), 1183-1202. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2006.11.007
- Song, L., Singleton, E. S., Hill, J. R., & Koh, M. H. (2004). Improving online learning: Student perceptions of useful and challenging characteristics. *Internet and Higher Education*, 7(1), 59-70. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.11.003
- Song, S. M. (2010). E-Learning: Investigating students' acceptance of online learning in hospitality programs. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. Retrieved from <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd> on July 3, 2010.
- Syed Abdullah, S. O., Hanafi, A., & Cheah, K. G. (2005). The Open University Malaysia learning management system: A study of interaction in the asynchronous forum board. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 2(1), 3-10.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S., (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tait, A. (2000). Planning student support for open and distance learning. *Open learning*, 15(3), 287-299. doi:10.1080/713688410

- Taha, A. M., & Ming, T. S. (2014). Exploring motivational design and motivation types facilitated by an online support system for learning literature. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 14(2), 109-122.
- Terzieva, S., Ilieva, M., & Radonova, I. (2009). Web-based learning and self-regulation of the learning. *Journal of the University of Chemical Technology and Metallurgy*, 44(4), 409-412.
- Thompson, L., & Ku, H. (2005). Chinese graduate students' experiences and attitudes towards online learning. *Educational Media International*, 41(1), 33-47. doi: 10.1080/09523980500116878
- Wang, C., & Reeves, T. C. (2007). Synchronous online learning experiences: The perspectives of international students from Taiwan. *Educational Media International*, 44(4), 339-356. doi: 10.1080/09523980701680821
- Wang, J., Mendori, T., & Xiong, J. (2014). A language learning support system using course-centered ontology and its evaluation. *Computers & Education*, 78, 278-293. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2014.06.009
- Wang, Y. S. (2003). Assessment of learner satisfaction with asynchronous electronic learning systems. *Information & Management*, 41(1), 75-86. doi: 10.1016/S0378-7206(03)00028-4
- Weng, L. J., & Cheng, C. P. (2000). Effects of response order on Likert-type scales. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 60(6), 908-924. doi: 10.1177/00131640021970989
- Wyatt, R. C., & Meyers, L. S. (1987). Psychometric properties of four 5-point Likert type response scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47(1), 27-35. doi: 10.1177/0013164487471003
- Weaver, D., Spratt, C., & Nair, C. S. (2008). Academic and student use of a learning management system: Implications for quality. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 24(1), 30-41.
- Wichadee, S. (2014). Students' learning behavior, motivation and critical thinking in Learning Management Systems. *Journal of Educators Online*, 11(3), 1-21.
- Xie, K., Durrington, V., & Yen, L. L. (2010). Relationship between students' motivation and their participation in asynchronous online discussions. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 17-29.
- You, J. W., & Kang, M. (2014). The role of academic emotions in the relationship between perceived academic control and self-regulated learning in online learning. *Computers & Education*, 77, 125-133. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2014.04.018

- Yueh, H. P., & Hsu, S. (2008). Designing a learning management system to support instruction. *Communications of the ACM*, 51(4), 59-63. doi: 10.1145/1330311.1330324
- Yulselturk, E., & Bulut, S. (2007). Predictors for student success in an online course. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(2), 71-83.
- Za'ba, N., Mamat, M. N., Isa, M. A. M., Aziz, A. A., Ramakrisnan, P., & Zain, N. H. M. (2012). A comparative study among selected global standards: i-Learn as a case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67, 476-483. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.352
- Zhao, H., Chen, L., & Panda, S. (2013). Self-regulated learning ability of Chinese distance learners. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45(5), 941-958. doi:10.1111/bjet.12118
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(3), 663-676. doi: 10.3102/00028312029003663
- Zhang, D., Zhao, J.L., Zhou, L., & Nunamaker Jr., J. F. (2004). Can e-learning replace classroom learning? *Communications of the ACM*, 47(5), 75-79. doi: 10.1145/986213.986216
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64-70. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 166-183. doi: 10.3102/0002831207312909
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Moylan, A. R. (2009). Self-regulation: Where metacognition and motivation intersect. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Handbook of metacognition in education* (pp. 299-315). New York: Routledge.
- Zimmerman, B. J. & Pons, M. M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23(4), 614-628. doi: 10.3102/00028312023004614
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2008). Motivation: An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 1-30). New York: Routledge.
- Zhao, C. & Kuh, G. D (2004) Adding value: Learning communities and student engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(2), 115-138. doi: 10.1023/B:RIHE.0000015692.88534.de