

40 Different measures of participation

| Passive Participation | Active Participation |
|---|---|
| <p>The number of 'hits' on the programme web site: Number of occasions (<100; 100–200; 200–300; 300–400; 400–500; 500–600; >600; >1000) (Coole, H., & Watts, M. (2009). Communal e-learning styles in the online classroom. <i>Research in Education</i>, 82(1), 13-27.)</p> | <p>Daily intervention-per-member average in discussion forum (Chiecher, A. C., & Donolo, D. S. (2013). Virtual dialogues and exchanges. The social and cognitive dimensions of interactions among students. <i>International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education</i>, 10(2), 285-300.)</p> |
| <p>Access per Day (Ariana, A., Amin, M., Pakneshan, S., Dolan-Evans, E., & Lam, A. K. (2016). Integration of traditional and e-learning methods to improve learning outcomes for dental students in histopathology. <i>Journal of dental education</i>, 80(9), 1140-1148.)</p> | <p>Number of posts (0-3; 4-6; 7-12; 13 and up) (Drouin, M. A. (2008). The relationship between students'perceived sense of community and satisfaction, achievement, and retention in an online course. <i>Quarterly Review of Distance Education</i>, 9(3).)</p> |
| <p>The number of first week viewers, MOOC completers, research participants, and sample completers, by course. (Barak, M., Watted, A., & Haick, H. (2016). Motivation to learn in massive open online courses: Examining aspects of language and social engagement. <i>Computers & Education</i>, 94, 49-60.)</p> | <p>Weekly discussion post (Al-Asfour, A. (2014). Improving Motivation and Persistence of Online Human Resource Students through the Use of E-Mail Communication: A Study Employing a Single Case Study Design. <i>Journal of Learning in Higher Education</i>, 10(2), 1-7.)</p> |
| <p>Tracks of online students in e-learning environment is an advantage of online teaching and learning compared to the traditional learning based presence of students in classrooms. Analysis of tracks of online students (Scores in achievement test, time of achievement test) provided by e-learning system is characterized by the validity and credibility and easy to export from the e-learning system for analysis. In the present study the cognitive performance of students (measurement of time answering questions, scores of achievement test, tracks of access of students to online course and activities) were provided by Moodle platform after the experimental period. (Barhoumi, C., & Rossi, P. G. (2013). The Effectiveness of Instruction-Oriented Hypertext Systems Compared to Direct Instruction in e-learning Environments. <i>Contemporary Educational Technology</i>, 4(4), 281-308.)</p> | <p>Participation refers to the number of messages posted by each group for every discussion item. For each class and group, we obtained the log counts of both online discussion systems. (Alrushiedat, N., & Olfman, L. (2019). Aiding participation and engagement in a blended learning environment. <i>Journal of Information Systems Education</i>, 24(2), 5.)</p> |
| <p>Number of Posts (Boury, T. T., Hineman, J. M., Klentzin, J. C., & Semich, G. W. (2013). The use of online technology to facilitate pre-service teachers' engagement and cultural competency development during an international field placement: reflections from Austria. <i>International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE)</i>, 9(3), 65-79.)</p> | <p>wall comments, discussion forum posts, blog posts, group pages (with nine comments/posts). (Arnold, N., & Paulus, T. (2010). Using a social networking site for experiential learning: Appropriating, lurking, modeling and community building. <i>The Internet and higher education</i>, 13(4), 188-196.)</p> |
| <p>Usage (Number of Hits) (Cascaval, R. C., Fogler, K. A., Abrams, G. D., & Durham, R. L. (2008). Evaluating the benefits of providing archived online lectures to in-class math</p> | <p>This study first investigated the participation pattern by conducting a temporal analysis of the group participation in the discussion forum. It was based on descriptive statistics of the</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>students. <i>Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks</i>, 12, 61-70.)</p> | <p>postings in a hybrid learning course offered by Zhejiang University. The vitality of the topics and the number of postings were calculated. And then the Chisquare test was conducted to determine if the number of postings on the day of the week and the time of the day produced a statistical difference. (Cheng, M., Su, C., Zhang, J., & Yang, Y. (2015). Analyzing Temporal Patterns of Groups and Individuals in an Online Learning Forum. <i>International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning</i>, 10(5).)</p> |
| <p>Accessed podcasts (during semester) %; Accessed podcasts (form exam revision) % (Chester, A., Buntine, A., Hammond, K., & Atkinson, L. (2011). Podcasting in education: Student attitudes, behaviour and self-efficacy. <i>Journal of Educational Technology & Society</i>, 14(2), 236-247.)</p> | <p>Total number of postings (Yildiz, S. (2009). Social presence in the web-based classroom: Implications for intercultural communication. <i>Journal of Studies in International Education</i>, 13(1), 46-65.)</p> |
| <p>Percentage of Usage (split by Chat rooms ; Online lessons ; Quizzes) (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. <i>Learning in Higher Education</i>, 29.)</p> | <p>Average # tweets (West, B., Moore, H.)(2015). Beyond the tweet: Using Twitter to enhance engagement, learning, and success among first-year students. <i>Journal of Marketing Education</i>, 37(3), 160-170.</p> |
| <p>Students accessing podcasts (%); Episodes created (No.) Episodes downloaded/not downloaded (No.); Listen 1 time (%); Listen 2 to 5 times (%); Listen 6 to 10 times (%); Listen >10 times (Schlairet, M. C. (2010). Efficacy of podcasting: use in undergraduate and graduate programs in a college of nursing. <i>Journal of Nursing Education</i>, 49(9), 529-533.)</p> | <p>Percentage of Usage (split by Chat rooms ; Online lessons ; Quizzes) (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. <i>Learning in Higher Education</i>, 29.)</p> |
| <p>number of file launches” (i.e., number of views) (Sargent, C. S., Borthick, A. F., Lederberg, A. R., & Haardörfer, R. (2013). A low-maintenance approach to improving retention: Short on-line tutorials in elementary statistics. <i>Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice</i>, 14(4), 549-566.)</p> | <p>Participation in Chat Rooms (Percentage (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. <i>Learning in Higher Education</i>, 29.)</p> |
| <p>Lecture Viewing Student engagement with the lecture portion of the class was measured by the number of lectures viewed, either f2f or online. Lecture viewing was monitored by a one-question quiz at the end of each lecture called a lecture quiz. The lecture quiz was administered and hand-recorded by the instructor after every f2f lecture, and was administered online and graded by the LMS after students viewed recorded video lectures. (Murphy, C. A., & Stewart, J. C. (2015). The Impact of Online or F2F Lecture Choice on Student Achievement and Engagement in a Large Lecture-Based Science Course: Closing the Gap. <i>Online Learning</i>, 19(3), 91-110.)</p> | <p>the number of exchanged chat messages, (a) the number of synchronic program executions, (b) the number of hints requested, (c) the number of role switches, and finally (d) the amount of inserted program code. (Tsompanoudi, D., Satratzemi, M., & Xinogalos, S. (2015). Evaluating the effects of scripted distributed pair programming on student performance and participation. <i>IEEE Transactions on education</i>, 59(1), 24-31.)</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Pageviews; Accesses; Pages, (de Araujo Guerra Grangeia, T., de Jorge, B., Franci, D., Martins Santos, T., Vellutini Setubal, M. S., Schweller, M., & de Carvalho-Filho, M. A. (2016). Cognitive load and self-determination theories applied to e-learning: impact on students' participation and academic performance. PloS one, 11(3), e0152462.)</p> | <p>Messages Posted in Discussion Board (weekly) (Less than 2 postings; 3-5 postings; 6-8 postings; 8-10 postings))(Tsai, I. C. (2012). Understanding social nature of an online community of practice for learning to teach. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 15(2), 271-285.</p> |
| | <p>Participation in Chat Rooms (Percentage (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. Learning in Higher Education, 29.)</p> |
| | <p>the number of exchanged chat messages, (a) the number of synchronic program executions, (b) the number of hints requested, (c) the number of role switches, and finally (d) the amount of inserted program code. (Tsompanoudi, D., Satratzemi, M., & Xinogalos, S. (2015). Evaluating the effects of scripted distributed pair programming on student performance and participation. IEEE Transactions on education, 59(1), 24-31.)</p> |
| | <p>Messages Posted in Discussion Board (weekly) (Less than 2 postings; 3-5 postings; 6-8 postings; 8-10 postings))(Tsai, I. C. (2012). Understanding social nature of an online community of practice for learning to teach. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 15(2), 271-285.</p> |
| | <p>sent text messages (student and another student (SS), a student and all participants (SA), and a student and teachers (ST)) (Teng, D. C. E., Chen, N. S., & Leo, T. (2012). Exploring students' learning experience in an international online research seminar in the Synchronous Cyber Classroom. Computers & Education, 58(3), 918-930.)</p> |
| | <p>number of their posts on Facebook. (MorAis, A., Barragués, J. I., & Guisasola, J. (2015). Using a classroom response system for promoting interaction to teaching mathematics to large groups of undergraduate students. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 34(3), 249-271.)</p> |
| | <p>participation and interactivity: No. and (%) of students who posted; No. of replies by teacher; No. of replies by students; No. and (%) of students who replied to the same post more than once; No. and (%) of students who used quotes in replies; % of quoted replies containing additional info. (Nielsen, B. (2013). Students' Perceptions and Learning Outcomes of Online</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Writing Using Discussion Boards. JALT CALL Journal, 9(2), 131-147.) |
| | Replies: No. sentences; No. words; Ave. words per sentence; No. syllables; Ave. No. syllables per sentence; No. paragraph (Nielsen, B. (2013). Students' Perceptions and Learning Outcomes of Online Writing Using Discussion Boards. JALT CALL Journal, 9(2), 131-147.) |
| | Laboratory Submission Rates Students were required to attend 28 f2f laboratory sessions, two per class week, during the semester and received credit for completing each of 28 lab activities. The completion rate of these laboratory activities was calculated as an indicator of student engagement. (Murphy, C. A., & Stewart, J. C. (2015). The Impact of Online or F2F Lecture Choice on Student Achievement and Engagement in a Large Lecture-Based Science Course: Closing the Gap. Online Learning, 19(3), 91-110.) |
| | Homework Submission Rates In addition to lecture viewing as a determinant of student engagement, the submission of homework assignments outside of the classroom was also examined. While homework assignment grades were previously described in relation to measures of achievement, submission rates for these out-of-class assignments were also calculated and used as a measure of student engagement. (Murphy, C. A., & Stewart, J. C. (2015). The Impact of Online or F2F Lecture Choice on Student Achievement and Engagement in a Large Lecture-Based Science Course: Closing the Gap. Online Learning, 19(3), 91-110.) |
| | total number of posts and responses; Frequency of Multiple Responses per Week; Response Times (Miller, S. T. (2013). Increasing Student Participation in Online Group Discussions Via Facebook. Astronomy Education Review, 12(1).) |
| | Number of quizzes taken, conditional on taking one or more.; Number of Attempts”: number of times the student took the quiz; “Play1”: number of times the student pressed the play button before attempting the quiz for the first time; “Cond. Play1”: number of times the student pressed the play button before attempting the quiz for the first time, conditioned to students who pressed the play button at least once; “PlayM”: number of times the student pressed the play button between his first and best attempt; “Cond. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>PlayM”: number of times the student pressed the play button between his first and best attempt, conditional on pressing it at least once; “TotalViews1”: number of threads the student viewed before his first attempt; “Cond. TotalViews1”: number of threads the student viewed before his first attempt, conditional to viewing at least one; “Procrastination”: hours the student waited between the publication of the quiz and his first attempt to solve it (Diver, P., & Martinez, I. (2015). MOOCs as a massive research laboratory: Opportunities and challenges. <i>Distance Education</i>, 36(1), 5-25.)</p> |
| | <p>number of questions (top) and answers (bottom) submitted per day (Galloway, K. W., & Burns, S. (2015). Doing it for themselves: students creating a high quality peer-learning environment. <i>Chemistry Education Research and Practice</i>, 16(1), 82-92.)</p> |
| | <p>The number of messages posted by each group per assignment was monitored throughout the year (Kelly, D., Baxter, J. S., & Anderson, A. (2010). Engaging first-year students through online collaborative assessments. <i>Journal of Computer Assisted Learning</i>, 26(6), 535-548.)</p> |
| | <p>No. of Post (Ling, S. W., Koo, A. C., & Ong, C. C. (2010). The Reasons for Encouraging or Inhibiting Students' Active Participation in Asynchronous Online Discussion: Three Cases from Malaysia. <i>International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences</i>, 5(1).)</p> |
| | <p>Number of words Number Total number of words in a message (by word count) (Linjawi, A. I., Walmsley, A. D., & Hill, K. B. (2012). Online discussion boards in dental education: potential and challenges. <i>European Journal of Dental Education</i>, 16(1), e3-e9.)</p> |
| | <p>Number of artifacts, Number of comments à split by Blog posts; Wiki pages; Bookmarks; File items; Photos (Lu, J., & Churchill, D. (2014). The effect of social interaction on learning engagement in a social networking environment. <i>Interactive learning environments</i>, 22(4), 401-417.)</p> |

| Passive Participation | Active Participation |
|---|---|
| <p>The number of 'hits' on the programme web site: Number of occasions (<100; 100–200; 200–300; 300–400; 400–500; 500–600; >600; >1000) (Coole, H., & Watts, M. (2009). Communal e-learning styles in the online classroom. <i>Research in Education</i>, 82(1), 13-27.)</p> | <p>Daily intervention-per-member average in discussion forum (Chiecher, A. C., & Donolo, D. S. (2013). Virtual dialogues and exchanges. The social and cognitive dimensions of interactions among students. <i>International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education</i>, 10(2), 285-300.)</p> |
| <p>Access per Day (Ariana, A., Amin, M., Pakneshan, S., Dolan-Evans, E., & Lam, A. K. (2016). Integration of traditional and e-learning methods to improve learning outcomes for dental students in histopathology. <i>Journal of dental education</i>, 80(9), 1140-1148.)</p> | <p>Number of posts (0-3; 4-6; 7-12; 13 and up) (Drouin, M. A. (2008). The relationship between students'perceived sense of community and satisfaction, achievement, and retention in an online course. <i>Quarterly Review of Distance Education</i>, 9(3).)</p> |
| <p>The number of first week viewers, MOOC completers, research participants, and sample completers, by course. (Barak, M., Watted, A., & Haick, H. (2016). Motivation to learn in massive open online courses: Examining aspects of language and social engagement. <i>Computers & Education</i>, 94, 49-60.)</p> | <p>Weekly discussion post (Al-Asfour, A. (2014). Improving Motivation and Persistence of Online Human Resource Students through the Use of E-Mail Communication: A Study Employing a Single Case Study Design. <i>Journal of Learning in Higher Education</i>, 10(2), 1-7.)</p> |
| <p>Tracks of online students in e-learning environment is an advantage of online teaching and learning compared to the traditional learning based presence of students in classrooms. Analysis of tracks of online students (Scores in achievement test, time of achievement test) provided by e-learning system is characterized by the validity and credibility and easy to export from the e-learning system for analysis. In the present study the cognitive performance of students (measurement of time answering questions, scores of achievement test, tracks of access of students to online course and activities) were provided by Moodle platform after the experimental period. (Barhoumi, C., & Rossi, P. G. (2013). The Effectiveness of Instruction-Oriented Hypertext Systems Compared to Direct Instruction in e-learning Environments. <i>Contemporary Educational Technology</i>, 4(4), 281-308.)</p> | <p>Participation refers to the number of messages posted by each group for every discussion item. For each class and group, we obtained the log counts of both online discussion systems. (Alrushiedat, N., & Olfman, L. (2019). Aiding participation and engagement in a blended learning environment. <i>Journal of Information Systems Education</i>, 24(2), 5.)</p> |
| <p>Number of Posts (Boury, T. T., Hineman, J. M., Klentzin, J. C., & Semich, G. W. (2013). The use of online technology to facilitate pre-service teachers' engagement and cultural competency development during an international field placement: reflections from Austria. <i>International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE)</i>, 9(3), 65-79.)</p> | <p>wall comments, discussion forum posts, blog posts, group pages (with nine comments/posts). (Arnold, N., & Paulus, T. (2010). Using a social networking site for experiential learning: Appropriating, lurking, modeling and community building. <i>The Internet and higher education</i>, 13(4), 188-196.)</p> |
| <p>Usage (Number of Hits) (Cascaval, R. C., Fogler, K. A., Abrams, G. D., & Durham, R. L. (2008). Evaluating the benefits of providing archived online lectures to in-class math students. <i>Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks</i>, 12, 61-70.)</p> | <p>This study first investigated the participation pattern by conducting a temporal analysis of the group participation in the discussion forum. It was based on descriptive statistics of the postings in a hybrid learning course offered by Zhejiang University. The vitality of the topics</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | and the number of postings were calculated. And then the Chisquare test was conducted to determine if the number of postings on the day of the week and the time of the day produced a statistical difference. (Cheng, M., Su, C., Zhang, J., & Yang, Y. (2015). Analyzing Temporal Patterns of Groups and Individuals in an Online Learning Forum. <i>International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning</i> , 10(5).) |
| Accessed podcasts (during semester) %; Accessed podcasts (form exam revision) % (Chester, A., Buntine, A., Hammond, K., & Atkinson, L. (2011). Podcasting in education: Student attitudes, behaviour and self-efficacy. <i>Journal of Educational Technology & Society</i> , 14(2), 236-247.) | Total number of postings (Yildiz, S. (2009). Social presence in the web-based classroom: Implications for intercultural communication. <i>Journal of Studies in International Education</i> , 13(1), 46-65.) |
| Percentage of Usage (split by Chat rooms ; Online lessons ; Quizzes) (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. <i>Learning in Higher Education</i> , 29.) | Average # tweets (West, B., Moore, H.)(2015). Beyond the tweet: Using Twitter to enhance engagement, learning, and success among first-year students. <i>Journal of Marketing Education</i> , 37(3), 160-170. |
| Students accessing podcasts (%); Episodes created (No.) Episodes downloaded/not downloaded (No.); Listen 1 time (%); Listen 2 to 5 times (%); Listen 6 to 10 times (%); Listen >10 times (Schlairet, M. C. (2010). Efficacy of podcasting: use in undergraduate and graduate programs in a college of nursing. <i>Journal of Nursing Education</i> , 49(9), 529-533.) | Percentage of Usage (split by Chat rooms ; Online lessons ; Quizzes) (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. <i>Learning in Higher Education</i> , 29.) |
| number of file launches" (i.e., number of views) (Sargent, C. S., Borthick, A. F., Lederberg, A. R., & Haardörfer, R. (2013). A low-maintenance approach to improving retention: Short on-line tutorials in elementary statistics. <i>Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice</i> , 14(4), 549-566.) | Participation in Chat Rooms (Percentage (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. <i>Learning in Higher Education</i> , 29.) |
| Lecture Viewing Student engagement with the lecture portion of the class was measured by the number of lectures viewed, either f2f or online. Lecture viewing was monitored by a one-question quiz at the end of each lecture called a lecture quiz. The lecture quiz was administered and hand-recorded by the instructor after every f2f lecture, and was administered online and graded by the LMS after students viewed recorded video lectures. (Murphy, C. A., & Stewart, J. C. (2015). The Impact of Online or F2F Lecture Choice on Student Achievement and Engagement in a Large Lecture-Based Science Course: Closing the Gap. <i>Online Learning</i> , 19(3), 91-110.) | the number of exchanged chat messages, (a) the number of synchronic program executions, (b) the number of hints requested, (c) the number of role switches, and finally (d) the amount of inserted program code. (Tsompanoudi, D., Satratzemi, M., & Xinogalos, S. (2015). Evaluating the effects of scripted distributed pair programming on student performance and participation. <i>IEEE Transactions on education</i> , 59(1), 24-31.) |
| Pageviews; Accesses; Pages, (de Araujo Guerra Grangeia, T., de Jorge, B., Franci, D., | Messages Posted in Discussion Board (weekly) (Less than 2 postings; 3-5 postings; 6-8 |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Martins Santos, T., Vellutini Setubal, M. S., Schweller, M., & de Carvalho-Filho, M. A. (2016). Cognitive load and self-determination theories applied to e-learning: impact on students' participation and academic performance. <i>PloS one</i>, 11(3), e0152462.)</p> | <p>postings; 8-10 postings))(Tsai, I. C. (2012). Understanding social nature of an online community of practice for learning to teach. <i>Journal of Educational Technology & Society</i>, 15(2), 271-285.</p> |
| | <p>Participation in Chat Rooms (Percentage (Ward, M., De Silva, T. A., & Weil, S. (2013). Constructing an intermodal learning culture: How accounting students deploy language resources to learn across classroom and online environments. <i>Learning in Higher Education</i>, 29.)</p> |
| | <p>the number of exchanged chat messages, (a) the number of synchronic program executions, (b) the number of hints requested, (c) the number of role switches, and finally (d) the amount of inserted program code. (Tsompanoudi, D., Satratzemi, M., & Xinogalos, S. (2015). Evaluating the effects of scripted distributed pair programming on student performance and participation. <i>IEEE Transactions on education</i>, 59(1), 24-31.)</p> |
| | <p>Messages Posted in Discussion Board (weekly) (Less than 2 postings; 3-5 postings; 6-8 postings; 8-10 postings))(Tsai, I. C. (2012). Understanding social nature of an online community of practice for learning to teach. <i>Journal of Educational Technology & Society</i>, 15(2), 271-285.</p> |
| | <p>sent text messages (student and another student (SS), a student and all participants (SA), and a student and teachers (ST)) (Teng, D. C. E., Chen, N. S., & Leo, T. (2012). Exploring students' learning experience in an international online research seminar in the Synchronous Cyber Classroom. <i>Computers & Education</i>, 58(3), 918-930.)</p> |
| | <p>number of their posts on Facebook. (MorAis, A., Barragués, J. I., & Guisasola, J. (2015). Using a classroom response system for promoting interaction to teaching mathematics to large groups of undergraduate students. <i>Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching</i>, 34(3), 249-271.)</p> |
| | <p>participation and interactivity: No. and (%) of students who posted; No. of replies by teacher; No. of replies by students; No. and (%) of students who replied to the same post more than once; No. and (%) of students who used quotes in replies; % of quoted replies containing additional info. (Nielsen, B. (2013). Students' Perceptions and Learning Outcomes of Online Writing Using Discussion Boards. <i>JALT CALL Journal</i>, 9(2), 131-147.)</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Replies; No. sentences; No. words; Ave. words per sentence; No. syllables; Ave. No. syllables per sentence; No. paragraph (Nielsen, B. (2013). Students' Perceptions and Learning Outcomes of Online Writing Using Discussion Boards. <i>JALT CALL Journal</i>, 9(2), 131-147.)</p> |
| | <p>Laboratory Submission Rates Students were required to attend 28 f2f laboratory sessions, two per class week, during the semester and received credit for completing each of 28 lab activities. The completion rate of these laboratory activities was calculated as an indicator of student engagement. (Murphy, C. A., & Stewart, J. C. (2015). The Impact of Online or F2F Lecture Choice on Student Achievement and Engagement in a Large Lecture-Based Science Course: Closing the Gap. <i>Online Learning</i>, 19(3), 91-110.)</p> |
| | <p>Homework Submission Rates In addition to lecture viewing as a determinant of student engagement, the submission of homework assignments outside of the classroom was also examined. While homework assignment grades were previously described in relation to measures of achievement, submission rates for these out-of-class assignments were also calculated and used as a measure of student engagement. (Murphy, C. A., & Stewart, J. C. (2015). The Impact of Online or F2F Lecture Choice on Student Achievement and Engagement in a Large Lecture-Based Science Course: Closing the Gap. <i>Online Learning</i>, 19(3), 91-110.)</p> |
| | <p>total number of posts and responses; Frequency of Multiple Responses per Week; Response Times (Miller, S. T. (2013). Increasing Student Participation in Online Group Discussions Via Facebook. <i>Astronomy Education Review</i>, 12(1).)</p> |
| | <p>Number of quizzes taken, conditional on taking one or more.; Number of Attempts”: number of times the student took the quiz; “Play1”: number of times the student pressed the play button before attempting the quiz for the first time; “Cond. Play1”: number of times the student pressed the play button before attempting the quiz for the first time, conditioned to students who pressed the play button at least once; “PlayM”: number of times the student pressed the play button between his first and best attempt; “Cond. PlayM”: number of times the student pressed the play button between his first and best attempt, conditional</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>on pressing it at least once; “TotalViews1”: number of threads the student viewed before his first attempt; “Cond. TotalViews1”: number of threads the student viewed before his first attempt, conditional to viewing at least one; “Procrastination”: hours the student waited between the publication of the quiz and his first attempt to solve it (Diver, P., & Martinez, I. (2015). MOOCs as a massive research laboratory: Opportunities and challenges. <i>Distance Education</i>, 36(1), 5-25.)</p> |
| | <p>number of questions (top) and answers (bottom) submitted per day (Galloway, K. W., & Burns, S. (2015). Doing it for themselves: students creating a high quality peer-learning environment. <i>Chemistry Education Research and Practice</i>, 16(1), 82-92.)</p> |
| | <p>The number of messages posted by each group per assignment was monitored throughout the year (Kelly, D., Baxter, J. S., & Anderson, A. (2010). Engaging first-year students through online collaborative assessments. <i>Journal of Computer Assisted Learning</i>, 26(6), 535-548.)</p> |
| | <p>No. of Post (Ling, S. W., Koo, A. C., & Ong, C. C. (2010). The Reasons for Encouraging or Inhibiting Students' Active Participation in Asynchronous Online Discussion: Three Cases from Malaysia. <i>International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences</i>, 5(1).)</p> |
| | <p>Number of words Number Total number of words in a message (by word count) (Linjawi, A. I., Walmsley, A. D., & Hill, K. B. (2012). Online discussion boards in dental education: potential and challenges. <i>European Journal of Dental Education</i>, 16(1), e3-e9.)</p> |
| | <p>Number of artifacts, Number of comments à split by Blog posts; Wiki pages; Bookmarks; File items; Photos (Lu, J., & Churchill, D. (2014). The effect of social interaction on learning engagement in a social networking environment. <i>Interactive learning environments</i>, 22(4), 401-417.)</p> |