The Factors Predicting Students' Participation in Online English Courses

Suat KAYA[1]

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Purpose: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which restricted face to face instruction, most of the educational institutions have been obliged to continue their education through distance education without examining the conditions necessary for effective online learning. The researcher who offered more than 100 class hours of English instruction realized that the students did not participate in online courses as much as expected. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the level of students' online learning readiness (OLR) and the factors predicting their participation in online English courses.

Method: The study employed a correlational research design to discover the relationship between variables. The sample included 177 students selected from the Departments of Civil Aviation and Translation and Interpreting. Data were collected using a validated and reliable OLR scale. This instrument was conducted as an online form, which included an additional part to obtain information about some characteristics of the sample, which were used to examine relationships. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and binary logistic regression.

Findings: The findings revealed that the students had an average level of OLR. The results of logistic regression analysis indicated that students' department type, previous experience in online courses, computer ownership, computer/internet self-efficacy (CIS) and motivation for learning (ML) influenced students' participation in online courses, while internet limit, self-directed learning (SDL), learner control (LC) and online communication self-efficacy (OCS) were not significant variables influencing their participation frequency.

Implications for Research and Practice: Further research was suggested to examine the relationship between different predictors and the outcome variable. It was suggested to take actions to maximize students' participation for more learning gains.

---

[1] Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen University, TURKEY, e-mail: sukaya@agri.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-6593-3205

Introduction

Learning, which can simply be defined as the process of change in behaviors of the individuals in a general sense, has started with the birth of human beings and various concepts, approaches, models and theories of learning have emerged throughout the history of humankind. It is possible to suggest that all of them are based on diverse philosophical and psychological stances and they not only contradict but also support and complement one another. With the development and advancement of technology in every aspect of life, and especially due to the spread of the internet, many concepts regarding educational technology have emerged, which in turn led to the emergence of new approaches in teaching and learning on a global scale. Some of the most popular ones include distance education, web-based learning, mobile learning and online learning. Online learning is one of these innovations, and it has become very popular in the education field all around the world as a result of these developments.

As the COVID-19 pandemic, which started in China in late 2019 and spread to all around the world, restricted face to face education, most of the educational institutions were obliged to continue their education through online learning, which was utilized mainly as an alternative or complement to face-to-face education in the recent past in the mode of blended learning. As suggested by Keegan (2005) and Usun (2006), online teaching should be provided on the condition that the necessary technological and pedagogical foundations are available. However, the Turkish Council of Higher Education, inevitably and without losing time, gave all higher education institutions the approval of teaching from a distance without knowing whether the students are ready in all aspects to learn online. To this connection, the current debate in education is no longer whether computers and the internet should be used in the learning and teaching process but rather how to do so and how to facilitate and improve learning through the use of them due to this pandemic.

In Agri Ibrahim Cecen University, MOODLE and Adobe Connect were utilized for distance education. However, the researcher who offered more than 100 hours of synchronous and asynchronous English courses realized that the students did not participate in these courses as much as expected. This problem is highlighted as one of the most frequent problems in the online learning process (Bilgic, Dogan, & Seferoglu, 2011; Ilgaz, 2014; Sumer, 2016; Tuncer & Taspinar, 2008). Therefore, the present study aimed to find out the likely reasons behind this insufficient participation rate. The pandemic caused many deaths, it continues to take lives and it is not known when it will come to an end. Therefore, the investigation of the likely reasons behind insufficient participation, which can be influenced by the characteristics of the students and instructors, and the course can guide future instructional design plans and thus "guide students toward successful and fruitful online learning experiences" (Hung et al., 2010, p. 1080). In addition, the chance of success in online learning is low as long as the students' level of readiness for online learning is insufficient (Moftakhari, 2013), so success in online learning comes with the determination of the participants' needs and an understanding of their readiness (Mercado, 2008). In other words, there is a correlation between learning and OLR (Kruger-Ross & Waters, 2013). The present research aims to examine students' OLR and the factors predicting students'

participation in online English courses. The following research questions were formulated to find answers for this purpose:

1. What is the students' OLR level?

2. What are the predictors of student participation level in online English courses?

Literature Review

The first section of the literature review includes information about the theoretical perspectives regarding online learning and OLR, while the second section focuses on the studies conducted to examine students' OLR. The central purpose of this review was to investigate the predictors of OLR and the factors predicting students' participation in online courses.

The Theoretical Perspectives on Online Learning and OLR

Online learning is viewed as a subcategory of distance education (Bates, 2015; Kruger-Ross & Waters, 2013), which makes use of the internet and the World Wide Web (Web) (Bates, 2015). Ally (2002) describes online learning as

[t]he use of the Internet to access learning materials; to interact with the content, instructor, and other learners; and to obtain support during the learning process, in order to acquire knowledge, to construct personal meaning, and to grow from the learning experience (as cited in Ally, 2008, p. 17).

There are many benefits of online learning (Bates, 2005), and the use of knowledge and communication technologies is thought to make learning easier (Broadbent & Poon, 2015; Celen, Celik & Seferoglu, 2011; Lim & Richardson, 2016; Pearson & Trinidad, 2005; Todhunter, 2013). However, students are expected to be ready to learn online to reap the benefits of online learning (Alsancak-Sirakaya & Yurdugul, 2016; Chung, Noor & Mathew, 2020; Hukle, 2009), which refer to the OLR. OLR, which was first suggested by Warner, Christie and Choy (1998), is thought to influence students' participation (Demir-Kaymak & Horzum, 2013) and success in online learning (Artino, 2009; Demir-Kaymak & Horzum, 2013; Galy, Downey & Johnson, 2011; Horzum, Demir-Kaymak & Güngören, 2015; Ibrahim, Silong & Samah, 2012; Kruger-Rose & Waters, 2013; Oliver, 2001).

Engagement and participation are often highlighted as key components for effective learning in online courses (Palloff & Pratt, 2011), so it should be instructors' first duty to establish the presence of the learners in online learning environments (Palloff & Pratt, 2011). Literature suggests many factors influencing their engagement/participation and thus success in online learning. Mostly, the students' success/failure and engagement/participation in online learning have been associated with some concepts and constructs which are viewed as sub-dimensions of OLR including motivation (Kanuka & Nocente, 2003; Lim, 2004; Kaya, 2002; Kilinc & Yuzer, 2015; Pillay, Irving & Tones, 2007; Saadé, He, & Kira, 2007; Smith, Murphy & Mahoney, 2003; Smith, 2005; Stansfield, McLellan & Connolly, 2004; Watkins, Leigh & Triner, 2004); self-directed learning (Daniel & Moore, 2000; Eunjoo, 2006; Hung et al., 2010; Lin, & Hsieh, 2001); learner control (Hung et al., 2010; Wang & Beasley, 2002);

computer self-efficacy (Celen, Celik & Seferoglu, 2011; Compeau & Higgins, 1995; Lim, 2001; Wang & Newlin, 2002) and internet self-efficacy (Celen, Celik & Seferoglu, 2011; Eastin & LaRose, 2000; Tsai & Tsai, 2003; Tsai & Lin, 2004), the computer technologies utilized and the quality of internet (Sun, Tsai, Finger, Chan & Yeh, 2008; Chang & Tung, 2008) and online communication self-efficacy (Hung et al., 2010). These concepts and constructs are reported to have an important role in influencing and shaping students' behaviors in the learning process (Compeau & Higgins, 1995; Hung et al., 2010). Participation, which refers to the interaction with the course content, has been a central issue in debates about online learning (Masters & Oberprieler, 2004), and ensuring active participation of the students has been highlighted as an intrinsic aspect of learning (Hrastinski, 2006).

Studies Conducted on OLR

Literature suggests many studies conducted to examine students' OLR level and the factors influencing readiness level. Chung, Noor and Mathew (2020) investigated students' OLR and the findings revealed that students' OLR was low concerning LC, moderate regarding SDL and ML, while it was high for CIS. In addition, gender was not a significant factor influencing students' OLR. On the other hand, grade level was a significant factor influencing their CIS and LC. Lastly, the poor internet connection was highlighted as the biggest challenge in the online learning process. Alsancak-Sirakaya and Yurdugul (2016) analyzed OLR levels of pre-service teachers using grade level, gender, type of department and the time spent on the internet as predictors. Gender was a significant factor that influenced pre-service teachers' SDL and CIS. Grade level and type of department were significant factors influencing their CIS. Lastly, the time spent on internet was a significant factor affecting their LC, CIS and OCS. Cakir and Horzum (2015) investigated the relationship between the OLR of 599 teacher candidates and their demographic characteristics. A significant difference was found between students' gender and their SDL on behalf of females, while significant differences were not found regarding their LC, CIS, OCS and ML. Lastly, department type and age did not cause a significant change in students' readiness level. Cigdem and Yildirim (2014) conducted a study to examine the OLR level of vocational college students and the factors influencing their readiness level. The findings revealed that students were ready for online learning. The highest readiness level was found in motivation for learning, LC and SDL, while the students needed to develop themselves in CIS and online communication self-efficacy. In addition, a significant relationship was found between the independent variables like computer ownership, type of department and type of high school and the students' OLR level. To illustrate, the students who had a computer had higher CIS, OCS and LC. Likewise, students who experienced web-based education before had a higher readiness level in all sub-dimensions of the OLR scale except for ML. Lastly, the students' department type caused significant differences in their CIS level. Hung et al. (2010) aimed to develop an OLR scale in their studies. The findings indicated that gender was not a significant predictor in the five OLRS dimensions. On the other hand, grade level was a significant predictor influencing students' readiness in the dimensions of SDL, CIS, ML, and LC

in favor of higher graders. In addition, the highest readiness level was found in CIS, which was followed by ML, OCS, SDL and LC.

Literature also suggests studies conducted to find out the factors influencing students' participation in online courses. Ozyurek, Begde, Yavuz-Ferah and Ozkan (2016) aimed to evaluate distance education applications based on students' perspectives. Internet connection was the biggest problem preventing engagement and participation in online courses. Duncan, Kenworthy and McNamara (2012) examined the relationship between MBA students' final exam and course performance outcomes and the quality and quantity of their participation in synchronous and asynchronous accounting courses. Findings revealed that the quality of students' participation was positively related to their final exam outcomes, while the quantity of their participation was related to their overall course performance. They suggested that higher quality and more frequent participation in both synchronous and asynchronous courses would maximize their performance. Lastly, Lim (2001) aimed to examine adult learners' satisfaction in a Web-based distance education course and their intent to participate in future similar courses. The only significant predictor was the computer self-efficacy dimension. In addition, the findings suggest that higher student satisfaction meant higher intent to participate in future Web-based courses.

Method

Research Design

The design employed in this study was a correlational design which "enables a researcher to ascertain whether, and to what extent, there is a degree of association between two variables" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p. 516), that is why "correlational research, like causal-comparative research, is an example of what is sometimes called associational research" (Fraenkel, Hyun & Wallen, 2012, p. 329). The purpose in this design is simply to discover the relationship between variables (Gall, Gall & Borg) without establishing cause and effect relationships (Fraenkel, Hyun & Wallen, 2012). The major advantage of this research design is that it enables the researcher to analyze the relationships among a large number of variables in a single study (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). "Correlational research is conducted for one of two basic purposes—either to help explain important human behaviors or to predict likely outcomes" (Fraenkel, Hyun & Wallen, 2012, p. 329). In this study, it was used to analyze how well some of the students' characteristics and their OLR level predicted students' participation in synchronous and asynchronous English courses.

Research Sample

The minimum acceptable sample size for a correlational study is considered by most researchers to be no less than 30 (Fraenkel, Hyun & Wallen, 2012; Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). The sample of this study included 177 students selected from Civil Aviation and Translation and Interpreting Departments at a public university in Turkey utilizing a simple random sampling method. Concerning the adequacy of sample size, the literature has not offered specific rules applicable to logistic regression

analysis. However, Lawley and Maxwell (1971), Marascuilo and Levin (1983), Tabachnick and Fidell (1996, 2001) "have recommended applying a minimum ratio of 10 to 1, with a minimum sample size of 100 or 50, plus a variable number that is a function of the number of predictors" (cited in Peng, Lee & Ingersoll, 2002, p. 10). Quite similarly, Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2014) advised to include at least 10 observations per predictor variables for each category of the dependent variable. Since there are nine predictor variables, each category of the dependent variable should have 90 observations (9x10). The dependent variable has two categories (higher participation group or lower participation group), so 180 observations can be regarded as an adequate sample size for logistic regression in this study (2x90). Thus, data, collected from 177 participants were judged as adequate for sample size.

Some characteristics of the students are presented in Table 1. As seen in Table 1, students had an average age of 21, and the sample included 103 females (58.2%) and 74 male students (41.8%). Of these students, 108 students (61%) were from the Civil Aviation Department, while 69 (39%) were from the Department of Translation and Interpreting. Regarding grade level, 110 students (62.1%) were in the first grade, while 67 (37.9%) were second-grade students.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Sample

Variables	Categories	*M*	*SD*	*f*	*%*
Age		21	1.79		
Gender	Female			103	58.2
	Male			74	41.8
Department	Civil Aviation			108	61
	Translation and Interpreting			69	39
Grade level	First			110	62.1
	Second			67	37.9
Previous experience	Yes			64	36.2
	No			113	63.8
Living area	Urban			128	72.3
	Rural			49	27.7
Computer ownership	Yes			74	41.8
	No			103	58.2
Internet Limit	Unlimited			73	41.2
	Limited			104	58.8
Tool	Computer			51	28.8
	Smartphone			126	71.2

In addition to above-mentioned demographics, some other characteristics were investigated as well. As seen in Table 1, 113 students (63.8%) did not have any online courses before, while 64 students (36.2%) had this experience before; 128 students (72.3%) lived in an urban area, while 49 students (27.7%) lived in a rural area; 103 students (58.2%) did not have a computer, while 74 students (41.8%) had one computer; 73 students (41.2%) had unlimited internet connection, while 104 students (58.8%) had limited connection; lastly, 51 students (28.8%) followed online courses via

a computer, while a great majority (71.2%) of the students used smartphones to follow the courses.

Research Instruments and Procedures

OLR developed by Hung et al. (2010) was used as a data collection instrument in this study. This scale consisted of five sub-dimensions which included 18 items measuring OLR on a five-point Likert type scale (1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree). The first sub-dimension, computer/internet self-efficacy, had three items, SDL was formed from five items, LC included three items, ML was composed of four items and the last sub-dimension, online communication self-efficacy, included three items. This scale was adapted to Turkish in three studies (Demir-Kaymak & Horzum, 2013; Ilhan & Cetin, 2013; Yurdugul & Alsancak-Sirakaya, 2013). Among these adaptions, that of Yurdugul and Alsancak-Sirakaya (2013) was used in this study as it yielded better reliability scores. The Cronbach's alpha values were.92, .84, .85, .80 and .91 for CIS, SDL, LC, ML and OCS, respectively. Five students not included in the sample were requested to read the items of the scale to measure face validity of the instrument. Results revealed that the instrument was clear and understandable.

For this research, Ethical permission was taken from Scientific Research Ethics Committee of Agri Ibrahim Cecen University with decision numbered 114. The instrument was conducted as an online form which included an additional part seeking information about some demographic characteristics of the students which were used to examine relationships. In the demographic part, they were asked to report their age, gender, department type (civil aviation vs. translation and interpreting), grade level (first grade vs. second grade), previous experience with online courses (yes vs. no), living area (rural vs. urban), whether they have a computer (yes vs. no), internet limit (unlimited vs. limited), the vehicle to use while participating the online courses (computer vs. smartphone). They were also asked to report frequency of their participation in online English courses on five point Likert type scale (1= Never, 2= Seldom, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Always).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using both descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations and logistic regression analysis using SPSS 22. Two research questions were formulated to answer in this study as explained in the following paragraphs.

The first one was asked to find out the students' OLR level. Means and standard deviations were used to analyze the data collected to answer this research question. For the second research question, which was asked to find out the factors predicting the students' participation level, binary logistic regression analysis was conducted as it allows to predict the outcome variable which is categorical based on predictor variables which could be categorical or continuous (Field, 2009). The outcome variable had two alternatives, namely whether they would be in the lower participation group or higher participation group. The students who never or seldom participated in the

online courses were placed in the lower participation group, while the students who often or always participated were placed in the higher participation group. The students, who sometimes participated, were not included in the sample as the aim was to find out the difference between the extreme groups. To this connection the research question was formulated as "How well do students' demographic characteristics (department type, previous experience with online courses, internet limit, computer ownership and their OLR level) predict students' placement in either lower participation group or higher participation group?"

Before conducting logistic regression, assumptions, including absence of multivariate outliers, absence of multicollinearity, expected cell frequency and linearity in the logit, were examined. Multivariate outliers were checked using Cook's distance, DfBeta(s) and Leverage values in the data. For multicollinearity, Tolerance values, which should be bigger than .20, and VIF values, which should be smaller four, were interpreted using correlation matrix (Field, 2009). Expected cell frequency was checked with cross-tabs. According to Field (2009), expected cell frequencies should be more than five because there will be little power in the analysis if the expected frequencies are small (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Last of all, linearity was checked using Box-Tidwell approach. Logistic regression assumes a linear relationship between continuous predictors and the logit transform of the dependent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As the results were not significant, linearity of logit was not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As all these assumptions were met, in short, the regression analysis was conducted.

Results

The first research question was asked to find out students' OLR level, which was measured with an OLR scale, including five sub-dimensions. The findings are presented in Table 2. The findings, as seen in the table, revealed that the highest readiness level was found in the OCS dimension (*M*=3.77, *SD*=.73), which was followed by ML (*M*=3.69, *SD*=.62), SDL (*M*=3.56, *SD*=.53), CIS (*M*=3.27, *SD*=.91) and LC (*M*=3.14, *SD*=.74), respectively.

Table 2

Students' OLR Level

Sub-dimensions	M	SD
CIS	3.27	.91
SDL	3.56	.53
LC	3.14	.74
ML	3.69	.62
OCS	3.77	.73

The second research question was asked to examine the factors predicting students' participation in online English courses. Some descriptive findings regarding the dependent variable are presented in Table 3. As seen in the table, 123 students (69.5%) were in the lower participation group, while 54 students (30.5%) were in the lower participation group based on the grouping criteria mentioned before. Findings indicated that the likelihood ratio test of the full model versus null (model with intercept only) was statistically significant, χ^2 (9) = 68.33, with Nagelkerke R^2 = .45, and Cox and Snell R^2 = .32. In other words, the logistic model was more effective than the null model.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of the Study

		f	$%$
Participation frequency	Never	50	28.2
	Seldom	73	41.2
	Often	49	27.7
	Always	5	2.8
Participation groups	Lower participation group	123	69.5
	Higher participation group	54	30.5

Using Wald's statistics as seen in Table 4, department type (Wald's χ^2 = 5.71, $p <$ .05), previous experience in online courses (Wald's χ^2 = 13.62, $p <$ .05), computer ownership (Wald's χ^2 = 6.20, $p <$ .05), the level of CIS (Wald's χ^2 = 12.38, $p <$ .05) and the level of ML (Wald's χ^2 = 4.29, $p <$ .05) were significant variables influencing students' participation level. On the other hand, internet limit (Wald's χ^2 = 1.87, $p >$ .05), the level of SDL (Wald's χ^2 = 1.78, $p >$ .05), the level of LC (Wald's χ^2 = .41, $p >$ .05) and the level of OCS (Wald's χ^2 = 1.86, $p >$ .05) were not significant variables.

Table 4

Logistic Regression Analysis of 177 Observations

Variables	B	S.E. of B	Wald	df	P	Odds ratio
Department type	1.23	.52	5.71	1	.02*	3.44
Previous experience	-1.97	.54	13.62	1	.00*	.14
Computer ownership	1.48	.59	6.20	1	.01*	4.37
Internet limit	.73	.53	1.87	1	.17	2.07
CIS	1.11	.32	12.38	1	.00*	3.03
SDL	.72	.54	1.78	1	.18	2.05
LC	.30	.47	.41	1	.52	1.35
ML	-.95	.46	4.29	1	.038*	.39
OCS	.47	.34	1.86	1	.17	1.60
Constant	-7.68	2.14	12.86	1	.00*	.00

*p<.05

Regarding the direction of the relationship, except for the variables "previous experience" and motivation for learning, which had a negative relationship with the outcome variable, there was a positive relationship between the outcome variable and the remaining variables. To this connection, the students who experienced distance education before tended to participate less frequently than the students who did not. Likewise, the students having higher ML tended to participate less than the students having less motivation. Regarding department type, the students from the Department of Translation and Interpreting tended to participate more frequently than the other group of students. Concerning computer ownership, the students who had a computer participated more frequently than the students who did not. Lastly, students having higher CIS participated more frequently than the students who had less computer/internet self-efficacy. Judging by the odds ratio levels, the most influential predictor in predicting the outcome variable was the status of computer ownership with an odds ratio of 4.37. It was followed by department type with an odds ratio of 3.44, CIS with an odds ratio of 3.03, ML with an odds ratio of .39, and previous experience with an odds ratio of .14, respectively.

Table 5 presents the classification success rate of the model, which yielded an overall rate of 82.5%. As seen in the table, the model correctly predicted 93.5% of students' placement in the lower participation group, while it correctly predicted 56.6% of their placement in the higher participation group. To put it more concretely, as seen in Table 5, of 124 observations predicted by the model to be placement in the lower participation group, 116 occurred, so 116 were classified correctly; on the other hand, eight were misclassified. Likewise, of 53 observations predicted by the model to

be placement in the higher participation group, 23 were classified correctly; on the other hand, 30 were misclassified.

Table 5

The Observed and the Predicted Frequencies for being in Higher Participation Group or Lower Participation Group by Logistic Regression with the Cutoff of 0.50

			Predicted		
			Being in a higher or lower participation group		Percentage Correct
	Observed		Lower	Higher	
Step 1	Participation group	Lower participation group	116	8	93.5
		Higher participation group	23	30	56.6
	Overall Percentage				82.5

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

This study was conducted to find out students' OLR level and the predictors influencing their participation in online English courses. The outcome/dependent variable had two alternatives, namely the students could be either in the higher participation group or lower participation group. The independent variables/predictors the scores obtained from five sub-dimensions of an OLR scale, which were continuous variables and some characteristics of the students including their department type, previous experience in distance education, computer ownership and internet limit which were categorical variables having two levels. The findings are discussed in relation to the corresponding literature in the following paragraphs.

The findings concerning students' OLR indicated that the scores obtained from all sub-dimensions of OLR were above three, which can be interpreted as the average OLR level for these students. This result was supported by the studies of Cakir and Horzum (2015) and Alsancak-Sirakaya and Yurdugul (2016). Compared to the studies of Cigdem and Yildirim (2014) and Hung et al. (2010); however, the students in this study reported lower readiness levels in all sub-dimensions of the OLR scale. This finding may arise from the characteristics of these specific students. Further findings revealed that the highest readiness level was found in the OCS sub-dimension while the students had the least scores in the LC sub-dimension. This study partly supported the study of Hung et al. (2010), which indicated the least readiness in the LC dimension of online learning, while Cigdem and Yildirim (2014) pointed to least readiness in CIS level.

The results of binary logistic regression analysis, which was conducted to examine the predictors of students' participation in online English courses, indicated that department type, previous experience in online courses, computer ownership, the level of CIS and the level of ML were significant predictors influencing the frequency

of students' participation. On the other hand, internet limit, the level of SDL, LC and OCS were not significant variables. Although the internet was highlighted as the biggest challenge in online learning by Ozyurek et al. (2016) and Chung, Noor and Mathew (2020, it did not influence their participation frequency in this study. To this connection, it is possible to state that some variables were more influential in predicting their participation frequency.

Concerning the direction of the relationship, except for the variable "previous experience", which had a negative relationship with the outcome variable, there was a positive relationship between the outcome variable and the remaining significant variables. To illustrate, the students who experienced distance education before tended to participate less frequently than the students who did not. This finding was supported in the study conducted by Lim (2001), who found a positive relationship between learners' satisfaction with their Web-based distance education courses and their intent to participate in future Web-based courses. In this respect, it is possible to put forward the idea that these students were not satisfied with the previous online courses, so they decided not to participate in other courses. Likewise, the students having higher ML tended to participate less than the students who had less motivation. This finding is contradicted by the literature, which indicates that the higher motivation would bring about more participation (Kanuka & Nocente, 2003; Lim, 2004; Kaya, 2002; Kilinc & Yuzer, 2015; Pillay, Irving & Tones, 2007; Saadé, He & Kira, 2007; Smith et al., 2003; Smith, 2005; Stansfield, McLellan & Connolly, 2004; Watkins, Leigh & Triner, 2004). The explanation for this contradicting result can be attributed to other independent variables included in the analysis. To illustrate, the students who had a computer participated more frequently than the students who did not, and the students having higher CIS participated more frequently than the students who had less computer/internet self-efficacy. In this respect, it is possible to state that maybe the students having higher ML did not have a computer to use or they did not have sufficient computer/internet self-efficacy, which hindered their participation. Therefore, further research may focus on this issue to see whether the students having all these characteristics will participate as much as expected. Lastly, the students from the Department of Translation and Interpreting tended to participate more frequently than the other group of students, which might have resulted from characteristics of the different groups of students.

Implications for Practice

This study offers some implications for researchers, policymakers and educators. Based on the findings of this study, policymakers are suggested to examine and see whether the necessary conditions for an effective online learning are available before deciding on distance education. Otherwise, participation will cause problems, which in turn may result in low learning gains. As stated by Hrastinski (2009), we should increase learner participation if we want to enhance online learning.

This study indicated that many students did not have a computer and had low computer/internet self-efficacy, which influenced their participation in online English courses. Although higher motivation is suggested to bring about more participation in

literate, this study indicated an opposite finding, which might have resulted from these two predictors or others included in the analysis. Therefore, policymakers are suggested to take actions to solve this problem; if not, they should not insist on distance education. Similarly, the instructors are suggested to take this situation into account while planning an online course. In addition, actions should be taken to maximize students' participation.

Limitations of the Study and Implications for Further Research

Like most of the research studies, this study has some limitations that can be considered while planning future research about the issues examined in this research. The limitations and suggestions are presented in the following paragraphs.

First of all, the influence of nine predictors could be analyzed in this study because of the sample size adequacy suggested for logistic regression analysis, so future research can be conducted with larger sample sizes to include more predictors. Some independent variables were more influential than others, which might prevent or decrease the power of other predictors. Therefore, future studies can control these variables to see the influence of other variables utilizing hierarchical regression analysis.

This study compared the data collected from students from two departments; further research, in this respect, can focus on the comparison of different groups of students. Likewise, only the participation in online English courses was investigated, so future research can focus on participation in different courses to compare the results.

The findings also revealed that the students who experienced online courses before tended to participate less. Literature suggests a positive relationship between learners' satisfaction with online courses and their intent to participate in future online courses (e.g., Lim, 2001). Therefore, future research can focus on students' satisfaction with online courses and examine the relationship between their satisfaction and participation rate to compare the results. Lastly, future research can focus on the relationship between students' achievement and their participation frequency.

References

Ally, M. (2008). Foundations of educational theory for online learning. In T. Anderson & F. Elloumi, (2nd Ed). *Theory and Practice of Online Learning* (pp.15-44). Athabasca University: AU Press.

Alsancak-Sirakaya, D., & Yurdugul, H. (2016). Investigation of online learning readiness level of teacher candidates: The sample of Ahi Evran University. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD), 17*(1), 185-200.

Artino, A. R. (2009). Online learning: Are subjective perceptions of instructional context related to academic success? *Internet and Higher Education, 12,* 117-125.

Bates, A. W. (2005). *Technology, e-learning and distance education* (2nd ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bilgic, H. G., Dogan, D., & Seferoglu, S. S. (2011). Current situation of online learning in Turkish higher education institutions: needs, problems, and possible solutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, *1*(2), 80-87.

Broadbent, J., & Poon, W. L. (2015). Self-regulated learning strategies & academic achievement in online higher education learning environments: A systematic review. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *27*, 1-13.

Cakir, O., & Horzum, M. B. (2015). The examination of the readiness levels of teacher candidates for online learning in terms of various variables. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 11*(1), 1-15.

Celen, F. K., Celik, A., & Seferoglu, S. S. (2011). Yükseköğretimde çevrim-içi öğrenme: Sistemde yaşanan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Journal of European Education, 1*(1), 25-34.

Chang, S.C., & Tung, F.C. (2008). An empirical investigation of students' behavioral intentions to use the online learning course website. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(1), 71-83.

Chung, E., Noor, N. M., & Mathew, V. N. (2020). Are you ready? An assessment of online learning readiness among university students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *9*(1), 301–317.

Cigdem, H., & Yildirim, O. G. (2014). Effects of students' characteristics on online learning readiness: A vocational college example. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 15*(3),80-93.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. (6th Ed). London and New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

Compeau, D. R., & Higgins, C. A. (1995). Computer self-efficacy: development of a measure and initial test. *MIS Quarterly, 19*(2), 189–211.

Daniel, H. L., & Moore, D. M. (2000). Interaction of cognitive style and learner control in a hypermedia environment. *International Journal of Instructional Media, 27*(4), 369-382.

Demir-Kaymak, Z., & Horzum, M. B. (2013). Çevrimiçi öğrenme öğrencilerinin çevrimiçi öğrenmeye hazır bulunuşluk düzeyleri, algıladıkları yapı ve etkileşim arasındaki ilişki. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *13*(3), 1783-1797.

Duncan, K., Kenworthy, A. L., & McNamara, R. (2012). The effect of synchronous and asynchronous participation on students' performance in online accounting courses. *Accounting Education: An International Journal, 21*(4), 431-449.

Eastin, M. A., & LaRose, R. (2000). Internet self-efficacy and the psychology of the digital divide. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 6*(1). http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue1/eastin.html.

Eunjoo, O. (2006). *Current practices in blended instruction*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Knoxville: The University of Tennessee.

Fraenkel, J. R, Hyun, H.H., & Wallen, N.E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction.* (7th Ed). USA: Pearson Education Inc.

Galy, E., Downey, C., & Johnson, J. (2011). The effect of using E-learning tools in online and campus-based classrooms on student performance. *Journal of Information Technology Education, 10*, 209-230.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). USA: Pearson Education.

Horzum, M. B., Demir Kaymak, Z., & Güngören, Ö. C. (2015). Structural equation modeling towards online learning readiness. Academic motivations, and perceived learning. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *15*(3), 759-770.

Hrastinski, S. (2006). Introducing an informal synchronous medium in a distance learning course: How is participation affected. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *9*(2),117-131.

Hrastinski, S. (2009). A theory of online learning as online participation. *Computers & Education, 52*(1), 78-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.06.009

Hukle, D.R. L. (2009). *An evaluation of readiness factors for online education*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Mississippi: Mississippi State University.

Hung, M., Chou, C., Chen, C., & Own, Z. (2010). Learner readiness for online learning: Scale development and student perceptions. *Computers & Education*, *55*, 1080–1090. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.05.004

Ibrahim, D.Z, Silong, A.D., & Samah, B. A. (2002). Readiness and attitude towards online learning among virtual students. Paper presented at the meeting of the Asian Association of Open Universities, New Delhi.

Ilgaz, H. (2014). The problems of distance education students on synchronized learning applications and suggestions for solutions. *Educational Sciences and Practice*, *13*(26), 187-201.

Ilhan, M., & Cetin, B. (2013). Çevrimiçi öğrenmeye yönelik hazır bulunuşluk ölçeği'nin (ÇÖHBÖ) Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması [*The validity and reliability of the Turkish version of an online learning readiness scale*]. *Educational Technology Theory and Practice, 3*(2), 72-101.

Kanuka, H., & Nocente, N. (2003). Exploring the effects of personality type on perceived satisfaction with web-based Learning in continuing professional development. *Decision Education, 24*(2), 227-245.

Kaya, Z. (2002). *Uzaktan Eğitim [Distance Education].* Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Keegan, D. (2005). Reintegration of the teaching acts. In D. Keegan (Ed.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp. 100- 119). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kilinc, H., & Yuzer, T. V. (2015). Context aware ubiquitous learning milieus in distance learning. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 6*(3), 102-111.

Kruger-Ross, M. J., & Waters, R. D. (2013). Predicting online learning success: Applying the situational theory of publics to the virtual classroom. *Computers & Education, 61*, 176- 184.

Lim, C. K. (2001). Computer self-efficacy, academic self-concept, and other predictors of satisfaction and future participation of adult learners. *American Journal of Distance Education, 15*(2), 41-51. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923640109527083

Lim, D. H. (2004). Cross cultural differences in online learning motivation. *Educational Media International*, *41*(2), 163–173.

Lim, J., & Richardson, J. C. (2016). Exploring the effects of students' social networking experience on social presence and perceptions of using SNSs for educational purposes. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *29*, 31-39.

Lin, B., & Hsieh, C. T. (2001). Web-based teaching and learner control: A research review. *Computers & Education, 37*(4), 377–386.

Masters, K., & Oberprieler, G. (2004). Encouraging equitable online participation through curriculum articulation. *Computers & Education, 42*(4), 319−332. Doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2003.09.001

Mercado, C. A. (2008). Readiness assessment tool for an e-learning environment implementation. *Special Issue of the International Journal of the Computer, The Internet and Management*, 16. Retrieved from http://www.elearningap.com/eLAP2008/Proceedings/18_fullpaper_cecilia%20Mercado_Revised.pdf

Moftakhari, M. M. (2013). *Evaluating e-learning readiness of faculty of letters of Hacettepe* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2011). *The excellent online instructor: Strategies for professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pearson, J., & Trinidad, S. (2005). OLES: An instrument for refining the design of e-learning environments. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *21*(6), 396-404.

Pillay, H., Irving, K., & Tones, M. (2007). Validation of the diagnostic tool for assessing tertiary students' readiness for online learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *26*(2), 217-234. doi: 10.1080/07294360701310821

Oliver, R. G. (2001). *Assuring the quality of online learning in Australian higher education*. Proceedings of 2000 Moving Online Conference (pp. 222-231). Gold Coast, QLD: Norsearch Reprographics.

Ozyurek, A., Begde, Z., Yavuz-Ferah, N., & Ozkan, I. (2016). Evaluation of distance education applications from students' perspective. *Karabük University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 6*(2), 592-605.

Saadé, R. G., He, X., & Kira, D. (2007). Exploring dimensions to online learning. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23*(4), 1721–1739.

Smith, P. J. (2005). Learning preferences and readiness for online learning. *Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 3–12.

Smith, P. J., Murphy, K. L., & Mahoney, S. E. (2003). Towards identifying factors underlying readiness for online learning: an exploratory study. *Distance Education, 24*(1), 57–67.

Stansfield, M., McLellan, E., & Connolly, T. (2004). Enhancing student performance in online learning and traditional face-to-face class delivery. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 3, 173-188.

Sumer, M. (2016). Sanal derslere ilişkin öğrenci görüşlerinin incelenmesi [Investigation of learners' opinions registering virtual classes]. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *9*(3), 181- 200.

Sun, P.C., Tsai, R.C., Finger, G., Chen, Y.Y., & Yeh, D. (2008). What drives a successful e-learning? An empirical investigation of the critical factors influencing learner satisfaction. *Computers & Education*, 50, 1183-1202.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed)*.* USA:Pearson.

Todhunter, B. (2013). LOL -limitations of online learning- are we selling the open and distance education message short? *Distance Education*, *34*(2), 232-252.

Tsai, C. C., & Lin, C. C. (2004). Taiwanese adolescents' perceptions and attitudes regarding the Internet: exploring gender differences. *Adolescence, 39*, 725–734.

Tsai, M. J., & Tsai, C. C. (2003). Information searching strategies in web-based science learning: the role of Internet self-efficacy. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 40*(1), 43–50.

Tuncer, M., & Taspinar, M. (2008). Sanal ortamda eğitim ve öğretimin geleceği ve olası sorunlar [*The future of education and training in virtual environments and possible problems*]. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *10*(1), 125-144.

Usun, S. (2006). *Uzaktan eğitim [Distance education]*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Yurdugul, H., & Alsancak-Sirakaya, D. (2013). The scale of online learning readiness: A study of validity and reliability. *Education and Science*, *38*(169), 391–406.

Wang, A. Y., & Newlin, M. H. (2002). Predictors of web-student performance: The role of self-efficacy and reasons for taking an on-line class. *Computers in Human Behavior 18*(2), 151-163.

Wang, L. C. C., & Beasley, W. (2002). Effects of learner control and hypermedia preference on cyber-students' performance in a web-based learning environment. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, 11*(1), 71–91.

Warner, D., Christie, G., & Choy, S. (1998). *Readiness of VET clients for flexible delivery including online learning*. Brisbane: Australian National Training Authority.

Watkins, R., Leigh, D., & Triner, D. (2004). Assessing readiness for e-learning. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 17*(4), 66–79. doi: 10.1111/j.1937-8327.2004.tb00321.x

Öğrencilerin Çevrimiçi İngilizce Derslerine Katılımını Yordayan Faktörler

Atıf:

Özet

Problem Durumu: Bireylerin davranışlarında genel anlamda bir değişim süreci olarak tanımlanabilen öğrenme, insanların doğumu ile başlamıştır. İnsanlık tarihi boyunca çeşitli kavramlar, yaklaşımlar, modeller ve öğrenme teorileri ortaya çıkmıştır. Hepsinin farklı felsefi ve psikolojik duruşlara dayandığını ve birbiriyle çeliştiğini, desteklediğini ve tamamladığını söylemek mümkündür. Yaşamın her alanında teknolojinin gelişmesi ve ilerlemesi ile ve özellikle internetin yayılması nedeniyle, eğitim teknolojisi ile ilgili birçok kavram ortaya çıkmıştır ve bu da öğretim ve öğrenmede küresel ölçekte yeni yaklaşımların ortaya çıkmasına yol açmıştır. Uzaktan eğitim, internet tabanlı öğrenme, mobil öğrenme, çevrimiçi öğrenme vb. bu yaklaşımlara örnek olarak verilebilir. Çevrimiçi öğrenme bu yeniliklerden biridir ve bu gelişmeler sonucunda tüm dünyada eğitim alanında çok popüler olmuştur.

2019 yılı ikinci yarısında Çin'de ortaya çıkıp bütün dünyaya yayılan COVID-19 salgını, yüz yüze eğitimi kısıtladığı için, eğitim kurumlarının çoğu, eğitimde yakın geçmişte yüz yüze eğitime alternatif olarak veya örgün eğitimin tamamlayıcısı olarak kullanılan uzaktan eğitim yoluyla eğitimlerine devam etmek zorunda kalmıştır. Bu bağlamda, eğitimdeki mevcut tartışma artık bilgisayarların ve internetin öğrenme ve öğretme sürecinde kullanılması gerekip gerekmediği değil, bunun nasıl yapılacağı ve bu salgın nedeniyle bunların kullanımı yoluyla öğrenmenin nasıl kolaylaştırılacağı ve geliştirileceği ile ilgilidir. Bazı yazarlar tarafından önerildiği gibi, gerekli teknolojik ve pedagojik temellerin mevcut olması şartıyla çevrimiçi öğretim sağlanmalıdır. Ancak, Türkiye Yükseköğretim Kurumu, kaçınılmaz olarak ve zaman kaybetmeden, tüm yükseköğretim kurumlarına öğrencilerin çevrimiçi öğrenmeye her açıdan hazır olup olmadıklarını bilinmeden uzaktan öğretime geçiş onayı verdi. Ağrı İbrahim Çecen Üniversitesi'nde uzaktan eğitim için MOODLE ve Adobe Connect sistemleri kullanıldı. Ancak, 100 saatten fazla eşzamanlı ve eşzamansız İngilizce dersi sunan araştırmacı, öğrencilerin çevrimiçi derslere beklendiği kadar katılmadığını fark etti.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu çalışmada, çevrimiçi İngilizce derslerine katılım oranının yetersiz olmasının muhtemel nedenlerini bulmak amaçlanmıştır. Salgın birçok ölüme neden oldu, hayat almaya da devam ediyor ve ne zaman sona ereceği bilinmiyor. Bu nedenle, öğrencilerin belli özelliklerinden etkilenebilecek yetersiz katılımın

arkasındaki olası nedenlerin araştırılması, gelecekteki öğretim tasarım planlarına rehberlik edebilir. Bu bağlamda, aşağıdaki araştırma sorularına yanıtlar aranmıştır:

1. Öğrencilerin çevrimiçi öğrenmeye hazır olma düzeyi nedir?

2. Çevrimiçi İngilizce derslerine öğrenci katılım düzeyinin yordayıcıları nelerdir?

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu çalışmada, bazı öğrenci özelliklerinin ve çevrimiçi öğrenmeye hazır olma düzeylerinin, öğrencilerin eşzamanlı ve eşzamansız İngilizce derslerine katılımını ne kadar iyi yordadığını analiz etmek için korelasyonel bir araştırma deseni kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini Türkiye'deki bir devlet üniversitesinde Sivil Havacılık Meslek Yüksek Okulu ve Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü'nden seçilen 177 öğrenci oluşturmuştur.

Çalışmada yabancı bir yazar tarafından geliştirip Türkçe'ye uyarlaması yapılan bir çevrimiçi öğrenme hazır bulunuşluk ölçeği veri toplama aracı olarak kullanılmıştır. Bu ölçek beş maddelik Likert tipi bir ölçekte çevrimiçi öğrenmeye hazır bulunuşluğu ölçen 18 maddelik beş alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır (1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 2 = Katılmıyorum, 3 = Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum, 4 = Katılıyorum, 5 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum). İlk alt boyut olan bilgisayar/internet öz-yeterliği'nde üç madde, öz-yönelimli öğrenme alt boyutunda beş madde, öğrenci kontrolü alt boyutunda üç madde, öğrenme motivasyonu alt boyutunda dört madde ve son alt boyut olan çevrimiçi iletişim öz-yeterlik'te üç madde bulunmaktadır.

Veri toplama araç, ilişkileri incelemek için kullanılan öğrencilerin bazı demografik özellikleri hakkında bilgi arayan ek bir bölüm de içeren çevrimiçi bir form olarak uygulanmıştır. Bu ek bölümde, öğrencilerden yaşlarını, cinsiyetlerini, bölümlerini (Sivil Havacılık/Mütercim-Tercümanlık), sınıf seviyelerini (birinci sınıf/ikinci sınıf), çevrimiçi derslerle ilgili önceki deneyimlerini (evet/hayır), yaşam alanlarını (kırsal/kentsel), bilgisayarları olup olmadığını (evet/hayır), sahip oldukları internet sınırını (sınırsız/sınırlı), çevrimiçi kurslara katılırken kullandıkları araçları (bilgisayar/akıllı telefon) bildirmeleri istenmiştir. Ayrıca, çevrimiçi İngilizce derslerine katılım sıklıklarını beş puanlık Likert tipi ölçekte bildirmeleri istenmiştir (1 = Asla, 2 = Nadiren, 3 = Bazen, 4 = Sıklıkla, 5 = Her Zaman).

Verilerin analizinde SPSS 22 programı kullanıştır. Sonuçlar rapor edilirken, frekans, yüzde, ortalama ve standart sapma gibi betimleyici istatistik teknikleri kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca, değişkenler arası ilişkileri analiz etmek için lojistik regresyon analizi'nden faydalanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırma bulguları, en yüksek hazır bulunuşluk düzeyinin çevrimiçi iletişim öz-yeterlik alt boyutunda bulunduğunu ve bunu öğrenme motivasyonu, kendi kendine öğrenme, bilgisayar/internet öz-yeterliği ve öğrenci kontrolü alt boyutlarının takip ettiğini göstermiştir. Öğrencilerin çevrimiçi İngilizce derslerine katılımını yordayan faktörleri incelemek amacıyla sorulan ikinci araştırma sorusu ile ilgili betimleyici bulgular, gruplandırma kriterlerine göre 123 öğrenci (% 69,5) daha az katılım gösteren grupta yer alırken, 54 öğrenci (% 30,5) daha fazla katılım gösteren grupta yer almıştır. Lojistik regresyon analizi ile ilgili bulgular, bölüm türü, çevrimiçi derslerle ilgili önceki deneyim, bilgisayara sahip olup olmama, gibi

özellikler ile çevrimiçi öğrenme hazır bulunuşluk ölçeğinin bilgisayar/internet öz-yeterliği ve öğrenme motivasyonu gibi alt boyutlarının öğrencilerin katılım düzeyini etkileyen anlamlı değişkenler olduğunu göstermiştir. Öte yandan, internet limiti, kendi kendine öğrenme düzeyi, öğrenci kontrol düzeyi ve çevrimiçi iletişim öz-yeterlik düzeyi gibi değişkenlerin anlamlı değişkenler olmadığı görülmüştür.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Öneriler: Ölçeğin alt boyutlarında alınacak en yüksek puanın beş (5) olduğu düşünüldüğünde, araştırma bulgularından elde edilen üç (3) puan üzerindeki değerin öğrencilerin ortalamanın üstünde bir çevrimiçi öğrenme hazır bulunuşluğuna sahip olduğunu söylemek mümkündür. İnternet, alanyazında çevrimiçi öğrenmede en büyük zorluk olarak vurgulansa da, bu çalışmada katılım sıklığını etkilemedi. Bu bağlamda, bazı değişkenlerin katılım sıklığını yordamada daha etkili olduğunu belirtmek mümkündür. Lojistik regresyon analizi ile ilgili örneklem büyüklüğü varsayımı nedeniyle, sadece dokuz bağımsız değişken kullanıldı, bu nedenle ilerideki araştırmalar daha büyük örneklem büyüklüğüne sahip daha fazla yordayıcı değişken ile uygulanabilir. Benzer şekilde, araştırmanın önemli bir bulgusu öğrenme motivasyonu ile katılım arasında negatif bir ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Literatürde tam tersi bir durum vurgulansa da yine kullanılan bazı değişkenlerin daha güçlü yordayıcılar olduğu ileri sürülebilir. Örneğin, çalışma bulguları öğrencilerin büyük bir çoğunluğunun bir bilgisayara sahip olmadığını ve bilgisayar/internet özyeterlik düzeylerinin düşük olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bağlamda, öğrenme motivasyonu yüksek olup bilgisayarı olmayan ve bilgisayar/internet özyeterlik düzeyleri düşük olan katılımcıların daha az katılmak zorunda kaldıklarını söylemek mümkündür.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Uzaktan eğitim, lojistik regresyon, öğrenci katılımı, çevrimiçi öğrenme hazır bulunuşluğu

For this research, Ethical permission was taken from Scientific Research Ethics Committee of Agri Ibrahim Cecen University with decision numbered 114.