

# Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

**Similarity Found: 10%**

Date: Friday, October 19, 2018

Statistics: 487 words Plagiarized / 4763 Total words

Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

---

,.~ \_ ~ J\siaTEFV

ELT in Asia in the Digital Era: Global Citizenship and Identity Proceedings of the 15th Asia TEFL and 64th TEFLIN International Conference on English Language Teaching, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 13-15 July 2017

Students experience in developing teaching media through project based learning F. Megawati..... 543 CIRC-Based Interactive CD: designing an innovative media to teach reading N. Sofiana & H. Mubarok

554 Students' perception on the implementation of multiliteracies approach by using social media in teachers'professional development coursework A.Hapsari & M.Mukhlas ..... 564 Students' perception of machine translation application in enhancing English literacy of Tridinanti University R. Ilma

573 Integrating need analysis and social semiotics in developing multimodal texts for ESP reading materials D. T. Cahyaningati & L. A. Lestari..... 583 Challenging the difficulties: utilizing technological application in teaching ESP classes N. Krisdayanti & Evidoyanti ..... 594 Computer mediated recasts on the reports of engineering students with low consistency of the use past tensed verbs: a case study A.Muharikah, Y.S.

Waluyo, & E. Oktavianti..... 602 The implementation of ICT Training for pre-service teachers as the foundation skill in integrating technology in ELT lesson plan R. Farani.....609 Developing Web Blog-Based Direct Instruction Model in curriculum and materials development course: a needs analysis E. M. Rahayu, D. Rochmawati, & W.

Bandjarjani .....619 Students' interest and their critical thinking skill in learning English through Facebook group usage Irmawati & S. Sahriana..... 631 Promoting students' autonomy through the Indonesian massive open online course D. Ginting

## PROMOTING STUDENTS' AUTONOMY THROUGH THE INDONESIAN MASSIVE OPEN ONLINE COURSE

D. Ginting (daniel.ginting@machung.ac.id) Ma Chung University

Abstract: In Indonesia context, the use of technology in language classrooms is not new. However, not all teachers have integrated technology into their classrooms.

This paper is a preliminary study of the IMOOC pilot project (Indonesian Massive Open Online Course). Prior to the implementation of the IMOOC, the needs analysis was carried out through a survey in order to examine teachers' attitudes and opinions about the integration of technology into English classes.

Involving 80 English teachers across Indonesia, this study found 73% were familiar with numbers of applications; 45% had no objection to preparing gadgets with internet connections; 76% mentioned their institutions concerned the use of technology for learning; 70% agreed integrating technology into classroom promotes a better teaching quality. The IMOOC recommended Canvas as a reliable web platform in response to teachers' existing problems.

This digital tool enabled teachers to achieve students' learning autonomy: providing collaborative work, exposing education channels for student self-study, and encouraging peer review activities. The majority of the IMOOC participants reported they had the sense of connectedness; both content and activities in the IMOOC encouraged them to learn; the instructor provided good feedback to and various kinds of learning activities that stimulated favorable learning environment.

Keywords: The IMOOC, technology, collaborative, Massive Open Online Course

INTRODUCTION The emergence of MOOC took place in 2008 and only around 2012 MOOC became popular. Several institutions joining in a collaborative work with universities became the supporters and later provided MOOC services such as Coursera, Udacity, Future Learn, Udemy, and edX (Gaebel, 2014).

A Massive Open Online Course is one of the alternative learning media that is open to anyone who intend to extend their knowledge or train skills through online instructions. Financial problems or limited access to formal learning made a lot of people difficult to continue their education

(McAuley., Stewart., Siemens, & Cormier, 2010 ; Gaebel, 2014). Rooted in a distant learning tradition, a MOOC was commonly available to those who were eager to learn.

In short, anyone can follow the MOOC program, provided they access to electronic equipment such as laptops, tablets and the internet. In Indonesia, some agencies have tried to initiate MOOC (Pantow, 2014). Some groups of individuals formed a face to face community for the consolidation of MOOC programs (Firmansyah, 2015).

Nevertheless, this online program is still not popular in Indonesia. The MOOC remains new to most English practitioners and educators. Developed by lecturers from various state and private universities in Indonesia, the IMOOC stands for **the Indonesian Massive Open Online** Course, the IMOOC aims to reach pre- **and in-service English teachers** to learn about how to integrate technology for teaching and learning English in the classroom.

This paper is a description of **the implementation of the** IMOOC pilot project after it has been implemented for two months- from February to April 2017. **METHOD** This is a preliminary study of the IMOOC which stands for **Indonesian Massive Open Online Course**. The participants using student accounts in Canvas were required to be autonomous.

They had to fulfill their obligations including understanding instructional inputs (reading text and watching movies) and doing tasks (following discussions, working on multiple choice, working on projects) on schedule without being constantly reminded. All IMOOC activities had been scheduled prior to the implementation. To monitor their tasks, the participants had to check the calendar on Canvas.

To follow the IMOOC program well, they were required to study for 11 weeks, starting from February 20, 2017 until April 29, 2017. This study used survey to collect the data. An online survey (monkeysurvey) was conducted twice. The first began from 27 January 2017 to 6 February 2017 whose purpose was to look into teachers 'views on their experiences of using technology for teaching and learning. The second was conducted from April 15, 2017 to April 18, 2017. The second survey aimed to investigate the participants' views after taking the IMOOC program.

**FINDINGS** This paper presents three aspects of the IMOOC: the pre-IMOOC (survey of teachers' view on technology for teaching-learning), **the implementation of the** IMOOC (Promoting Students' Autonomy through the IMOOC), and the post-IMOOC (the evaluation of the program).

The Pre-IMOOC: Survey on Teachers' Familiarity with the Technology for Teaching and Learning Prior to the implementation of the IMOOC, the writer conducted an online survey. The first survey conducted from 27 January 2017 to 6 February 2017 aimed to explore teachers' opinions on the use of technology in the classroom.

By involving about 58 respondents, the results of the survey are shown in Table 2. Table 1. Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Technology in the Classrooms

No Questions Agree Neither agree or disagree \_Disagree Total

?? ?? % ?? % ?? % ?? % 1 Integrating technology into 42 72 14 24 2 4 58 100 classrooms promotes a better teaching quality than that without technology 2 My institution supports the use of 45 78 11 19 2 4 58 100 technology for learning.

3 Teaching students online is more 8 14 39 67 11 19 58 100 superior than teaching students in a face to face meeting 4 I am quite familiar with numbers of 40 69 0 0 18 31 58 100 applications for teaching and learning 5 Students have no objections to 27 47 22 39 8 14 58 100 preparing gadgets with internet connection for learning 6 I have no problem with financial 34 60 17 30 6 11 58 100 issues to provide electronic gadgets for learning Most teachers (72%) were confident that integrating technology into the classroom would improve the quality of their teaching.

They believed visual and audio effects from the technology could increase students' learning motivation. These features suited their students' preference for learning such as visual, audio and or the combination of visual and audio inputs. As their teaching inputs were able to stimulate students' learning interests, this favorable situation facilitates helped the teachers achieve their learning objectives more effectively. A lot of teacher also mentioned that technology helped them get material from various different kinds of sources.

One of the factors strengthening teachers' belief in the benefits of technology was due to the supports from their respective workplace (see question 2 Table 1). The majority (78%) mentioned their schools strongly agreed with the use of technology for learning. To some extent, this condition was due to the fact that most institutions approved of the mandates from the Indonesian government.

As explicitly stated in the National Strategic Plan of the Ministry of National Education 2005-2009,



the government of Indonesia recommended schools to make use of ICT since it supported **the three pillars of** national education policy, namely: (1) expansion and equity of access; (2) improvement of quality, relevance and competitiveness; And (3) strengthening governance, accountability and public image of education, to realize quality, accountable, low-cost, equitable and affordable education of the masses. While the teachers had a positive view of technology for education, this did not mean the online teaching was more superior to a traditional teaching (face to face meeting) (see question 3 Table 1). 67% of them viewed nothing superior was found between the online teaching and the conventional teaching.

Even, the other 19% disagreed that online teaching was superior to the teaching conventional. When asked what types of application they used in the classrooms, teachers had different opinions (see question 4 Table 1). The majority (69%) mentioned they were familiar with some conventional technologies or applications such as social media (see Table 3) such as Edmodo (33%), Socrative (16%), Youtube (12%), Google doc (12%), Power Point (11 %) and others.

However, other teachers (31%) mentioned they were not very familiar with technology for classroom teaching. Table 2. Applications Teachers used in the Classrooms

Name of Application	%
Edmodo	33
Socrative	16
Youtube	12
Google Doc	12
Power Point	11
Facebook	3
Google Drive	2
APA generator	3
Whatsapp	2
Prezi	3
Others	1
Total	73

When asked about the ability of students and teachers about financial support (facility provision), not a few of the teachers were still pessimistic.

Despite the fact that the majority (47%) had an optimistic view about the facility supports (see question 5 in Table 1), many still regarded it as a problematic issue. About 39% neither disagreed nor agreed with the facility supports, with the rest of 14% showing their pessimistic opinions. According to these groups of teachers, many students could not afford to

buy electronic equipment because the price was quite expensive.

Even in some areas, they had difficulties with internet connections. Moreover, not all of the teachers had the same opinions regarding financial supports for the implementation of technology for teaching. Based on question 6 in Table 1, 60% of them mentioned that they had no difficulty with the purchase of gadgets and internet facilities.

However, the rest considered financial support was still a big issue, and that was not easy to implement. The first group (30%) was hesitant about the issue of financial support and the second group (11%) considered financial support a serious problem. These finding implied teachers **did not have the** same degree of commitment to support the provision of the gadget equipment for teaching and learning.

The Whilst-IMOOC: Promoting Students' Autonomy through the IMOOC Developing Clear Teaching Objectives The instructional objective of the IMOOC was to build learners' autonomy in mastering **the use of technology for** teaching and learning. This general objective was then specified into several sub-competences into five modules: Autonomous Learning (Module One), Digital Literacy (Module Two), Mobile Devices for Autonomous Teaching and Learning (module Three), Autonomous Learning Using Videos (Module Four), and Autonomy for Video Creation (Module Five).

Module One had two objectives. By the end of Module One, the participants were able to understand autonomous learning as a learning approach and practice using some applications (digital tools) to support the English learning process. The objectives of Module Two, Digital Literacy, were as follows.

After completing the module, the participants would be able to: critically highlight the most important aspects of Internet and technology integration in a language classroom, list the most relevant digital contents/apps that you can use in your classroom context, critically evaluate websites and select content for **English language teaching and learning**, determine web content that is relevant to the context of **English language teaching and learning**, and critically evaluate digital apps (e.g.

Rubistar, Canva) for the purpose of language teaching and learning using technology. Module Three, Mobile Devices for Autonomous Teaching and Learning, had the following objectives: understand the ways of using relevant mobile device applications in language teaching and learning activities, understand the possible obstacles in using mobile device applications in language teaching and learning activities, evaluate mobile device applications based on certain criteria of useful mobile device applications for language learning and teaching.

In so doing, you not only make your language classes effective, but more importantly also promote

your students' autonomous learning attitudes especially through the aid of relevant mobile app technology, and create a lesson plan using one of the mobile devices introduced in the module. Module Four, Autonomous Learning Using Video, has the following objectives: Upon completing this module, you will be able to do the following: understand the advantages of using videos in the classrooms, select relevant videos for language teaching activities, and create tasks using videos to build students' autonomy.

Module Five, Autonomy for Video Creation, has the objectives such as produce a useful storyboard for your video creation, create a video based on your storyboard by using a smartphone application, and plan a lesson which integrates video creation i.e. where students are required to create a video. Organizing the Modules Using **the role of teachers** at Canvas as the Learning Management System (LMS), the writer as the IMOOC instructor designed the instructional models (films and readings), developed assessment (multiple choice, discussion, and projects), assign the participants to do peer review tasks) and conduct assessments (see Table 3).

The program has five modules, and the entire module has the following number of activities: reading the webpage (35%), participating in the discussions (20%), watching movies (17%), conducting the projects (14%), doing peer Review (8%) and completing the multiple choice (6%) (see Table 3). Table 3. The Modules, Teaching Instructions and Tasks in the IMOOC

Name of the Module\_Theme



Module One Module Two Module Three \_Introduction & Autonomous Learning  
Digital Literacy Mobile Devices for Autonomous Teaching and \_4 0 1 5 1 2 13 (18%) 6 2  
2 4 1 2 17 (24%) 6 5 1 3 1 2 18 (25%)

Module Learning Promotion 5 4 0 2 1 1 13 The Four Modules of Autonomous Learning Using Videos 4 1 0 0 2 3 (18%) 10 The Five Modules Through Video (14%) Creation TOTAL 25 12 4 14 6 10 71 (35%) (17%) (6%) (20%) (8%) (14%) (100%) Scheduling Teaching Instructions All activities in the IMOOC modules have been scheduled prior to its implementation.

Scheduling tasks in the IMOOC means that all activities at IMOOC had the due dates for the participant to pay attention. This information was intended to help them to complete them on time. To check the due submissions of the tasks, the participants could check either in the calendar (see Figure 1) or web pages of the modules (see Figure 2).

Figure 1. The Calendar of the Tasks in the



Figure 2. A Web Page in the Module Learning through Collaboration All modules in the IMOOC program were provided with the tasks for participants to collaborate in achieving the learning objectives. During the collaborative work, the participants shared ideas, provided feedback and evaluated the work of other participants.

There were at least two ways how such collaboration was implemented in the IMOOC: discussions (see Figure 3) and peer reviews (see Figure 4 & 5). Discussion was one of the IMOOC's online forums where participants were required to answer and give their views on the prompt in each module. Before answering or sharing their views, the participants had to read the discussion materials. These could be in the form of texts or films.

To increase their motivation in learning, the instructor scored their performance from 0-5. Score 0 was given, if the participants did not put any postings. Score 1-3 were given to them if they posted their comments. The participants were given score 4-5, if they gave very good comments or ideas to the prompts.

\_ Figure 3. Collaboration through a Discussion In addition to the discussion, the collaboration was built through peer review activities.

Unlike discussions, in the peer review the participants are specifically required to provide feedback or even an assessment of the work of other participants. The project can be in the form of making movies, designing lesson plan and so forth. In practice, there are at least three to four participants who give feedback to the work of other participants.

To motivate this peer review activity, the instructor also applied an assessment of the peer review conducted by the participants. \_ Figure 4. Collaborative Works through Peer Review

Figure 5. Students' Feedback in Peer Review Assessments Several assessments were employed to measure participants' knowledge and skills during the IMOOC program such as discussions, peer reviews, multiple choice tests, and project based assessments.

All of students' work were recorded in Canvas, this made easy for the instructor to monitor the progress of the participants. Below is the result of the analysis of participants' performance in the IMOOC after taking the course for about two months (see Table 4). Table 4. Group Performance of the IMOOC

Category	Freq.
High Achievers (67-98)	21
Medium Achievers (34-66)	6
Low Achievers (0-33)	10
TOTAL	37

% 1 High Achievers (67-98) 21 57 2 Medium Achievers (34-66) 6 16 3 Low Achievers (0-33) 10 27 TOTAL 37 100 The majority (57%) has shown excellent performance. Unlike the majority, the medium achievers were still struggling for the content of the IMOOC. The low achievers were totally left behind due to the fact that they decided not to join the IMOOC at the early stage of the program.

When asked why they did not join the IMOOC, they said they were very busy with

their activities at their own campus. Some others did not give any replies even after being contacted several times. The Post-IMOOC: The Reflection of the Teaching of Autonomous Learning in the IMOOC This section is an evaluation of the IMOOC program given by the participants after attending the IMOOC for about two months.

The relevance of the IMOOC program, the learning process and the quality of instruction of the IMOOC instructor are among aspects eighteen participants assessed through an online survey. The survey was conducted from May 15- 16 April 2017. Empowering Knowledge The majority of IMOOC participants (89%) agreed the IMOOC program had successfully improved their teaching and knowledge skills.

11% has a neutral answer, and none disagreed with the statement. This finding implied most participants had positive perception on the IMOOC. 100 80 60 40 20

0 Agree Neither agree nor disagree \_ Disagree

a Diagram 1. Relevancy of the IMOOC with t ent. None disagreed with the statement. This finding implied that the technology for autonomy the IMOOC concerned had suited the needs of the participants.

70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 Agree Neither agree nor disagree \_ Disagree

Diagram 2. The Teaching Instructions of the IMOOC



The participants were also asked about which activity they found the most relevant in the IMOOC to improve their knowledge and skills of using technology in the classroom.

The majority (61%) chose working on the project, 28% participating in the discussion, 6% reading the articles, 6% working on the multiple choice tests. Nobody chose watching movies.

70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 Reading materials \_ Watching movies \_ Participating in discussions \_ Completing multiple choice tests \_ Working on the project

Diagram 3.

Types of Activities in the IMOOC Collaborative Work Subsequently, the participants were asked if they felt comfortable when they were asked to exchange ideas or give feedback to other people's ideas during the discussion process. 67% said they felt comfortable collaborating with their colleagues during the discussion process. While only 28% were neutral and only 6% disagreed with the statement. 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Diagram 4.

Collaborative Work during the Discussions

When asked if IMOOC participants were cooperative when they conducted a peer review process, most 61% agreed with the opinion. 39% chose a neutral view. This finding implied most IMOOC participants had a positive perception towards peer review activities. 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Diagram 5.

Collaborative Work during the Peer Review Teaching Instructions The next question was related to the teaching instructions (see Diagram 6). The participants were asked whether he was capable of delivering the material in an organized manner. Most 78% said IMOOC material was very well organized. It made them easier to learn new topics. Only 22% were neutral about the question. 80 60 40 20 0 Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Diagram 6.

The Organization of the Instructions Next, the participants were asked if the instructor provided good feedback to them during the discussion and assessment of the project (see Diagram 7). Most 72% said they enjoyed learning with the instructor. 25% chose a neutral position. Only 6% did not agree with such an opinion. This finding implied most participants viewed the instructor's feedback was very useful for them to guide their learning.

80 60 40 20 0 Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Diagram 7. The Quality of Feedback from the Instructor When asked if the instructor was able to create a favorable, about 56% mentioned they enjoyed learning under the instructor guidance. For them, the instructor was quite helpful with the information they needed during the IMOOC.

Moreover, the instructor was very cooperative especially when they asked questions or shared their problems via email or sms (see Diagram 8). About 33% took a neutral answer to that question. Only 11% disagreed with the statement. 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 Diagram 8. The Instructor's Teaching Ability Diagram 8.

The Instructor's Teaching Ability The result of the evaluation results of IMOO implementation is summarized in the table 5 below. Table 5. The Summary of the Evaluation of the IMOOC

No Questions Agree Neither agree or disagree \_Disagree Total

? ? ?? % ? ?? % ? ?? % ? ?? %

1 The IMOOC improved my teaching skill and knowledge about integrating technology  
\_16 89 2 11 - - 18 100



\_into classrooms.

2 The teaching instructions were relevant to my needs to become professional teachers. 3 I had no fear to exchange ideas with the members. 4 The members were cooperative to do peer review. 5 The members gave good feedback during discussions. 6 The instructor gave good feedback to my work.

7 The instructor created favorable learning atmosphere. DISCUSSION This study found participants considered the IMOOC successful at building their capacity in mastering knowledge about integrating technology into language classrooms.

Some authors said the obvious benchmark for such a successful implementation of the MOOC relied heavily on the extent to which the program has been able to realize a conducive learning community, commonly called a community of inquiry (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2001). At the practical level, this community was closely related to three interrelated aspects of teaching presence, social presence and cognitive presence (Garrison & Anderson, 2003; Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2001; Gunawardena, Lowe, & Anderson, 1997). Learning from the IMOOC, the three aspects above were present together.

That the participants felt comfortable to learn and interact with each other has proved the availability of social presence in the IMOOC community. This emotional connectivity made them willing to share knowledge without fear or reluctance to the instructor or other members. At the same time, this strong emotional connection also strengthened their cognitive abilities. They learnt new knowledge and helped each other with new information.

On the other hand, the presence of the instructor was also crucial. Shea (2010) mentioned the importance of instructors' contributions and raise additional questions about the relation of social presence to learning. When the online instructor was leading, students tended to follow.

Higher levels of teaching (and social) presence on the part of the instructor tend to lead to higher levels of social presence from the students. When the instructor did not take on this role, the students did not have an educational orchestrator and their corresponding level of presence diminished.

CONCLUSION The success of a MOOC heavily depends on how much a community of inquiry is built by the online community members.

This objective will be achieved if social presence, teaching presence and cognitive presence exist. When access to formal education and higher education costs are likely to narrow the opportunities for people to learn and develop themselves, MOOCs are the best choice for them.

However, technical aspects such as the availability of equipment (laptops, electronic gadgets, and internet connections) are also worth noting to support the MOOC.

REFERENCES Firmansyah, M. (2015, September). Idcourserians, a MOOCs learning community in Indonesia. In Proceedings of Teaching and Education Conferences (No. 2905299). International Institute of Social and Economic Sciences. McAuley, A., Stewart, B., Siemens, G., & Cormier, D. (2010). The MOOC model for digital practice.

Pantow, J. B. (2014). A survey on the MOOC English course at University Terbuka.

Advancing Open and Distance Learning: Research and Practices, 871. Garrison, D. R.,

Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment:

Computer conferencing in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education*, 11(2), 1–14.

doi:10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6 Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2001).

Critical thinking, cognitive presence, and computer conferencing in distance education.

*The American Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 7–23. Garrison, D.R., & Anderson, T.

(2003). *E-learning in 21st century: A framework for research and practice*. London:

Routledge Falmer. Gunawardena, C. N., Lowe, C. E., & Anderson, T. (1997).

Analysis of a global online debate and the development of an interaction analysis model for examining social construction of knowledge in computer conferencing. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 17(4), 397–431. Gaebel, M. (2014). MOOCs: Massive open online courses. EUA. Shea, P., Hayes, S., Vickers, J., Gozza-Cohen, M., Uzuner, S.,

Mehta, R., & Rangan, P. (2010). A re-examination of the community of inquiry

framework: Social network and content analysis.

The *Internet and Higher Education*, 13(1), 10-21.

INTERNET SOURCES:

5% -

<http://asiatefl2017.uny.ac.id/sites/asiatefl2017.uny.ac.id/files/Unedited%20Volume%20Proceedings%281%29.pdf>

<1% -  
<https://citejournal.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/v7i4languagearts1.pdf>  
<1% - <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/il.doc>  
<1% - <https://es.scribd.com/doc/211003258/Proceedings-Moocs-Summit-2014>  
<1% - [https://issuu.com/waveprint/docs/woodhouse\\_college\\_prospectus\\_2018](https://issuu.com/waveprint/docs/woodhouse_college_prospectus_2018)  
<1% -  
[http://www.academia.edu/7094788/Investigating\\_the\\_Information\\_Technology\\_Courses\\_for\\_Pre-service\\_and\\_In-service\\_English\\_Teachers\\_in\\_Hong\\_Kong](http://www.academia.edu/7094788/Investigating_the_Information_Technology_Courses_for_Pre-service_and_In-service_English_Teachers_in_Hong_Kong)  
<1% - <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3012589>  
<1% -  
<https://www.scribd.com/document/382207519/FINAL-EBOOK-ESP-2018-MADE-BY-BATCH-2014-2015>  
<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1936657416301327>  
<1% - <http://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/12/3/3042/htm>  
<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812014164>  
<1% - <https://issuu.com/theparliamentarian/docs/theparliamentarian2017issueonefinal>  
<1% - <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19415257.2015.1114507>  
<1% - [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Private\\_school](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Private_school)  
<1% - <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/docs/HRI.CORE.IDN.2010.doc>  
<1% - [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ICT\\_for\\_Development](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ICT_for_Development)  
<1% - [http://www.sgi-network.org/docs/2018/thematic/SGI2018\\_Implementation.pdf](http://www.sgi-network.org/docs/2018/thematic/SGI2018_Implementation.pdf)  
<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652606000941>  
<1% -  
<https://www.edge.org/responses/how-is-the-internet-changing-the-way-you-think>  
<1% -  
[https://www.researchgate.net/journal/1052-5629\\_Journal\\_of\\_Management\\_Education](https://www.researchgate.net/journal/1052-5629_Journal_of_Management_Education)  
<1% -  
[http://www.academia.edu/8883599/Teaching\\_English\\_in\\_Digital\\_Times\\_Suggested\\_Workshop\\_Materials](http://www.academia.edu/8883599/Teaching_English_in_Digital_Times_Suggested_Workshop_Materials)  
<1% - <https://pt.scribd.com/document/354392294/Teaching-in-a-Digital-Age>  
<1% -  
<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/111001/chapters/Setting-Objectives-and-Providing-Feedback.aspx>  
<1% - <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11423-015-9421-6>  
<1% - [https://issuu.com/edensecretariat/docs/annual\\_2014\\_zagreb\\_boa](https://issuu.com/edensecretariat/docs/annual_2014_zagreb_boa)  
<1% - <https://www.yelp.com/biz/international-martial-art-center-buena-park>  
1% -  
<https://www.scribd.com/document/126187822/Employability-Education-Ipsos-MORI-pdf>  
f

<1% -

<https://www.webanywhere.co.uk/blog/2016/02/top-6-benefits-technology-classroom/>

<1% -

[http://www.academia.edu/30025043/Higher\\_Education\\_Academy\\_Research\\_Impact\\_Evaluation\\_2016](http://www.academia.edu/30025043/Higher_Education_Academy_Research_Impact_Evaluation_2016)

<1% -

<https://www.scribd.com/document/282879347/Employee-Satisfaction-Survey-at-Hindalco-Muri-Works>

<1% - <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0198742917704647>

<1% - [https://issuu.com/world.bank.publications/docs/9781464807794\\_25e98f95ee237d](https://issuu.com/world.bank.publications/docs/9781464807794_25e98f95ee237d)

<1% - <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40889-016-0022-y>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287234577\\_Using\\_the\\_Community\\_of\\_Inquiry\\_Framework\\_to\\_Inform\\_Effective\\_Instructional\\_Design](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287234577_Using_the_Community_of_Inquiry_Framework_to_Inform_Effective_Instructional_Design)

<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK310550/>

<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4579762/>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1096751609000682>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1096751610000278>

<1% - [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Village\\_pump\\_\(idea\\_lab\)/Archive\\_22](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Village_pump_(idea_lab)/Archive_22)

<1% - <https://coi.athabascau.ca/publications/coi-papers/>

<1% - <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2372732216630328>

<1% - <https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/article/view/1175>

<1% - <https://polipapers.upv.es/index.php/eurocall/article/view/4562>

<1% - <http://www.sciepub.com/reference/97074>

<1% - <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/924/1855>

<1% - <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.2304/elea.2014.11.1.19>