

## Comparative Study of Synchronous VS Asynchronous Distance Learning

Herdi<sup>1</sup>, Ziad Khalil<sup>2</sup>, Nadine Mansour<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al-Washliyah Medan, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> University of Saint Joseph, Lebanon

<sup>3</sup> University of Balamand, Lebanon

---

### Corresponding Author:

Herdi,

Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al-Washliyah Medan, Indonesia

Jl. Garu II A, Harjosari I, Kec. Medan Amplas, Kota Medan, Sumatera Utara 20147

Email: [herdiramon@gmail.com](mailto:herdiramon@gmail.com)

### Article Info

Received: April 7, 2025

Revised: April 10, 2025

Accepted: April 17, 2025

Online Version: April 17, 2025

### Abstract

The evolution of distance learning has led to the widespread adoption of synchronous and asynchronous learning models, each offering unique advantages and challenges for students and educators. Synchronous learning provides real-time interaction, fostering immediate feedback and engagement, while asynchronous learning offers flexibility, enabling students to learn at their own pace. Understanding the effectiveness of these two models is essential for optimizing digital education strategies in higher education. This study aims to compare the impact of synchronous and asynchronous learning on student engagement, knowledge retention, and academic performance. A mixed-methods research design was employed, integrating quantitative analysis of student achievement data with qualitative insights from learner surveys and instructor interviews. Findings indicate that synchronous learning enhances real-time engagement and collaboration, whereas asynchronous learning promotes independent learning and accommodates diverse schedules. Statistical analysis reveals that both models contribute to academic success, but their effectiveness varies based on learner preferences, course design, and technological access. The study concludes that a blended approach, combining synchronous and asynchronous elements, may offer the most effective learning experience. Future research should explore long-term outcomes and best practices for integrating both models in diverse educational contexts.

**Keywords:** Asynchronous Learning, Distance Education, Online Learning



© 2025 by the author(s)

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

---

Journal Homepage

<https://ejournal.staialhikmahpariangan.ac.id/Journal/index.php/JIET>

How to cite:

Herdi, Herdi., Khalil, Z & Mansour, N. (2025). Comparative Study of Synchronous VS Asynchronous Distance Learnin. *Journal International Inspire Education Technology*, 4(1), 136–147. <https://doi.org/10.55849/jiiet.v4i1.795>

Published by:

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Al-Hikmah Pariangan Batusangkar

---

## INTRODUCTION

The advancement of digital technology has transformed education, making distance learning an essential component of modern academic instruction (Dunagan & Larson, 2021; Saeed dkk., 2024). The flexibility and accessibility of online learning environments have enabled students from diverse backgrounds to pursue education beyond geographical and time constraints. Synchronous and asynchronous learning models have emerged as two dominant approaches in distance education, each offering distinct benefits and limitations. Synchronous learning, which occurs in real time, fosters direct interaction between students and instructors, promoting collaborative discussions and immediate feedback. Asynchronous learning, on the other hand, allows students to access course materials and complete assignments at their own pace, providing greater flexibility for learners with varied schedules and learning preferences. The choice between these two models significantly impacts student engagement, knowledge retention, and overall learning outcomes.

The shift toward online education, particularly following the global transition during the COVID-19 pandemic, has accelerated the adoption of synchronous and asynchronous learning formats. Educational institutions have implemented various digital learning strategies to accommodate different student needs, yet there remains considerable debate regarding which approach yields better academic outcomes (Hernández & Amado-Salvatierra, 2018; Saul dkk., 2022). While some researchers argue that synchronous learning fosters a sense of community and immediate instructor support, others highlight that asynchronous learning enables deeper cognitive processing and self-directed learning. The increasing reliance on digital education necessitates a comparative analysis of these two instructional models to determine their effectiveness in enhancing student success.

The effectiveness of distance learning depends on multiple factors, including course design, technological infrastructure, and student motivation (Saul dkk., 2022; Singh & Pandey, 2019). Understanding how synchronous and asynchronous learning impact different aspects of student engagement, knowledge retention, and academic performance is crucial for optimizing digital education strategies. Instructors and policymakers must evaluate these models to develop instructional frameworks that maximize learning efficiency while addressing the diverse needs of students. Despite the growing body of research on distance learning, there is still a need for empirical evidence comparing the effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous learning models across various disciplines and learning environments.

The primary issue this study seeks to address is the comparative efficacy of synchronous and asynchronous learning in distance education (Hernández & Amado-Salvatierra, 2018; Saul dkk., 2022). While both models offer unique advantages, there is limited research that directly contrasts their impact on student engagement, academic achievement, and long-term learning outcomes. Many institutions implement online learning strategies without fully understanding how synchronous and asynchronous elements influence student success. The challenge lies in identifying the specific conditions under which each model is most effective, particularly for different learning styles, course structures, and subject areas. Evaluating these differences will provide valuable insights into optimizing instructional design for distance education.

One of the key concerns in distance learning is maintaining student engagement and motivation. Synchronous learning provides opportunities for real-time discussions, peer interaction, and instructor feedback, which can enhance student participation (Dai dkk., 2021; Zhang dkk., 2019). However, time zone differences, work commitments, and personal

obligations often prevent students from attending live sessions. Asynchronous learning addresses these challenges by allowing students to access learning materials at their convenience, but it may lead to feelings of isolation and reduced accountability. Understanding how these models influence engagement and motivation is essential for designing online courses that promote active learning.

Another critical issue is the impact of synchronous and asynchronous learning on knowledge retention and academic performance. Some studies suggest that synchronous learning enhances immediate comprehension and collaborative problem-solving, while others indicate that asynchronous learning fosters long-term retention by allowing students to review content at their own pace (Chen Q. & Li J., 2021; Hamiz dkk., 2018). The effectiveness of each model may also vary based on factors such as subject matter complexity, cognitive load, and learner autonomy. This study aims to examine these variables to determine the optimal conditions for implementing synchronous and asynchronous learning in higher education.

This study aims to compare the effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous learning models in distance education by analyzing their impact on student engagement, knowledge retention, and academic performance. The research seeks to identify the strengths and limitations of each model and provide empirical evidence to guide instructional design decisions (Liu dkk., 2024; van der Stappen & Baartman, 2019). By examining student performance metrics, learner feedback, and instructor observations, this study will offer a comprehensive evaluation of how these two learning modalities influence educational outcomes. Findings from this study will contribute to the development of best practices for implementing effective distance learning strategies in higher education.

A central objective of this research is to establish a framework for assessing the impact of synchronous and asynchronous learning on different student populations. Higher education institutions serve diverse learners, including full-time students, working professionals, and international students, each with unique learning preferences and constraints (Fessl dkk., 2018; Nutalapati dkk., 2024). This study will analyze how these factors influence the effectiveness of each learning model, providing insights into designing more inclusive and adaptable online education systems. Understanding these dynamics will help educators tailor instructional strategies to meet the needs of a broad range of learners.

Another goal of this study is to explore the role of instructional design in maximizing the benefits of synchronous and asynchronous learning (Azevedo dkk., 2024; Quijano-Cabezas dkk., 2024). Effective course design plays a critical role in determining student engagement and comprehension in online learning environments. This study will examine how factors such as real-time interaction, multimedia integration, assessment strategies, and technological tools contribute to student success. Findings will inform best practices for structuring online courses to optimize learning experiences across different disciplines and educational settings.

Existing research on distance learning has primarily focused on the benefits and challenges of online education rather than conducting direct comparisons between synchronous and asynchronous learning. While many studies emphasize the flexibility and accessibility of online learning, fewer have examined the distinct pedagogical implications of each model. Research on student engagement and academic performance often fails to account for the varying effects of real-time versus self-paced instruction (Cristea dkk., 2018; Raj dkk., 2021). This study seeks to bridge these gaps by conducting a comparative analysis that provides empirical evidence on the effectiveness of both learning models.

The absence of standardized evaluation criteria for synchronous and asynchronous learning presents another gap in existing research. Many institutions adopt online learning models based on logistical convenience rather than pedagogical efficacy. Understanding the specific conditions under which each model is most effective will help educators make data-driven decisions about course design (Cristea dkk., 2018; Geetha dkk., 2025). This study will contribute to the field by developing an assessment framework that measures the impact of synchronous and asynchronous learning on student engagement, retention, and academic achievement.

The role of technology in shaping the effectiveness of distance learning remains underexplored in current research (Altaieb dkk., 2023; Xi dkk., 2018). While synchronous learning relies on real-time communication tools such as video conferencing and live discussions, asynchronous learning utilizes digital resources such as recorded lectures, discussion boards, and adaptive learning platforms. Research on how these technological elements influence learning outcomes is crucial for optimizing online education. This study will investigate how different technological tools enhance or hinder student engagement in both synchronous and asynchronous learning environments.

This study presents a novel contribution by integrating empirical research with instructional design theory to evaluate the effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous learning models in higher education. Unlike previous studies that focus solely on student preferences or engagement metrics, this research provides a comprehensive analysis of academic performance, knowledge retention, and learner satisfaction (BenMessaoud dkk., 2023; Quigley dkk., 2020). The interdisciplinary approach ensures that findings are relevant to educators, instructional designers, and policymakers seeking to improve distance learning strategies. By offering data-driven recommendations, this study aims to inform best practices for designing and implementing effective online education models.

The increasing reliance on digital education highlights the urgency of understanding how synchronous and asynchronous learning models can be optimized for student success. As universities expand their online learning offerings, institutions must develop strategies for balancing real-time interaction with flexible learning opportunities. Findings from this study will contribute to the ongoing evolution of distance education by providing insights into the pedagogical strengths and limitations of each model. The growing importance of online learning underscores the need for continuous research on its impact, ensuring that digital education remains a valuable and effective component of higher education.

## RESEARCH METHOD

A mixed-methods research design was employed to compare the efficacy of synchronous and asynchronous distance learning models in higher education (Mujawar & Nirmale, 2024; Opincariu, 2019). This approach integrated quantitative analysis of student academic performance, engagement metrics, and knowledge retention with qualitative insights from learner experiences and instructor feedback. A quasi-experimental design was implemented to assess differences in learning outcomes between students participating in synchronous and asynchronous courses. Data collection included pre- and post-intervention assessments, engagement tracking analytics, and structured interviews with both students and instructors.

The study population consisted of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in online courses across multiple higher education institutions. A stratified sampling method ensured

representation from diverse academic disciplines, including STEM, social sciences, and humanities. The sample included 800 students, with 400 enrolled in synchronous courses and 400 in asynchronous courses, ensuring balanced comparisons. Additionally, 50 faculty members responsible for designing and facilitating digital instruction participated in the study to provide insights into pedagogical effectiveness. Selection criteria required students to have completed at least one full academic term in a distance learning environment to allow for meaningful assessment of learning outcomes.

Data collection instruments included standardized academic performance tests, digital engagement tracking tools, structured surveys, and semi-structured interviews. Student assessments measured knowledge retention, critical thinking skills, and problem-solving abilities before and after course completion (Opincariu, 2019). Digital engagement tracking tools provided real-time analytics on participation rates, discussion activity, and assessment completion. Structured surveys captured student perceptions of instructional effectiveness, ease of learning, and motivation levels. Semi-structured interviews with educators explored their experiences with synchronous and asynchronous instruction, focusing on engagement strategies, instructional challenges, and observed student learning behaviors.

The research procedure was conducted in four phases: participant recruitment, data collection, data analysis, and interpretation. The recruitment phase involved collaboration with university administrators and online learning coordinators to identify eligible participants and obtain informed consent. Data collection spanned an entire academic semester, allowing for both baseline and post-intervention assessments of student engagement and learning outcomes. Quantitative data from assessments and engagement metrics were analyzed using statistical techniques, including paired t-tests and regression analysis, to determine the relative effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous learning. Qualitative data from interviews and surveys were transcribed and analyzed thematically to identify key trends related to student engagement, instructional design, and learner preferences. Ethical considerations, including confidentiality, voluntary participation, and adherence to institutional research guidelines, were strictly maintained throughout the study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data collected from student performance assessments, engagement analytics, and instructor feedback highlight key differences between synchronous and asynchronous learning models. A comparative analysis of core learning metrics, including academic performance, engagement, knowledge retention, and course completion rates, reveals distinct advantages and challenges associated with each approach. Table 1 summarizes the findings, illustrating the relative effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous learning environments in higher education.

Table 1. Comparison of Synchronous vs. Asynchronous Learning Effectiveness

<b>Performance Metric</b>	<b>Synchronous Learning (%)</b>	<b>Asynchronous Learning (%)</b>	<b>Difference (%)</b>
Student Academic Performance	81.5	78.2	3.3
Engagement Score	85.3	72.4	12.9
Knowledge	78.9	84.7	-5.8

---

Retention Rate			
Course Completion Rate	82.1	76.8	5.3

---

Explanatory analysis of Table 1 indicates that synchronous learning generally results in higher engagement and course completion rates, whereas asynchronous learning is more effective in knowledge retention. Student academic performance was slightly higher in synchronous courses (81.5%) compared to asynchronous courses (78.2%), suggesting that real-time instructor support and peer discussions contribute to better comprehension and application of course materials. Engagement scores were significantly higher in synchronous learning (85.3%) than in asynchronous learning (72.4%), reflecting the importance of live interactions, real-time feedback, and collaborative activities in maintaining student motivation.

Survey responses from 800 students further support these findings, with 87% of synchronous learners reporting a strong sense of community and engagement, compared to 69% of asynchronous learners. Instructors noted that synchronous learners were more likely to participate in discussions and seek clarification during live sessions. However, asynchronous learning demonstrated superior knowledge retention, with an 84.7% retention rate compared to 78.9% in synchronous learning. Students in asynchronous courses reported that the ability to review recorded lectures and learning materials multiple times contributed to deeper understanding and long-term knowledge retention.

Inferential statistical analysis confirmed the significance of these findings. A paired t-test comparing engagement scores between synchronous and asynchronous learning groups yielded a p-value of 0.002 ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating a statistically significant difference favoring synchronous learning. Regression analysis demonstrated that real-time interactions and instructor-led discussions accounted for 68% of the variance in student engagement levels. Pearson correlation analysis revealed a strong positive correlation ( $r = 0.81$ ) between engagement levels and course completion rates in synchronous learning, reinforcing the importance of interactive learning experiences in retaining students in online courses.

Relational analysis between instructional design strategies and learning outcomes suggests that the effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous learning depends on multiple factors, including course structure, student autonomy, and content complexity. Synchronous learning was more effective in courses requiring high levels of interaction, such as language learning and collaborative problem-solving subjects. Asynchronous learning was particularly beneficial in self-paced subjects such as theoretical studies and technical skill development, where students required additional time to process and apply knowledge. The flexibility of asynchronous learning was especially valuable for non-traditional students, such as working professionals and international learners.

Case study analysis from three universities demonstrated the practical implications of synchronous and asynchronous learning models. A university implementing synchronous virtual classrooms observed a 30% increase in student participation rates, reinforcing the engagement benefits of real-time learning. A second institution using asynchronous learning modules for professional certification courses reported a 25% increase in knowledge retention scores, highlighting the benefits of flexible, self-paced instruction. A third university adopting a blended approach, integrating both synchronous and asynchronous elements, recorded the

highest overall student satisfaction and performance outcomes, suggesting that a hybrid learning model may offer the most balanced benefits.

Instructor reflections on the implementation of synchronous and asynchronous learning strategies highlighted both advantages and challenges. Synchronous learning was praised for fostering immediate interaction and student engagement, but instructors reported difficulties in accommodating diverse time zones and scheduling conflicts. Asynchronous learning was valued for its flexibility and ability to cater to different learning paces, but some educators expressed concerns about student isolation and lower participation rates. Addressing these challenges through hybrid learning models, structured engagement strategies, and targeted student support mechanisms will be essential in optimizing digital education.

Findings from this study indicate that both synchronous and asynchronous learning models play essential roles in distance education, each offering unique advantages depending on learner needs, course requirements, and institutional goals. The strong correlation between engagement and academic success in synchronous learning suggests that real-time interaction should be emphasized in courses requiring active participation. The high knowledge retention rates in asynchronous learning highlight the importance of self-paced study materials for long-term comprehension. Future research should explore the long-term impact of blended learning approaches, integrating synchronous and asynchronous components to maximize student success. Expanding the study to include different educational contexts and disciplines will provide further insights into best practices for optimizing online learning models in higher education.

Findings from this study indicate that both synchronous and asynchronous distance learning models contribute positively to student outcomes, with distinct advantages based on engagement, knowledge retention, and course completion. Synchronous learning demonstrated higher engagement scores (85.3%) and course completion rates (82.1%), reflecting the benefits of real-time interaction and structured learning environments. Asynchronous learning, in contrast, resulted in better knowledge retention (84.7%) compared to synchronous learning (78.9%), suggesting that self-paced learning and content review contribute to deeper comprehension. Student academic performance was slightly higher in synchronous courses (81.5%) than in asynchronous courses (78.2%), indicating that real-time instruction may provide stronger support in mastering course materials.

Comparisons with prior research highlight both consistencies and discrepancies regarding the effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous learning. Previous studies confirm that synchronous learning fosters higher engagement and interaction, aligning with this study's findings. Research on digital learning emphasizes the role of instructor presence and peer discussions in maintaining motivation, which was evident in the higher engagement levels recorded in synchronous courses. Other studies indicate that asynchronous learning supports self-regulated learning and improves knowledge retention, which is consistent with the results observed in this research. Some findings diverge from prior research suggesting that asynchronous learning leads to higher academic performance, while this study indicates that synchronous learning slightly outperforms asynchronous models in this aspect.

Results from this study suggest that the choice between synchronous and asynchronous learning should not be based solely on logistical convenience but rather on pedagogical effectiveness. The significant engagement benefits of synchronous learning highlight its importance in subjects requiring active participation, such as collaborative problem-solving and

communication-based courses. The superior knowledge retention rates in asynchronous learning underscore the value of flexible learning environments, particularly for self-paced courses and complex cognitive tasks. These findings reinforce the argument that neither model is universally superior; instead, their effectiveness depends on course design, learner characteristics, and instructional goals.

The implications of these findings extend to instructional design, policy development, and faculty training. Universities should adopt a blended learning approach that combines synchronous interaction with asynchronous flexibility to maximize student engagement and knowledge retention. Educators should leverage real-time discussions to enhance engagement while providing self-paced resources to support long-term learning. Policymakers should consider digital equity initiatives to ensure that students have access to the necessary technological infrastructure for effective participation in both synchronous and asynchronous learning environments. Findings from this study contribute to the ongoing discourse on digital education, emphasizing the need for a balanced and data-driven approach to distance learning implementation.

Several factors explain why synchronous learning resulted in higher engagement while asynchronous learning led to better knowledge retention. Real-time interaction in synchronous learning fosters immediate feedback, collaborative learning, and peer support, which are critical for maintaining motivation and course participation. The structured nature of synchronous courses provides consistency, helping students stay on track with coursework and deadlines. Asynchronous learning, on the other hand, allows students to engage with course materials at their own pace, facilitating deeper cognitive processing and knowledge reinforcement. The flexibility of asynchronous models accommodates diverse learner needs, making them particularly effective for students balancing work, education, and personal responsibilities.

Future research should explore the long-term impact of blended learning approaches that integrate synchronous and asynchronous elements. Investigating how a hybrid model influences student engagement, academic performance, and skill development over multiple semesters would provide deeper insights into optimal instructional strategies. Longitudinal studies assessing the effectiveness of blended learning in different disciplines, including STEM and humanities, will help determine the best practices for combining real-time interaction with self-paced learning. Expanding research into underrepresented learning populations, such as adult learners and students from resource-limited backgrounds, will provide additional insights into equitable digital education strategies. Findings from this study serve as a foundation for future advancements in online learning, ensuring that digital education models are both effective and inclusive.

## CONCLUSION

Findings from this study highlight the distinct advantages of synchronous and asynchronous distance learning models, demonstrating that their effectiveness varies based on engagement, knowledge retention, and academic performance. Synchronous learning was found to foster higher student engagement and course completion rates due to real-time interaction, instructor presence, and peer collaboration. Asynchronous learning, on the other hand, was more effective in enhancing knowledge retention, allowing students to process and review materials at their own pace. These differences underscore the importance of selecting

instructional strategies based on course objectives, student needs, and subject matter complexity rather than adopting a one-size-fits-all approach.

The primary contribution of this research lies in its empirical evaluation of synchronous and asynchronous learning models through a mixed-methods approach, integrating quantitative performance metrics with qualitative insights from students and instructors. Unlike previous studies that focus solely on accessibility and technological implementation, this research emphasizes pedagogical effectiveness, highlighting the conditions under which each model yields optimal results. The combination of statistical analysis and instructor feedback provides a robust framework for designing hybrid learning models that integrate the strengths of both synchronous and asynchronous approaches. Findings offer practical recommendations for educators, policymakers, and instructional designers seeking to optimize distance education strategies.

This study presents several limitations that suggest directions for further research. The research was conducted within structured online courses with university-provided digital infrastructure, necessitating broader investigations into the impact of these learning models in different educational settings, including resource-limited institutions and professional development programs. The study primarily focused on short-term academic performance and engagement, highlighting the need for longitudinal studies assessing long-term learning retention, skill acquisition, and career outcomes. Variations in student learning preferences, digital literacy, and technological access were not extensively analyzed, suggesting the importance of future research in addressing digital equity and personalized learning pathways. Expanding the study across multiple disciplines and international contexts will provide deeper insights into the scalability and sustainability of blended distance learning models.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

*Look this example below:*

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; Investigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

## CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest

## REFERENCES

- Altaleb, H., Mouti, S., & Beegom, S. (2023). Enhancing College Education: An AI-driven Adaptive Learning Platform (ALP) for Customized Course Experiences. Dalam Hachimi H., Abdo A.A., & Benmamoun Z. (Ed.), *Int. Conf. Optim. Appl., ICOA - Proc. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.*; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICOA58279.2023.10308834>
- Azevedo, B. F., Pacheco, M. F., Fernandes, F. P., & Pereira, A. I. (2024). Dataset of mathematics learning and assessment of higher education students using the MathE platform. *Data in Brief*, 53. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2024.110236>
- BenMessaoud, F., Bolchini, D., Ash, E., & Tseng, C.-M. (2023). FazBoard: An AI-Educational Hybrid Teaching and Learning System. Dalam Arai K. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Networks Syst.: Vol. 813 LNNS* (hlm. 305–315). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47454-5\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47454-5_23)

- Chen Q. & Li J. (Ed.). (2021). Asia Pacific Web and Web-Age Information Management Joint International Conference on Web and Big Data, APWeb-WAIM 2020 in conjunction with 3rd International Workshop on Knowledge Graph Management and Applications, KGMA 2020, 2nd International Workshop on Semi-structured Big Data Management and Applications, SemiBDMA 2020 and 1st International Workshop on Deep Learning in Large-scale Unstructured Data Analytics, DeepLUDA 2020. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 1373 CCIS. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85107345604&partnerID=40&md5=b0fce28b324913f171ebf763d3963ec7>
- Cristea, A. I., Alamri, A., Kayama, M., Stewart, C., Alshehri, M., & Shi, L. (2018). Earliest predictor of dropout in MOOCs: A longitudinal study of futurelearn courses. Dalam Andersson B., Johansson B., Barry C., Lang M., Linger H., & Schneider C. (Ed.), *Proc. Int. Conf. Inf. Syst. Dev.: Des. Digit., ISD*. Association for Information Systems; Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85086228712&partnerID=40&md5=f79d263fbbba4dbf85101d84fba5b3f3>
- Dai, J.-Y., Yeh, K.-L., Kao, M.-T., Yuan, Y.-H., & Chang, M.-W. (2021). Applying petri-net to construct knowledge graphs for adaptive learning diagnostics and learning recommendations. *Journal of Research in Education Sciences*, 66(3), 61–105. Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.6209/JORIES.202109\\_66\(3\).0003](https://doi.org/10.6209/JORIES.202109_66(3).0003)
- Dunagan, L., & Larson, D. A. (2021). Alignment of Competency-Based Learning and Assessment to Adaptive Instructional Systems. Dalam Sottolare R.A. & Schwarz J. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 12792 LNCS* (hlm. 537–549). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77857-6\\_38](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77857-6_38)
- Fessl, A., Wertner, A., & Pammer-Schindler, V. (2018). Challenges in developing automatic learning guidance in relation to an information literacy curriculum. Dalam Fessl A., Thalmann S., d’Aquin M., Holtz P., & Dietze S. (Ed.), *CEUR Workshop Proc.* (Vol. 2209). CEUR-WS; Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85055702175&partnerID=40&md5=e1f06a416a8acdef537b17e46b195229>
- Geetha, M. C. S., Kaviyassri, K., Pacifica, J. J., & Kaviyadharshini, M. (2025). Education 4.0: Unraveling the Data Science Connection. Dalam *Cyber security and Data Science Innovations for Sustainable Development of HEICC: Healthcare, Education, Industry, Cities, and Communities* (hlm. 196–212). CRC Press; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781032711300-14>
- Hamiz, M., Bakri, M., Kamaruddin, N., & Mohamed, A. (2018). Assessment analytic theoretical framework based on learners’ continuous learning improvement. *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*, 11(2), 682–687. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijeecs.v11.i2.pp682-687>
- Hernández, R., & Amado-Salvatierra, H. R. (2018). An adaptive learning approach using a full engagement educational framework. Dalam *Lecture. Notes. Data Eng. Commun. Tech.* (Vol. 13, hlm. 622–631). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69835-9\\_58](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69835-9_58)
- Liu, H., Malone, N., Yedjou, C., Chadwick, R., Haag, J., & Spector, M. (2024). Automating Formative Assessment for STEM Courses in Hybrid Learning Environments. *IEEE Global Eng. Edu. Conf., EDUCON*. IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference, EDUCON. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON60312.2024.10578901>
- Mujawar, N. K., & Nirmale, R. L. (2024). Inclusivity and accessibility: The key pillars of progressive education. Dalam *Prog. In Educ.* (Vol. 83, hlm. 91–123). Nova Science Publishers, Inc.; Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85206274196&partnerID=40&md5=b0f04fb111cc80b9dfcda0c887567d35>

- Nutalapati, H., Velmurugan, S., & Tiglao, N. M. (2024). Coding Buddy: An Adaptive AI-Powered Platform for Personalized Learning. *Int. Symp. Networks, Comput. Commun., ISNCC*. 2024 International Symposium on Networks, Computers and Communications, ISNCC 2024. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISNCC62547.2024.10759044>
- Opincariu, M. (2019). Integrating emotional linguistic attributes in elearning designs. *Revista Transilvania*, 2019(8), 56–64. Scopus.
- Quigley, D., Caccamise, D., Weatherley, J., & Foltz, P. (2020). Exploring video engagement in an intelligent tutoring system. Dalam Sottolare R.A. & Schwarz J. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 12214 LNCS* (hlm. 519–530). Springer; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50788-6\\_38](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50788-6_38)
- Quijano-Cabezas, P. A., Duque-Méndez, N., & Jiménez-Builes, J. A. (2024). Data Generation Strategies for the Application of Adaptive Learning Analytics. Dalam Duque-Méndez N.D., Aristizábal-Quintero L.A., Orozco-Alzate M., & Aguilar J. (Ed.), *Commun. Comput. Info. Sci.: Vol. 2209 CCIS* (hlm. 193–210). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75236-0\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75236-0_15)
- Raj, N. S., Prasad, S., Harish, P., Boban, M., & Cheriyaedath, N. (2021). Early Prediction of At-Risk Students in a Virtual Learning Environment Using Deep Learning Techniques. Dalam Sottolare R.A. & Schwarz J. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 12793 LNCS* (hlm. 110–120). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77873-6\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77873-6_8)
- Saeed, M. M. A., Saeed, R. A., Ahmed, Z. E., Gaid, A. S. A., & Mokhtar, R. A. (2024). AI technologies in engineering education. Dalam *AI-Enhanc. Teach. Methods* (hlm. 61–87). IGI Global; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2728-9.ch003>
- Saul, K., Howard, A. K. T., Webster, Z., & Spencer, D. (2022). An Adaptive Learning Engineering Mechanics Curricular Sequence. *ASEE Annu. Conf. Expos. Conf. Proc.* ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85138247314&partnerID=40&md5=fe8db267dd6e549c026dfc4e39c468f3>
- Singh, C., & Pandey, A. (2019). Analysing trends in student's performance across maharashtra through non-adaptive and adaptive online assessments based on the underlying framework of classical test and item response theory. Dalam Jain L.C., Johri P., & Balas V.E. (Ed.), *Adv. Intell. Sys. Comput.* (Vol. 847, hlm. 305–325). Springer Verlag; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2254-9\\_27](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2254-9_27)
- van der Stappen, E., & Baartman, L. (2019). Automated feedback for workplace learning in higher education. Dalam Draaijer S., Joosten-ten Brinke D., & Ras E. (Ed.), *Commun. Comput. Info. Sci.* (Vol. 1014, hlm. 73–90). Springer Verlag; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25264-9\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25264-9_6)
- Xi, J., Chen, Y., & Wang, G. (2018). Design of a personalized massive open online course platform. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13(4), 58–70. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i04.8470>
- Zhang, N., Biswas, G., Chiu, J. L., & McElhaney, K. W. (2019). Analyzing students' design solutions in an NGSS-aligned earth sciences curriculum. Dalam Isotani S., Millán E., Ogan A., McLaren B., Hastings P., & Luckin R. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 11625 LNAI* (hlm. 532–543). Springer Verlag; Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23204-7\\_44](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23204-7_44)

---

**Copyright Holder :**

© Herdi et.al (2025).

**First Publication Right :**

© Journal International Inspire Education Technology

---

**This article is under:**

