

STUDENTS PERSPECTIVE ON ASYNCHRONOUS AND SYNCHRONOUS TYPE OF E- LEARNING AT BAN OOM SCHOOL THAILAND

Ervi Ananda Ayu Rahmadani

*English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
University of Muhammadiyah, Gresik
Email: erviananda_18403@umg.ac.id*

Ribeh Najib Muhammad

*English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
University of Muhammadiyah, Gresik
Email: ribeh@umg.ac.id*

APA Citation: Rahmadani, E. A. A., & Muhammad, R. N. (2021). Students' perspective on asynchronous and synchronous type of e-learning at Ban Oom School Thailand. *Indonesian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 4(2), pp. 11-16. doi: 10.25134/ijli.v4i2.5199

Received: 11-05-2020

Accepted: 12-07-2021

Published: 01-10-2021

Abstract: During Covid-19 pandemic, the main focus of education is distance learning. Especially for learning strategy. In this research, the researcher used two strategies; synchronous focuses on e-learning using Zoom and asynchronous using video material. Researchers used two of strategies to measure which strategy is more effective to assist students in facilitating e-learning process. The process also aimed to reach students and teach them from home during quarantine. This paper examined students' perceptions of e-learning using synchronous (zoom) and asynchronous (video material) at Ban Oom school of Thailand. The students have experience of implementing the strategies 4 (four) months during e-learning. There are 25 students participated on the learning process. The study used quantitative and qualitative design with triangulation approaches, with the analysis instrument being a questionnaire with Likert scale questions. According to the findings of the observations, there are three activity factors (communication, learning materials and the learning process). The analysis instrument is a questionnaire consisting of Likert scale questions. The findings from the questionnaire showed positive answers to all the three factors. The students agreed that they can communicate easily. It shows that students have a high perspective on synchronous learning with various advantages compared to asynchronous learning where learning by watching videos that sent by the teacher and cannot interact directly if there are something is not understood by the students.

Keywords: *students' perspective; asynchronous and keyword synchronous; e-learning.*

INTRODUCTION

Learning in the classroom has several supporting features that the function for the success of students and teachers in learning, also direct interaction, direct feedback, and train students' skills in socializing. It is called f2f (face-to-face) learning (Altner, 2015). However, students do not always enjoy this opportunity. For example, when there is problem such as a global pandemic or a natural calamity that forces schools to close and lessons to halt, it will be difficult for students to carry out face-to-face learning as usual (White, Ramirez, Smith, & Plonowski, 2010). As a real example, the world has experienced a disaster together, namely Covid-19 which has an impact on several human activities such as examples of the teaching and learning process. To reduce the spread of the virus, many schools were closed for several months. Changes in the educational system are prompting institutions to use online

learning, remote education, correspondence education, external studies, flexible learning, and massive open online courses. The identical situation exists in the United States. E-learning has been implemented, including digital and distance learning choices, which are acceptable and necessary to support students' educational continuity during the covid-19 pandemic (National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD), 2021). However, the teaching and learning process still must be carried out in order to save the nation's generation. In this study where the teacher comes from Indonesia and teaches students in Thailand, the teaching and learning process cannot be done offline and must be done with e-learning.

In Thailand, e-learning has become one of the national information technology policies, set by the Ministry of Science and Technology. This e-learning aims to provide more meaningful and

useful (Panyajamorn, Suanmali, Kohda, Chongphaisal, & Supnithi, 2018) to improve student learning the quality of education in an area that affected by a natural disaster or pandemic, causing students' difficulties in face-to-face learning. Adoption of online learning, on the other hand, is fraught with difficulties. A distinct problem that educational institutions in Thailand must face is that "the language learning environment in Thailand pushes students to memorize; this is in sharp contrast to the online education strategy that exists in students' motivation and self-regulation" (Ngampornchai & Adams, 2016). By this opportunity and coincide the current conditions, Ban Oom school was one of the participates in the success of education in that area so as not to be left behind. In taking advantage of the opportunity, Ban Oom's teachers conduct the lessons first and foremost in learning foreign languages (English).

Over the years, advances in computer-mediated communication technology have made expanding classrooms to online students more affordable and functioning very well (Wang & Wiesemes, 2012) Learning in such an environment is commonly referred to as mixed synchronous learning (Conklina, Oyarzun, & Barreto, 2017) or synchronous learning in a distributed environment (Warden, Stanworth, Ren, & Warden, 2013). In Greece, we piloted a research with two elementary schools linked by interactive video conferencing. The kids participated in both intergroup (from two schools) and intragroup (from the same school) collaborative activities. It should be noted that all of these studies were conducted with students at two fixed locations only (i.e., a local classroom and a distance learning center), and some of the existing studies have explored how to engage online students located at multiple sites (Wang, Huang, & Quek, 2018). Studying on multiple sites definitely presents a varied learning experience and challenge for online students. Therefore, the teacher uses a new method, namely uploading learning materials to the learning management system and letting students download and study on their own asynchronously.

This method can be said to be good and effective if it is applied temporarily, but it is not good if the class takes place continuously (Warden et al., 2013). Online learning focuses on internet-based courses that are available both synchronously and asynchronously. Synchronous learning is a type of learning that involves direct interaction between students and teachers through

the use of online tools such as conferences and online chat. Likewise, researchers use synchronous learning by conducting distance learning f2f activities that utilize online platforms such as zoom and massager. Here students can interact directly with the teacher even though they are not face-to-face offline and students can also receive the material clearly because the teacher takes the time to share and interact with students about the material presented.

However, this synchronous learning has several obstacles for Ban Oom School students where sometimes the signal is bad and also does not have a smartphone so that there are some students who cannot take synchronous classes because in the synchronous class itself all information will be conveyed directly and only once, if there is an interference signal, often students cannot receive information clearly. Asynchronous learning is a type of indirect (not simultaneous) learning that employs an autonomous learning technique. In asynchronous learning, the process is facilitated by streaming media, social media, email, discussion boards and here critical thinking is encouraged as the learner has more time to reflect, interact with content and process information conditions (Narayan, 1976) that are most convenient for them. They can utilize activities in various ways such as individually, in pairs, teams or groups.

Asynchronous learning, on the other hand, has a complementary and supportive role for e-learners in the development of learning communities (Narayan, 1976). In short, both are useful delivery tools to aid learning, especially in contexts where face-to-face teaching is limited or impossible (Shamsudin, Hashim, & Yunus, 2019). The influence of student perceptions has been emphasized in studies examining the quality of blended learning (Wright, 2017). For example, an extensive meta-analysis study found that students' positive perceptions of blended learning were associated with significantly higher scores, and concluded that teachers using mixed learning should understand students' perceptions of online learning and how it supports global learning. Student satisfaction with online lessons has been studied extensively, and some researchers believe it plays an important role in determining the success of CALL. This paper reports on a study examining students' perspectives on distance learning using synchronous and asynchronous methods.

METHOD

The data of this paper were collected from elementary school students in Ban Oom Loei Thailand where they were in grade 6 elementary school. This study explores how students perceive the application of distance learning using synchronous and asynchronous methods. Researchers applied blended e-learning because they want to know the effectivity of both learning strategy. Therefore, researchers conducted a research of the perception of students in e-learning with the approach used is mix method. The study used quantitative and qualitative design approaches, with the analysis instrument being a questionnaire with Likert scale questions, dichotomous questions, and close-ended questions. Qualitative data content responses to close-ended questions. This research was conducted at the Ban Oom School in Phu Lhuang district, Loei Province, Thailand. The students consisting of grade 6 In total 25 students were invited to complete the survey and responses were received from 25 (response rate 100%).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

General preferences and learning types

General preferences and modes of learning, more students demonstrate a general preference for synchronous learning (face to face via zoom) of the 25 respondents, 18 students or 72% indicated a preference for asynchronous (through video conference) with a total 5 students or 20% of students. In addition, 2 students, or 8% of the total sample, is indicated preference for students who agree with both types of lessons.

Table 1. *General preference synchronous face to face via zoom and asynchronous through video material (n=25)*

Preference lesson	Number of Students	Percentage
Synchronous (face to face via zoom)	18	72%
Asynchronous(Through video material)	5	20%
both types of lessons	2	8%

The reasons given by students for their preference questions reveal some common statements. Students showed a preference for regularly scheduled classes, in the synchronous showed 72% The following themes were

mentioned in the reasoning of the respondents (categorized and arranged by prevalence). Preference for asynchronous (video material), which counts for 20% of students fall under the categories of convenience, comfort, or fun, and skill enhancement (in order of prevalence). The last is the percentage of students who chose both of that lesson, the number showed 8%. Currently, e-learning can be synchronous or asynchronous according to the needs of distance learning education systems. It is estimated that the application of synchronous and asynchronous can be a reference for educators in choosing a learning model according to their needs and most importantly as a supporter of distance learning so that it can run well and make it easier for teachers and students (Öz & Kayalar, 2021). Synchronous distance learning makes virtual education into a new dimension by bringing together students and teachers in different places but in the same time, with synchronous learning classroom conditions can be said to be more effective because students can interact directly with the teachers (Kantar, İbili, Bayram, Hakkari, & Doğan, 2008). In summary, students prefer synchronous learning (by zoom), with the reasons that they gain a better understanding, more effective, more teacher's guide and help, more detailed explanation, also the class becomes more interesting and alive. The opportunity of interaction or clarifying grammatical explanations with teachers and also the lessons that are conveyed can be enjoyed and absorbed well. Several previous studies have indicated that asynchronous education, for example, is not as successful as face-to-face instruction (Choe, Sciric, Eshkol, Cruser, Arndt, Cox, Toma, Shapiro, Levis-Fitzgerald, Barnes, & Crosbie, 2019). Poor course design, poor supervision, and poor pedagogy in online teaching are possible factors leading to poor learning outcomes and low enthusiasm for this format (Choe et al., 2019).

Lesson types and student motivation

The results for close ended questions about student motivation and different lessons generally revealed that that students feel more motivated during asynchronous learning (by video material).

Tabel 2. *Motivation and lesson types of asynchronous learning (n=25)*

Likert Scale Response (%)	
---------------------------	--

Indicator Items	Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Motivation higher for Asynchronous lesson(Video material)	1. I get announcement or reminder communicated in asynchronous learning.	-	0	-	0	15	60	10	40
	2. I can communicate easily in spoken communication with my teacher in asynchronous learning.	-	0	-	0	14	56	11	44
	3. I get feedback on my learning progress from my teacher in asynchronous learning.	-	0	-	0	18	72	7	28
	4. I can ask and answer questions with my teacher in asynchronous learning.	-	0	-	0	12	48	13	52
	5. I can communicate and discuss the lessons easier and better with my classmates in break out meeting.	-	0	-	0	19	76	6	24
	6. I can communicate and discuss the lessons easier and better with my lecturer in one screen compared to online meeting	-	0	-	0	16	64	9	36
	7. Communication with my teacher in one screen of meeting is the same as communication in face-to-face meeting.	-	0	-	0	11	44	14	56
	8. I can understand the lessons given in asynchronous learning	3	12	-	0	10	40	12	48
	9. I can get the lesson materials easily in asynchronous learning	-	0	2	8	13	52	12	48
	10. I can have an ice breaker in asynchronous learning.	-	0	-	0	8	32	17	68

There are three aspects that showed the students and teacher activity during observation. The aspects are: communication, materials, & study process.

Communication. By the factor of communication, there is no participant responded with satisfaction when they are treated by asynchronous learning. The result of the data above showed by the statement number 2, 5, 6, & 10 that the students who had perception on asynchronous are effective on communication (0% strongly agree & 0% agree). They could not interact with the teacher, they only watched the video material that sent by the teacher.

Lesson material. The next factor is about lesson material that the students use on this

Learning. By the data above showed that students easily to get the lesson materials by asynchronous learning (8% agree). Students easy to get the material because they can play the video more than 2 times.

Study process. In the asynchronous learning, students can understand the lesson given by video material because without teacher guidance they can look the video many times. It showed by the data there are 12% students who strongly agreed with this learning.

The results of close ended questions about student motivation and different lessons reveal in general that students feel more motivated during synchronous (by Zoom).

Tabel 3. *Motivation and lesson types of synchronous learning (n=25)*

Likert Scale Responses (%)					
Item	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Motivation higher for synchronous	1. I get announcement or reminder communicated in synchronous learning.	15	60	10	40	-	0	-	0
	2. I can communicate easily in spoken communication with my teacher in synchronous learning.	18	72	6	24	1	4	-	0
	3. I get the feedback on my learning progress from my teacher in synchronous learning.	14	56	9	36	2	8	-	0
	4. I can ask and answer questions with my teacher in synchronous learning.	16	64	9	36	-	0	-	0
	5. I can communicate and discuss the lessons easier and better with my friends in break out meeting.	18	72	6	24	1	4	-	0
	6. I can communicate privately by room chat with my teacher and my friend during learning activity.	16	64	8	32	1	4	-	0
	7. I can collaborate with my friend on the break out room.	15	60	10	40	-	0	-	0
	8. I can understand the lessons given in synchronous learning.	16	64	9	36	-	0	-	0
	9. I can get the lesson materials easily in synchronous learning.	13	52	12	48	-	0	-	0
	10. I can have an ice breaker in synchronous learning.	12	48	13	52	-	0	-	0

There are three aspects that showed the students and teacher activity during observation. The aspects are: communication, materials, & study process.

Communication

Based on the factor of communication, most of the participants responded with satisfaction of synchronous learning. More than 70% of participants agreed that they could communicate on one screen with the teacher also their friend by break out room. The result of the table shows that learning activity using synchronous which exactly focus on communication, students are able to communicate with the teacher, it showed the number inside of the table (72% strongly agreed, 24% agreed). In addition, learning activity using synchronous can transfer the lessons easier also easier in sharing with their friends in break out meeting. It showed the number of the table (72% strongly agreed & agreed, 24% agreed). Students also can communicate privately when they need to ask something or they need to talk with the teacher by room chat during learning activity, the number by the table showed (64% strongly agreed & 32% agreed). (48% strongly agreed & 52%

agreed) shows that with synchronous learning students can also carry out activities before the material is delivered, greet each other during break time, and communicate freely when the teacher has not entered the Zoom room.

Lesson material

The next factor is about lesson material on this learning. The question was about how the access to the learning material. (60% strongly agreed & 40% agreed) that the students easily to get announcement by the teacher. The roles or the instruction that informed to the students during learning activity. (56% strongly agreed & 36% agreed) that student easily got a feedback when they made mistakes or had something to fix on their works, so they had a good progress during the way of learning. By synchronous lesson student also easily to get the material when the teacher delivered the material, direct explanation makes the student focus on what the teacher said also explained. This statement proved by the students' number of statement (52% strongly & 48% agree).

Study process

During synchronous learning student could ask and answer with the teacher. When they cannot the teacher explanation and they should understand the lesson, they could ask the teacher about what the missing lesson she/he had. It shows from the number of students' statement (64% strongly agreed & 36% agreed). 60% strongly agreed & 40% agreed that students collaborate learning with their friend by break out room and they can share the lesson with their friend in group that providing by the teacher.

CONCLUSION

The finding of this study indicate that synchronous learning can be said more effective than asynchronous, it can be seen from the results of students' questionnaires where previously students have been treated using 2 strategies, synchronous by zoom and asynchronous by video material. Synchronous learning has been proven by the large number of students who are motivated to learn face-to-face on one screen with the teachers and classmates. From this statement, it was proven that 76% of students' stated synchronous learning is more effective than asynchronous, meanwhile 24% preferred asynchronous learning by video material. In the results of the table interview of synchronous, there are 3 types of questions, there are communication, lesson material, and study process. In communication, students showed they are more motivated by synchronous learning using zoom. It can be proven by the percentage of students, 72% of students said direct communication with the teacher can facilitate the entry of the material.

REFERENCES

- Altiner, C. (2015). Perceptions of undergraduate students about synchronous video conference-based English courses. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(4452), 627–633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.589>
- Choe, R. C., Scuric, Z., Eshkol, E., Cruser, S., Arndt, A., Cox, R., Toma, S. P., Shapiro, C., Levis-Fitzgerald, M., Barnes, G., & Crosbie, R. H. (2019). Student satisfaction and learning outcomes in asynchronous online lecture videos. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 18(4). <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.18-08-0171>
- Conklina, S., Oyarzun, B., & Barreto, D. (2017). Blended synchronous learning environment: Student perspectives. *Research on Education and Media*, 9(1), 17–23. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rem-2017-0004>
- Kantar, M., İbili, E., Bayram, F., Hakkari, F., & Doğan, M. (2008). Software and content creation on distance education systems. *Conference Proceeding*. Istanbul University Press, 4793, 334-343.
- Narayan, A. D. (1976). Inheritance of Body Eight and Rate of Gain in Japanese Quail. *British Poultry Science*, 17(5), 513–523.
- National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD). (2021). Implementation of Mitigation Strategies for Communities with Local COVID-19 Transmission. *Cdc*, 1. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/community-mitigation.html>
- Ngampornchai, A., & Adams, J. (2016). Students' acceptance and readiness for E-learning in Northeastern Thailand. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-016-0034-x>
- Öz, R., & Kayalar, M. T. (2021). A Comparative Analysis on the Effects of Formal and Distance Education Students' Course Attendance Upon Exam Success. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(3), 122. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v10n3p122>
- Panyajamorn, T., Suanmali, S., Kohda, Y., Chongphaisal, P., & Supnithi, T. (2018). Effectiveness of E-Learning Design in Thai Public Schools. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 15(1), 1–34.
- Shamsudin, H., Hashim, H., & Yunus, M. M. (2019). Integration of Asynchronous and Synchronous Gameplay to Improve Pupils' Vocabulary. *Creative Education*, 10(12), 3101–3106. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1012234>
- Wang, Q., Huang, C., & Quek, C. L. (2018). Students' perspectives on the design and implementation of a blended synchronous learning environment. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3404>
- Wang, R. L., & Wiesemes, R. (2012). Enabling and supporting remote classroom teaching observation: Live video conferencing uses in initial teacher education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 21(3), 351–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2012.719397>
- Warden, C. A., Stanworth, J. O., Ren, J. B., & Warden, A. R. (2013). Synchronous learning best practices: An action research study. *Computers and Education*, 63, 197–207.
- White, C. P., Ramirez, R., Smith, J. G., & Plonowski, L. (2010). Simultaneous delivery of a face-to-face course to on-campus and remote off-campus students. *TechTrends*, 54(4), 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-010-0418-z>
- Wright, B. M. (2017). Blended learnings student perception of face-to-face and online EFL lessons. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 64–71. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6859>