Nusantara: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia
P-ISSN: 2774-3829|E-ISSN: 2774-7689
Vol. 5, No. 3, July 2025
https://journal.rumahindonesia.org/index.php/njpi/index

Correlation between Lecturer Support and Student Satisfaction: Insights from Blended English for Tourism Course

Addinda Maulidita Antari[1], Eri Kurniawan[1]
[1]Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Purpose – This study investigates the relationship between hospitality students' perceptions of lecturer support and their satisfaction with the English for Tourism course delivered in a blended learning format in response to the changing learning environments following the COVID-19 pandemic. Amid increasing demands for technology-integrated instruction in English for Specific Purposes (ESP), this research highlights the role of pedagogical support in shaping student satisfaction.

Method – Employing a quantitative correlational approach, this study collected data using validated instruments: the Scale of Perceived Instructor Support (SPIS) and the ESP Student Satisfaction Scale. Out of 92 students enrolled in the course, 47 (51.1%) participated voluntarily. Pearson's correlation coefficient was applied to examine the relationship between perceived lecturer support and student satisfaction.

Findings – Results indicated that students perceived moderate to high levels of support from their lecturers and reported a generally positive experience with the course, as reflected in a strong positive correlation ($r=0.732$, $p < 0.01$) between lecturer support and student satisfaction, emphasizing the importance of lecturer presence, interpersonal connection, and responsive feedback in blended ESP instruction.

Research Implications – The study contributes to the growing literature of ESP pedagogy and blended learning by affirming the crucial role of lecturer support in shaping positive student experiences. The research is limited by its single-institution scope, modest sample size, and insufficient examination of factors affecting students' willingness to continue learning in blended format. Future research is recommended to investigate lecturer support's impact on student motivation, psychological challenges, and learning outcomes, using longitudinal or mixed methods approaches.

OPEN ACCESS

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 01-06-2025
Revised: 11-07-2025
Accepted: 13-07-2025

KEYWORDS

english for specific purposes, english for tourism, lecturer support, student satisfaction, blended learning

Corresponding Author:

Addinda Maulidita Antari
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia
Email: addindantari@upi.edu

Introduction

In the years following the COVID-19 pandemic, the implementation of blended learning has become a pedagogical norm across many higher education institutions worldwide, including Indonesia. This shift has particularly impacted English for Specific Purposes (ESP) instruction, where balancing specialized content delivery with flexible digital formats remains a pressing challenge. Blended learning environments are known to improve learning flexibility, engagement, and autonomy, provided that adequate support structures are in place (Megahed & Ghoneim, 2022; Thahir et al., 2023). In ESP contexts, the utilization of technology and the implementation of blended learning models are increasing to provide a more holistic and flexible learning environment (Dou, 2024; Gaffas, 2023; Sakti et al., 2024).

Numerous studies have established that lecture support, defined through instructional, emotional, and interpersonal dimensions, positively influences student satisfaction and success in both traditional and online learning environments, including blended learning (An et al., 2023; Kauffman, 2015; Lee et al., 2011; Marlina et al., 2021). In ESP contexts, various support provided by lecturers is tailored to meet the specific needs of students in areas such as vocabulary, discourse practices, and communication skills to enhance their language proficiency (Constantinou et al., 2019; Dou, 2024). Moreover, studies like those of Gaffas (2023) and Liu & Mantuhac (2024) underline the significance of interpersonal and instructional support in blended ESP learning environments. Instructional support significantly impacts students' satisfaction, engagement, and perceived learning outcomes in blended learning contexts (Anthony Jnr., 2022; Wong & Chapman, 2023). However, the effectiveness of such support is contingent upon students' perceptions of teacher presence, responsiveness, and clarity in blended modalities (Liu & Mantuhac, 2024; McNeill & Bushaala, 2023).

In terms of satisfaction, students in ESP courses have been shown to prioritize clear communication, timely feedback, and relevance to real-world professional needs (Avsheniuk et al., 2021; Pham & Huynh, 2023). Concerns about improving education quality, the institution's reputation, student admissions, well-being, and learning outcomes often arise in student satisfaction literature (Bye et al., 2020; Rehman et al., 2022). Several studies suggest that active lecturer involvement, autonomy support, guidance, feedback, and interaction are among the types of support that significantly impact student satisfaction (Hernández et al., 2022; Sihombing et al., 2025). However, while a growing number of studies explore satisfaction factors in general online education, few have inquired about how lecturer support specifically shapes satisfaction in blended ESP courses such as English for Tourism. Moreover, there is limited empirical research conducted within Indonesian higher education contexts that investigates the interconnectedness of support and satisfaction in specialized, practice-oriented language instruction.

Although research in blended learning has expanded post-pandemic, most studies remain focused on general EFL or subject-specific STEM courses, leaving ESP fields like English for Tourism underrepresented. This creates a gap in the literature regarding how students perceive instructional quality, especially in terms of tailored support, within blended learning environments that aim to prepare them for hospitality industries. The purpose of the study is to investigate how hospitality students perceive their lecturers' support during the semester and how this perception relates to their overall satisfaction with the course.

Methods

The present study employed a quantitative approach to investigate the correlation between students' perceptions of lecturer support and their satisfaction with an English for Tourism course conducted in a blended learning format. This approach was chosen to enable measurable insights across a broad student population, crucial during large-scale educational shifts (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). Quantitative methods are effective for assessing attitudes and perceptions in educational research (Johnston et al., 2005; Muijs, 2010).

The participants in this study were undergraduates enrolled in an English for Tourism course at a hospitality-focused higher education institution in Indonesia. During the academic semester of data collection, a total of 92 students were enrolled in the course across three study programs: Culinary Management, Food and Beverage Management, and Room Division Management. Out of these, 47 students voluntarily completed both research instruments, resulting in a response rate of 51%. The sample size is considered adequate for correlational analysis, as a minimum of 44 participants is sufficient to detect a medium effect size (Cohen, 1992).

The study employed structured questionnaires, specifically the Scale of Perceived Instructor Support (SPIS) (Young-Jones et al., 2022) and the ESP student satisfaction scale (Avsheniuk et al., 2021), to collect data on the relationship between the variables. Both of the instruments were adapted with modifications tailored to the contexts of hospitality students and English for Tourism. The participants also provided demographic information, including name, gender, study program, and batch year. The data was analyzed using SPSS Statistics software, with the Pearson coefficient of correlation employed to examine the relationship between lecturer support and student satisfaction.

The validity and reliability assessments indicated that both the SPIS and ESP course satisfaction questionnaires were statistically sound, with the significance values for all items below 0.05, suggesting that each item was statistically valid and appropriately measured students' perceptions of lecturer support and instruction in the English for Tourism course. Additionally, reliability analysis revealed Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.962 for the SIPS and 0.912 for the course satisfaction scale. Both values exceed the

commonly accepted threshold of 0.70, indicating strong internal consistency for each scale.

Results

A total of 47 students completed both questionnaires, representing three different study programs: Room Division Management (14 students, 29.79%), Food and Beverage Management (15 students, 31.91%), and Culinary Management (18 students, 38.30%).

1. SPIS questionnaire results

To investigate the relationships among the four factors of lecturer support as perceived by the students, mean subtotal scores for average perceived engagement, expectation, interpersonal relationship, and autonomy were calculated. The highest mean was reported for interpersonal support ($M = 5.04, SD = 0.86$), followed by expectation ($M = 4.98, SD = 0.80$). students reported positive levels of autonomy ($M = 4.64, SD = 1.03$) and engagement ($M = 4.57, SD = 0.97$). Table 1 below summarizes the statistics regarding perceived lecturer support.

Table 1. SPIS questionnaire statistics

Item	N	Mean	SD	Variance	Skew	Kurtosis
Engagement	47	4.574	.971	.943	-.235	-.919
Experience	47	4.982	.802	.644	-.717	.382
Interpersonal Relationship	47	5.035	.860	.739	-.576	-.290
Autonomy	47	4.638	1.025	1.050	-.508	-.596

1.1. Relationships among four factors of lecturer support

Pearson bivariate correlation was employed to calculate relationships among the four factors of lecturer support and based on the output in Table 2. All the four factors of lecturer support strongly correlate positively to one another, indicated by the significant levels which are < 0.01.

Table 2. Correlation among the four factors of lecturer support

Item		Engagement	Experience	Interpersonal Relationship	Autonomy
Engagement	Pearson Correlation	1	.796**	.818**	.698**
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000
Experience	Pearson Correlation	.796**	1	.714**	.835**
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000
Interpersonal Relationship	Pearson Correlation	.818**	.714**	1	.782**
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000
Autonomy	Pearson	.698**	.835**	.782**	1

	Correlation				
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

2. Students' satisfaction questionnaire results

Mean subtotal scores were calculated for average perceived learning experience ($M = 3.732, SD = 0.948$), learning materials ($M = 0.676, SD = 0.469$), lecturer's performance ($M = 3.302, SD = 0.923$), and assessment ($M = 3.294, SD = 0.989$) to examine the relationships between perceived lecturer support and student satisfaction. As shown in Table 3 below, students reported moderately positive learning experiences, with slight left skew and a flattened distribution indicating a mild preference for agreement alongside notable variability.

Table 3. Students' course satisfaction questionnaire statistics

Item	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance	Skew	Kurtosis
Learner Experience	47	2	5	3.732	.948	.898	-.230	-.872
Learning Materials	47	0	1	.676	.469	.220	-.756	-1.444
Lecturer's Performance	47	1	5	3.302	.923	.853	-.013	-.551
Assessment	47	1	5	3.294	.989	.978	-.078	.670

2.1. Students' perception on learning experience

Regarding the students' perception of their learning experience in English for Tourism course during the semester, the results from the questionnaire suggested that the students were generally satisfied with the instructions given by the lecturer. As indicated in Table 4, the students rated three of the items as fairly satisfied while the rest as average satisfaction. Students reported relatively high satisfaction with the course engagement activities ($M = 4.128, SD = 0.612$), opportunities to access and use information ($M = 4.064, SD = 0.791$), and their ability to meet deadlines ($M = 4.234, SD = 0.560$).

Table 4. Students' perception on learning experience statistics

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Course engagement activities	3	5	4.128	.612
Willingness to continue studying in blended learning	2	5	3.234	.960
Satisfaction with course content	2	5	3.426	.950
Opportunity to access and use information	3	5	4.064	.791
Students' motivation	3	5	3.936	.704
Ability to meet deadlines	3	5	4.234	.560

2.2. Students' perception on learning materials

Students were surveyed on their perception of learning materials and preferences for blended learning resources. They found Microsoft Teams as the Learning Management System (LMS) and the lecturer's frequent use of Microsoft PowerPoint

during class to be the most effective and convenient media for delivering English for Tourism lessons. Table 5 below shows how student perceive the learning materials of the English for Tourism course. Students expressed favorable perceptions of their ability to work independently with the provided learning resources ($M = 0.702, SD = 0.462$), closely followed by overall satisfaction with class resources ($M = 0.681, SD = 0.471$). however, perceptions regarding the instructional effectiveness of blended classes were comparatively less favorable. Less than 50% of students ($M = 0.447, SD = 0.503$) considered blended learning instruction to be an effective mode of learning. Furthermore, only 53.2% ($M = 0.532, SD = 0.504$) indicated that they understood class requirements more clearly in the blended learning compared to in-person formats.

Table 5. Students' perception on learning materials

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Ability to work on learning activities on their own	0	1	.702	.462
Find classes conducted in blended learning as an effective way of learning	0	1	.447	.503
Satisfaction with course resources	0	1	.681	.471
Ability to understand course requirements better in blended learning than in conventional classroom situation	0	1	.532	.504

2.3. Students' perception on lecturer's performance

Students' evaluation of their English for Tourism lecturers revealed varied perceptions across five aspects of performance. As presented in Table 6, the lecturer's presence in class ($M = 3.77, SD = 0.60$) garnered the highest rating, indicating that students appreciated consistent engagement and visibility in the blended format. This was followed by the communication methods chosen by the lecturer ($M = 3.32, SD = 0.66$), suggesting that communication tools such as Microsoft Teams and messaging platforms were generally effective. In contrast, students assessed cooperation with the lecturer ($M = 2.98, SD = 0.71$) and collaboration with peers ($M = 2.87, SD = 0.65$) below the midpoint, pointing to a perceived lack of interactive or relational engagement. The lowest score was recorded for response time from the lecturer ($M = 2.70, SD = 0.86$), which may reflect students' concerns about delayed feedback or limited access to support outside class hours.

Table 6. Students' perception on lecturer's performance

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Means of communication chosen by lecturer	2	4	3.319	.663
Lecturer's presence in class	3	5	3.766	.598
Cooperation with lecturer	2	4	2.979	.707
Collaboration with other students	2	4	2.872	.647
Time response from lecturer	1	4	2.702	.858

2.4. Students' perception on the assessment

Students' perceptions of course assessments offered significant insights regarding the fairness, transparency, and difficulty of the employed evaluation method. As shown in Table 6, the difficulty of midterm exams ($M = 3.468, SD = 0.654$) and semester tasks ($M = 3.149, SD = 0.659$) was assessed as moderate, with a slight inclination towards the easier end of the scale. Students demonstrated considerable confidence in the transparency of assessment instructions ($M = 3.766, SD = 0.813$) and the accuracy of the grades they received ($M = 3.574, SD = 0.972$). Performance monitoring has emerged as a concern, however, with students reporting lower satisfaction ($M = 2.787, SD = 0.750$).

Table 7. Students' perception on the course assessment

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Level of difficulty of the midterm exam	2	4	3.468	.654
Level of difficulty of the tasks during the semester	2	4	3.149	.659
Clarity and transparency in the exam instructions	3	5	3.766	.813
Accuracy on academic progress	2	5	3.574	.972
Easy to monitor academic performance	2	4	2.787	.750

3. Lecturer support and student satisfaction correlation

The Pearson coefficient of correlation was used to identify the relationship between perceived lecturer support and course satisfaction during the semester, which is presented in Table 8. The output of correlation test revealed the significant levels between lecturer support and course satisfaction is at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$), meaning the result is statistically highly significant.

Table 8. Correlation between students' perception on lecturer support and course satisfaction

		Lecturer support	Course satisfaction
Lecturer support	Pearson Correlation	1	.732**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
Course satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.732**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Discussions

The study examines the relationship between lecturer support and student satisfaction in a blended English for Tourism course. The results demonstrated a strong, statistically significant correlation between the two variables, affirming previous findings that emphasize the importance of teacher presence and support in online and blended learning environments (Lee et al., 2011; Wong & Chapman, 2023). Among the four dimensions of lecturer support, interpersonal support received the highest student ratings, highlighting the critical role of relational aspects such as approachability,

encouragement, and clear communication. This aligns with prior research showing that social-emotional connection helps offset the reduced physical presence in blended classrooms (Dewaele & Li, 2020; Gaffas, 2023). However, autonomy support showed more variability, indicating that while some students felt empowered, others experienced inconsistent guidance, which is a pattern echoed in studies on structured learning environments (Assor et al., 2002; Reeve, 2006).

The findings also suggest that clear expectations and consistent communication contribute to increased student engagement, satisfaction, and perceived autonomy. This supports research that links instructional clarity and support to higher motivation and satisfaction in ESP and blended learning settings (Hendrian & Kurniawati, 2024; Hornstra et al., 2023; Prananto et al., 2025). Students prioritize clarity and fairness in lecturers but may express criticism when expectations or feedback lack consistency (Deeley et al., 2019). These findings align with studies emphasizing the importance of instructional quality and learning resources in student satisfaction as well as the necessity of improving teaching practices through professional development (PD) for ESP lecturers (Afida & Junaidi, 2021; Chandra & Fitriyanto, 2024; Constantinou et al., 2019).

While students generally rated their learning experience positively, there were concerns about the effectiveness of the learning materials and assessment monitoring. Although many students reported being comfortable navigating the LMS and working independently, fewer perceived the blended instruction as more effective than in-person learning. This result highlights the need for improved instructional design and better alignment between materials, tasks, and course objectives (Mubango & Ngirande, 2024; Rasheed et al., 2020). However, concerns about the pedagogical limitations suggest the need for differentiated instructional strategies and student-centered course design to address diverse student needs and preferences (Raes et al., 2020; Taylor, 2024; Zhang et al., 2020). Students also rated lecturer presence and clarity of communication favorably but gave lower scores for lecturer response time and peer collaboration. These findings indicate a need for more structured interaction opportunities and timely feedback, echoing similar concerns in blended course evaluations (Heilporn et al., 2021; Su et al., 2024).

Students perceived the assessments as accessible, fair, and effectively communicated; however, reported lower satisfaction with performance monitoring. This suggests insufficient support for academic progress tracking, which corresponds with preexisting studies in blended ESP settings emphasizing the importance of formative feedback and timely performance monitoring for improved learning outcomes (Chen, 2023; Fisher et al., 2025). Additionally, recent research has highlighted the significance of transparent assessment practices and consistent monitoring, clear criteria, and continuous feedback for improved e-assessment and student achievement to ensure

fairness and accountability (Alimorad & Saleki, 2022; Almuhanna, 2023; Susanti et al., 2021).

Overall, the findings confirm that students' satisfaction with ESP instruction in blended environments is significantly influenced by perceived lecturer support. Strengthening communication, instructional clarity, and responsiveness is essential for improving learning quality. In a similar vein, course design, lecturer quality, and effective communication are key predictors of satisfaction and learning outcomes (Eom & Ashill, 2016). Students perceive lecturers as supportive when they provide timely feedback, clear communication, and offer accessible guidance, which correlates with higher satisfaction in their learning experience.

Conclusion

This study affirms that lecturer support is a critical determinant of student satisfaction in blended ESP instruction, particularly English for Tourism. A strong, statistically significant correlation was found between perceived lecturer support and student satisfaction, indicating the importance of instructional clarity, emotional connection, and lecturer presence in blended learning environments. The findings also indicate the necessity for targeted PD to enhance ESP lecturers' capacity to deliver responsive, engaging, and student-centered instruction. Improving the quality of learning materials, ensuring timely feedback, and fostering transparent performance monitoring are also essential to support learner success.

While this study explored the correlation between students' perceptions of lecturer support and their satisfaction with the blended English for Tourism course, several limitations remain, notably its single-institution scope and focus on one specific course. In addition, it did not explore factors affecting students' willingness to continue learning English for Tourism in a blended learning format, as well as the psychological challenges encountered by students due to the implementation of blended ESP learning. Further research is advised to uncover additional evidence and insights regarding lecturer support, class satisfaction, student motivation, and learning outcomes. A longitudinal or mixed-method approach is recommended for future implementation to comparatively examine support offered by lecturers as it evolves, aiming to investigate the similarities and differences in the impact of this support on students' learning experiences and outcomes.

References

Afida, A., & Junaidi, A. (2021). Student Satisfaction Index on Lecturer Performance Based on E-learning and Competence. *At-Taqaddum*, *13*(2), 117–136.

Al-Fraihat, D., Joy, M., Masa'deh, R., & Sinclair, J. (2020). Evaluating E-learning systems success: An empirical study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *102*, 67–86.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.08.004

Alimorad, Z., & Saleki, A. (2022). Challenges and Opportunities of Web-based Assessment in EFL Courses as Perceived by Different Stakeholders. *Applied Research on English Language*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.22108/are.2022.132413.1843

Almasi, M., & Zhu, C. (2019). Studying Teaching Presence in Relation to Learner Performance in Blended Learning Courses in a Tanzanian University: A Mixed Design Approach. *Proceedings of the 8th Teaching & Education Conference, Vienna*. 8th Teaching & Education Conference, Vienna. https://doi.org/10.20472/TEC.2019.008.002

Almuhanna, M. (2023). Improving E-Assessment Based on University Students' Experiences. *TOJET*, *22*(1), 130–143.

An, F., Yu, J., & Xi, L. (2023). Relations between perceived teacher support and academic achievement: Positive emotions and learning engagement as mediators. *Current Psychology*, *42*(30), 26672–26682. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03668-w

Anthony Jnr., B. (2022). An exploratory study on academic staff perception towards blended learning in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(3), 3107–3133. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10705-x

Assor, A., Kaplan, H., & Roth, G. (2002). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviours predicting students' engagement in schoolwork. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *72*(2), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709902158883

Avsheniuk, N., Seminikhyna, N., Svyrydiuk, T., & Lutsenko, O. (2021). ESP Students' Satisfaction with Online Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Ukraine. *Arab World English Journal*, *1*, 222–234. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid.17

Bye, L., Muller, F., & Oprescu, F. (2020). The impact of social capital on student wellbeing and university life satisfaction: A semester-long repeated measures study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(5), 898–912. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1705253

Chandra, D., & Fitriyanto, A. (2024). An Empirical Analysis of Student Satisfaction with Lecturer Teaching Quality: Applying the Expectation-Disconfirmation Theory. *Indonesian Journal of Economics and Management*, *4*(3), 460–474. https://doi.org/10.35313/ijem.v4i3.6425

Chen, I.-C. (2023). Enhancing EFL Students' Writing Skills through Formative Assessment in a Blended Learning Course. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL-EJ)*, *24*(2), 86–103.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155

Constantinou, E. K., Papadima-Sophocleous, S., & Souleles, N. (2019). Finding the way through the ESP maze: Designing an ESP teacher education programme. In S. Papadima-Sophocleous, E. K. Constantinou, & C. N. Giannikas (Eds.), *ESP teaching and*

teacher education: Current theories and practices (1st ed., pp. 27–46). Research-publishing.net. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2019.33.924

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Deeley, S. J., Fischbacher-Smith, M., Karadzhov, D., & Koristashevskaya, E. (2019). Exploring the 'wicked' problem of student dissatisfaction with assessment and feedback in higher education. *Higher Education Pedagogies*, *4*(1), 385–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2019.1644659

Dewaele, J.-M., & Li, C. (2020). Emotions in Second Language Acquisition: A critical review and research agenda. *Foreign Language World*, *196*(1), 34–49.

Dou, A. (2024). Language Needs and Learning Strategies of ESP Learners. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, *7*(5), 243–247. https://doi.org/10.25236/fer.2024.070537

Eom, S. B., & Ashill, N. (2016). The Determinants of Students' Perceived Learning Outcomes and Satisfaction in University Online Education: An Update*. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, *14*(2), 185–215. https://doi.org/10.1111/dsji.12097

Fisher, D. P., Brotto, G., Lim, I., & Southam, C. (2025). The Impact of Timely Formative Feedback on University Student Motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2449891

Fisher, R., Perényi, Á., & Birdthistle, N. (2021). The positive relationship between flipped and blended learning and student engagement, performance and satisfaction. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *22*(2), 97–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418801702

Gaffas, Z. M. (2023). Students' perceptions of e-learning ESP course in virtual and blended learning modes. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(8), 10329–10358. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11579-x

Heilporn, G., Lakhal, S., & Bélisle, M. (2021). An examination of teachers' strategies to foster student engagement in blended learning in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00260-3

Hendrian, N., & Kurniawati, L. A. (2024). A correlational study on teacher-student relationships and students' engagement in EFL classes. *Cambodian Journal of Educational and Social Sciences (CJESS)*, *1*(2), 53–74. https://doi.org/10.69496/cjess.v1i2.31

Hernández, E. H., Lozano-Jiménez, J. E., De Roba Noguera, J. M., & Moreno-Murcia, J. A. (2022). Relationships among instructor autonomy support, and university students' learning approaches, perceived professional competence, and life satisfaction. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(4), e0266039. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0266039

Hornstra, L., Stroet, K., Rubie-Davies, C., & Flint, A. (2023). Teacher Expectations and Self-Determination Theory: Considering Convergence and Divergence of Theories.

Educational Psychology Review, *35*(3), 76. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09788-4

Johnston, J., Killion, J., & Oomen, J. (2005). Student Satisfaction in the Virtual Classroom. *Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.46743/1540-580X/2005.1071

Kauffman, H. (2015). A review of predictive factors of student success in and satisfaction with online learning. *Research in Learning Technology*, *23*. https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v23.26507

Lee, S. J., Srinivasan, S., Trail, T., Lewis, D., & Lopez, S. (2011). Examining the relationship among student perception of support, course satisfaction, and learning outcomes in online learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *14*(3), 158–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.04.001

Liao, H., Zhang, Q., Yang, L., & Fei, Y. (2023). Investigating relationships among regulated learning, teaching presence and student engagement in blended learning: An experience sampling analysis. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(10), 12997–13025. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11717-5

Liu, T., & Mantuhac, P. B. (2024). Teacher Support and Student Engagement in the Conduct of Blended Learning Instruction for English as A Foreign Language. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, *11*(2), 22–31. https://doi.org/10.54097/1g7q6h12

Marlina, E., Tjahjadi, B., & Ningsih, S. (2021). Factors Affecting Student Performance in E-Learning: A Case Study of Higher Educational Institutions in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *8*(4), 993–1001. https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO4.0993

McNeill, L., & Bushaala, S. (2023). Meaningful connection in virtual classrooms: Graduate students' perspectives on effective instructor presence in blended courses. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*, 1271245. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1271245

Megahed, N., & Ghoneim, E. (2022). Blended Learning: The New Normal for Post-COVID-19 Pedagogy. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning*, *14*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJMBL.291980

Moreira, F. P., & Araújo Lima, D. (2024). Systematic literature review on the impact of Blended Learning in promoting student engagement and autonomy: Findings and recommendations. *Revista Brasileira de Informática Na Educação*, *32*, 242–269. https://doi.org/10.5753/rbie.2024.3284

Mubango, H., & Ngirande, H. (2024). Self-Regulated Learning: Time Management in a Blended Learning Environment for Student Academic Performance. In S. Mistretta (Ed.), *Education and Human Development* (Vol. 29). IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1006068

Muijs, D. (2010). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Pelikan, E. R., Lüftenegger, M., Holzer, J., Korlat, S., Spiel, C., & Schober, B. (2021). Learning during COVID-19: The role of self-regulated learning, motivation, and procrastination for perceived competence. *Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft*, *24*(2), 393–418. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11618-021-01002-x

Pham, L. A., & Huynh, T. M. D. (2023). Factors Influencing Students' Attitudes Towards Learning English for Specific Purposes. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, *4*(4), 138–147. https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0285

Prananto, K., Cahyadi, S., Lubis, F. Y., & Hinduan, Z. R. (2025). Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students – a systematic literature review. *BMC Psychology*, *13*(1), 112. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02412-w

Raes, A., Detienne, L., Windey, I., & Depaepe, F. (2020). A systematic literature review on synchronous hybrid learning: Gaps identified. *Learning Environments Research*, *23*(3), 269–290. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-019-09303-z

Ramadhan, M. F., Mundilarto, M., Ariswan, A., Irwanto, I., Bahtiar, B., & Gummah, S. (2023). The Effect of Interface Instrumentation Experiments-Supported Blended Learning on Students' Critical Thinking Skills and Academic Achievement. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)*, *17*(14), 101–125. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v17i14.38611

Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, *144*, 103701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701

Reeve, J. (2006). Teachers as Facilitators: What Autonomy-Supportive Teachers Do and Why Their Students Benefit. *The Elementary School Journal*, *106*(3), 225–236. https://doi.org/10.1086/501484

Rehman, M. A., Woyo, E., Akahome, J. E., & Sohail, M. D. (2022). The influence of course experience, satisfaction, and loyalty on students' word-of-mouth and re-enrolment intentions. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *32*(2), 259–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2020.1852469

Sakti, N. S. S., Sarkiah, S., Sukma, S., Amaluddin, A., & Efendi, R. (2024). Redefining Esp: Bridging The Gap Between Traditional Methods and Modern Educational Needs. *Klasikal : Journal of Education, Language Teaching and Science*, *6*(3), 806–813. https://doi.org/10.52208/klasikal.v6i3.1164

Shurygin, V., Abdullayev, I., Hajiyev, H., Yakutina, M., Kozachek, A., & Zakiev, R. (2024). *Blended Learning: The Effect on Students' Self-Regulation and Academic Achievements*. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.11057892

Sihombing, D., Lutfhi, M., Nabila, T., Silitonga, J., & Fachruddin, W. (2025). The Effect of Academic Service Quality on Student Satisfaction. *Journal of Advances in Accounting, Economics, and Management*, *2*(3), 15. https://doi.org/10.47134/aaem.v2i3.572

Su, F., Zou, D., Wang, L., & Kohnke, L. (2024). Student engagement and teaching presence in blended learning and emergency remote teaching. *Journal of Computers in*

Education, *11*(2), 445–470. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-023-00263-1

Susanti, S., Pujiastuti, P., & Purnanto, A. W. (2021). Students' Perception of the Assessment Transparency Based Google Sheet. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *13*(2), 1269–1277. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i2.648

Taylor, P. (2024). Blended learning challenges of EFL undergraduate students: Student learning experience in an AI-integrated ESP course. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *11*(3), 1431–1449. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i3.37472

Thahir, M., Widiawati, & Baitillah, N. (2023). The Post Pandemic Education: A Blended Learning Approach for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education in New Normal Era. *International Journal of Ethno-Sciences and Education Research*, *3*(3), 99–108.

Wong, W. H., & Chapman, E. (2023). Student satisfaction and interaction in higher education. *Higher Education*, *85*(5), 957–978. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00874-0

Yang, F.-Y. (2023). Flexibility as a double-edged sword? Language learner autonomy in a blended self-directed learning program beyond the classroom. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(3), 188–204. https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v6n3.1194

Young-Jones, A., Hart, B., Yadon, C. A., & Buchanan, E. M. (2022). Validation of a Four Factor Measure: Scale of Perceived Instructor Support. *Psychological Reports*, *125*(3), 1714–1731. https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211000653

Zhang, Y., Chen, T., & Wang, C. (2020). Factors Influencing Students' Willingness to Choose Blended Learning in Higher Education. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 289–302. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-51968-1_24