Influence of Technology-Enhanced Learning Tools on Collaborative Learning in Higher Education: A Critical Review

Lateefat Folake HAMZAT
CUSET Department, Federal College of Education, PMB 2096, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.
email: hamzatlateefah444@gmail.com

Abstract
The rapid integration of digital technologies, or Technology-Enhanced Learning (TEL) tools, has transformed collaborative learning in higher education. TEL tools promote engagement, enable remote collaboration, and facilitate student-centred learning, aligning with modern pedagogies. This review explores the theoretical foundations, types of TEL tools, benefits, challenges, and future directions for TEL in fostering collaboration in higher education. TEL tools significantly enhance collaborative learning, fostering engagement, critical thinking, and teamwork. However, issues such as access disparities, technology overload, and group dynamics need addressing. For Nigerian HEIs, effective TEL implementation requires investment in infrastructure, faculty training, and inclusive policies. Adopting TEL tools in alignment with pedagogical goals will support meaningful, equitable, and collaborative learning for all students.
Keywords: Digital learning tools, Collaborative learning, learning outcomes, Higher Education, Students.

Introduction
The proliferation of digital technologies has transformed the education landscape, especially in higher education, where technology-enhanced learning (TEL) tools are increasingly utilized. TEL tools encompass a range of digital technologies and platforms to improve student engagement, facilitate collaboration, and enhance learning outcomes (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). Collaborative learning, which emphasizes peer-to-peer interaction and collective knowledge building, aligns with modern pedagogical approaches that prioritise active participation and student-centred learning (Laal and Laal, 2012). Collaborative learning emphasises the interactive engagement of students, allowing them to co-construct knowledge through discussions, group tasks, and problem-solving activities (Baker, 2015). In contemporary educational settings, TEL tools provide innovative ways to facilitate this interaction and collaboration, making learning more effective, dynamic, and student-centred. Technology integration into education has reshaped not only the content students learn but also how they engage with that content and with each other. Traditional collaboration methods often came with time and space limitations, and students had to meet physically for discussions or group projects. However, TEL tools overcome these barriers, providing flexible, asynchronous, and remote collaboration opportunities. The rise of digital platforms such as Google Docs, Microsoft Teams, and Zoom has allowed students to work on shared tasks regardless of their physical location. Similarly, discussion forums, wikis, and virtual whiteboards enable them to co-create knowledge interactively (Choukaier, 2024). In this new paradigm, collaborative learning is not just about working together but about leveraging digital technologies to enhance the experience. The tools and platforms that facilitate collaboration are often designed to mimic real-world working conditions, thereby preparing students for professional teamwork and problem-solving. Research indicates that students using TEL tools develop stronger communication, critical thinking, and teamwork skills (Kirkwood & Price, 2014). In the Nigerian higher education system, where challenges such as inadequate funding, overcrowding, and limited access to resources persist, TEL tools offer potential solutions to bridge learning gaps (Ateloye, 2019). As a result, many institutions now see technology-enabled collaboration as a strategic priority for improving learning outcomes. However, the extent to which these technologies influence collaborative learning positively or negatively has become a central focus of research and educational discourse. This review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the influence of TEL tools on collaborative learning within higher education settings, focusing on theoretical perspectives, key technologies, pedagogical implications, challenges, and future trends.

Theoretical Perspectives on Collaborative Learning and Technology Integration
Collaborative learning is grounded in several theoretical frameworks, including social constructivism, the community of inquiry model, and connectivism.

Social Constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978): Learning is seen as a social activity in which knowledge is co-constructed through interaction. TEL tools, such as discussion forums, allow students to engage in dialogue, share ideas, and reflect collaboratively.

Community of Inquiry (CoI) Model (Garrison et al., 2000): This framework highlights the importance of social, cognitive, and teaching presence in online learning environments. TEL tools contribute to these presences by supporting student interactions, enhancing instructor facilitation, and promoting deep learning through reflection. Connectivism (Siemens, 2005): As knowledge networks grow increasingly digital, learning involves connecting with and navigating through information across multiple platforms. TEL tools such as learning management systems (LMS) facilitate collaborative learning by creating interconnected environments for students and instructors.

Key Technology-Enhanced Learning Tools Used in Higher Education
Technology-enhanced learning (TEL) has revolutionized the landscape of higher education, providing diverse tools and methodologies that enhance teaching and learning experiences. The integration of technology in educational practices has facilitated more flexible, interactive, and personalized learning environments (Garrison & Anderson, 2003). This literature review explores key technology-enhanced learning tools widely used in higher education, examining their functionalities, benefits, challenges, and implications for teaching and learning.

Learning Management Systems (LMS)
Learning Management Systems (LMS) are among the most widely adopted technology tools in higher education. Platforms like Moodle, Blackboard, and Canvas allow educators to create, manage, and deliver course content efficiently. They provide functionalities such as course organization, assignment submission, grading, and communication channels (Kumar & Mangal, 2018).

Research indicates that LMS can significantly enhance student engagement and learning outcomes by offering a centralized platform for resources and collaborative activities (Bates & Sangra, 2011). However, challenges such as technical difficulties, lack of training for instructors, and the potential for students to become overwhelmed by features are noted (Al-Sharif & Al-Badi, 2020). Furthermore, the effectiveness of LMS is often contingent on instructors' pedagogical approaches and their willingness to integrate these systems meaningfully into their teaching practices (Davis et al., 2018).

Interactive Multimedia and Simulations
Interactive multimedia and simulations have emerged as powerful tools in higher education, particularly in fields such as science, engineering, and medicine. Tools like Labster and PhET Interactive Simulations offer students immersive experiences that enhance understanding of complex concepts (Fowler et al., 2020).

The use of multimedia resources videos, animations, and interactive graphics—can cater to diverse learning styles and promote deeper engagement with the material (Bishop & Verleger, 2013). Research indicates that these tools can lead to improved retention and comprehension of subject matter (López-Pérez et al., 2011). However, the development of high-quality simulations can be resource-intensive, and there may be resistance from instructors unfamiliar with these technologies (Kirkpatrick et al., 2019).

Collaborative Learning Tools
Collaboration is a critical component of the learning process, and technology has enabled various tools to facilitate teamwork and communication among students. Platforms such as Google Workspace (formerly G Suite), Microsoft Teams, and Slack provide real-time collaboration features, allowing students to work on projects simultaneously and communicate effectively (Rienties & Gunter, 2016).

Studies show that collaborative learning tools enhance peer-to-peer interaction and support the development of critical soft skills, such as teamwork and communication (O'Neil & Fisher, 2008). However, challenges include managing group dynamics in virtual settings, the potential for unequal participation, and varying levels of digital literacy among students (Topping, 2005). Effective structuring of collaborative tasks and clear guidelines are necessary to maximize the benefits of these tools (Dillenbourg, 1999).

Virtual and Augmented Reality (VR/AR)

Virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) technologies are gaining traction in higher education, providing immersive learning experiences that enhance engagement and understanding. Tools such as Oculus Rift and Google Expeditions allow students to explore complex environments and scenarios, from historical landmarks to biological processes (Fowler, 2015).

Research indicates that VR/AR can significantly improve motivation, experiential learning, and retention (Merchant et al., 2014). However, high costs, technical limitations, and a lack of faculty training can impede widespread adoption (Huang et al., 2019). Furthermore, the need for appropriate pedagogical strategies to integrate these technologies effectively into the curriculum is essential (Bacca et al., 2014).

E-Assessment Tools

E-assessment tools such as Turnitin, Quizlet, and Socrative provide educators with innovative methods for evaluating student learning and providing feedback. These tools enable formative and summative assessments, facilitate peer assessment, and promote self-regulated learning (Gikandi et al., 2011).

Studies suggest that e-assessment tools can enhance the assessment process by providing instant feedback and supporting diverse assessment formats (Barrett, 2019). However, concerns about academic integrity, the quality of automated feedback, and students' perceptions of e-assessment remain challenges that need to be addressed (Pechenkina et al., 2016). Additionally, educators must be trained to design effective assessments that align with learning outcomes and incorporate technology judiciously (Heathcote & Dawson, 2019).

Social Media and Learning Networks

Social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn are increasingly used in higher education to foster engagement and create learning networks. These platforms enable students to share resources, collaborate on projects, and engage in discussions beyond the classroom (Manca & Ranieri, 2016).

Research highlights that social media can enhance student interaction, promote active learning, and facilitate community building among learners (Duncan et al., 2019). However, challenges such as distractions, privacy concerns, and the need for effective moderation can limit their effectiveness as educational tools (Ribble, 2015). Educators must navigate these challenges to harness the potential of social media for learning purposes (Bennett & Maton, 2010).

Mobile Learning Tools
The proliferation of smartphones and tablets has led to the rise of mobile learning (m-learning) in higher education. Applications such as Kahoot, Duolingo, and Edmodo provide students with access to learning materials and activities anytime, anywhere (Ally, 2009).

Research indicates that m-learning can enhance accessibility and flexibility, catering to diverse learner needs (Pimmer et al., 2016). However, challenges related to device compatibility, varying levels of digital literacy, and the potential for distractions in mobile environments are significant concerns (Traxler, 2007). Ensuring equitable access to mobile technology is also crucial for maximizing the benefits of m-learning (Kukulska-Hulme & Shield, 2008).

Influence of TEL Tools on Collaborative Learning
Improved Student Engagement
Technology-enhanced learning tools offer multiple channels for interaction, thus increasing student engagement in collaborative activities (Kirkwood & Price, 2014). Students are more likely to participate actively in collaborative discussions and group tasks when supported by TEL tools such as forums and shared workspaces.

Development of Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills
TEL tools facilitate collaborative problem-solving by providing platforms for brainstorming, discussions, and peer evaluation. For instance, collaborative concept mapping tools like MindMeister have been found to improve students' critical thinking abilities (Novak & Cañas, 2008).

Flexible and Inclusive Learning
TEL tools accommodate diverse learning styles and preferences, promoting inclusivity. They allow students to collaborate at their own pace through asynchronous tools such as forums and shared documents. Additionally, TEL tools provide flexibility in group dynamics, as students can participate remotely without geographical constraints (Hrastinski, 2008).

Enhanced Communication and Teamwork
Collaborative software enhances communication among students, fostering teamwork and reducing social isolation. LMS tools that support group formation and peer evaluation encourage students to develop essential interpersonal skills (Alrushiedat & Olfman, 2013).

Challenges of Technology-Enhanced Collaborative Learning (TECL)
Collaborative learning, a pedagogical approach in which students work together to achieve shared goals, has become increasingly popular due to its effectiveness in improving academic performance, enhancing communication skills, and fostering critical thinking (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). With the advent of technology, collaborative learning has taken new forms, making it easier for students to connect, share information, and learn together regardless of geographical constraints. However, technology-enhanced collaborative learning (TECL) faces several challenges that affect its implementation and effectiveness. This literature review explores the key challenges associated with TECL, focusing on technical, pedagogical, social, and psychological factors.

One of the primary challenges of TECL is the reliability and accessibility of technology infrastructure. Students in different regions often face discrepancies in internet connectivity, which affects their ability to participate equally in online collaborative activities (Bower, 2019). Studies reveal that students with limited access to high-speed internet or devices capable of running sophisticated learning platforms face significant disadvantages, leading to an unequal learning experience (Barhoumi, 2015). Moreover, frequent software updates, compatibility issues, and a lack of technical support can disrupt the collaborative learning process, leading to frustration and reduced engagement among students (Al-Samarraie & Saeed, 2018).

TECL requires educators to design learning activities that foster collaboration while integrating technology effectively. However, a common challenge is the lack of faculty training in creating and managing online collaborative environments (Hrastinski, 2008). Instructors may struggle to adapt traditional teaching methods to suit digital platforms, which can result in poorly structured activities that fail to promote meaningful interactions among students (Bates & Sangra, 2011). Additionally, there is often a lack of clarity regarding the goals and expected outcomes of collaborative tasks, which can lead to confusion and disengagement among students (Kreijns et al., 2013). Educators must balance the dual objectives of teaching course content and facilitating group dynamics, which requires specialized skills and knowledge in both technology and pedagogy (Voet & De Wever, 2017).

The effectiveness of TECL depends on students' ability to communicate and work together effectively. However, research highlights that online environments can lead to social challenges, including isolation and miscommunication (Biasutti, 2011). Students often find it difficult to interpret non-verbal cues, which play a critical role in face-to-face communication and help establish rapport (Kim, 2018). Without these cues, misunderstandings can arise, and some students may feel disconnected or excluded from group activities. Moreover, time zone differences and scheduling conflicts pose additional barriers to real-time collaboration, especially in international settings where students are geographically dispersed (Rourke et al., 2001).

Another social challenge in TECL is the issue of group dynamics. Studies indicate that some students may dominate discussions, while others may take a passive role, reducing the overall quality of collaboration (Capdeferro & Romero, 2012). Instructors need effective strategies to ensure equal participation and to manage conflicts that may arise in the group due to differing perspectives, work ethics, or commitment levels.

The digital environment of TECL can introduce psychological challenges that may hinder learning. Feelings of isolation and lack of immediate support can lead to anxiety, which is particularly evident in students who are less familiar with technology (Zheng et al., 2018). Some students experience "technostress," defined as stress caused by an inability to adapt to new technologies, which can negatively impact their engagement and performance in collaborative activities (Tarafdar et al., 2019). Furthermore, the self-paced nature of online collaboration may lead to procrastination, resulting in lower quality contributions and difficulty in meeting deadlines (Broadbent & Poon, 2015).

Another psychological factor is the potential for cognitive overload. In TECL, students often have to navigate multiple information streams and juggle different forms of media, which can overwhelm their cognitive resources (Kirschner et al., 2018). This overload may reduce the students' ability to process information effectively, leading to superficial engagement and lower learning outcomes.

Assessing collaborative learning in a technology-enhanced environment is another challenge for educators. Traditional assessment methods, such as individual tests or quizzes, are inadequate for evaluating collaborative work, which often involves group problem-solving and project-based learning (Le, Janssen, & Wubbels, 2018). In TECL, it is difficult to assess individual contributions objectively, as online interactions do not always capture the nuances of each student's input. Additionally, students often express frustration when they feel their grades are influenced by group members who may not contribute equally (Anderson et al., 2015). Therefore, designing fair and transparent assessment criteria that recognize both individual and group efforts remains a significant challenge.

TECL also brings to light cultural differences that may affect collaboration, particularly in diverse, multicultural settings. Variations in communication styles, attitudes towards hierarchy, and approaches to conflict resolution can create misunderstandings and affect group cohesion (Kimmel & Volet, 2012). In some cultures, students may be reluctant to voice differing opinions or challenge ideas openly, which can stifle discussion and limit the diversity of perspectives that collaborative learning aims to promote (Morse, 2003). Instructors need to be aware of these cultural dynamics and create inclusive environments that encourage respectful and open exchange of ideas.

Several strategies have been proposed to mitigate the challenges associated with TECL. Providing training for both instructors and students on effective online collaboration tools and methods can help reduce technical and pedagogical barriers (Hrastinski & Aghaee, 2012). For social and communication challenges, incorporating synchronous sessions and activities that promote team-building can foster better group cohesion and improve communication. Moreover, using structured frameworks, such as clear guidelines on task division and group roles, can help manage group dynamics and ensure equal participation (Janssen et al., 2007).

In addressing assessment challenges, some studies recommend using a combination of self-assessment, peer assessment, and instructor assessment to evaluate individual contributions within collaborative tasks (De Wever et al., 2011). This multi-faceted approach can provide a more comprehensive evaluation of each student's involvement while minimizing issues related to free-riding.

Pedagogical Implications and Best Practices

Instructor Role and Facilitation

Instructors play a crucial role in guiding and moderating collaborative activities using TEL tools. Research suggests that effective facilitation involves setting clear expectations, providing timely feedback, and encouraging student autonomy (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008).

Designing Collaborative Activities

To maximize the benefits of TEL tools, collaborative activities should be thoughtfully designed. This includes ensuring alignment with learning objectives, promoting accountability among group members, and using diverse tools to accommodate different learning preferences (Laurillard, 2012).

Blended Learning Models

Combining online and face-to-face interactions through blended learning models can optimize the use of TEL tools. Studies show that blended learning environments promote deeper collaboration and better learning outcomes compared to fully online or traditional settings (Vaughan, 2014).

Future Trends and Research Directions

While many studies highlight the benefits of TEL tools in promoting collaborative learning, there is still a need for empirical research to assess their long-term impact on academic performance, student satisfaction, and skill development. The influence of TEL tools on collaborative learning within Nigerian HEIs is increasingly significant as these tools offer solutions to persistent challenges in education. However, the successful implementation of TEL tools faces obstacles, including infrastructure deficiencies and limited digital literacy. For TEL to be fully effective in Nigerian HEIs, there is a need for targeted investment in ICT infrastructure, structured training for faculty and students, and the development of supportive policies that promote the adoption of TEL in collaborative learning contexts. AI-powered tools are increasingly integrated into collaborative learning platforms to provide personalized support and real-time feedback. Future research should explore how AI can further enhance collaborative learning experiences. Immersive technologies such as VR and AR offer new opportunities for collaborative learning by simulating real-world environments. These tools can facilitate hands-on group activities and foster experiential learning (Dede, 2009). Future research should focus on

strategies for mitigating the digital divide and ensuring equitable access to TEL tools. This includes exploring low-cost technologies and inclusive teaching practices to support diverse learners.

Conclusion

The integration of technology-enhanced learning tools has significantly influenced collaborative learning in higher education, promoting engagement, critical thinking, and teamwork among students. While these tools offer numerous benefits, challenges such as access issues, technological overload, and uneven participation must be addressed. As higher education continues to evolve in the face of technological and societal changes, research on TEL-enabled collaborative learning will play a vital role in shaping future educational practices. Institutions must ensure that the integration of TEL tools aligns with their pedagogical goals while fostering inclusive, accessible, and meaningful learning experiences for all students. For TEL to be fully effective in Nigerian HEIs, there is a need for targeted investment in ICT infrastructure, structured training for faculty and students, and the development of supportive policies that promote the adoption of TEL in collaborative learning contexts. However, the successful implementation of TEL tools faces obstacles, including infrastructure deficiencies and limited digital literacy. Future trends, including AI, VR/AR, and adaptive learning systems, hold promise for further enhancing collaborative learning. To maximize the impact of TEL tools, higher education institutions must invest in faculty training, infrastructure, and inclusive practices, ensuring that all students benefit from collaborative learning opportunities.

References

Al-Azawei, A., Parslow, P., & Lundqvist, K. (2017). Barriers and opportunities of e-learning implementation in Iraq: A case of public universities. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 18(1), 253–275.

Ally, M. (2009). Mobile learning: Transforming the delivery of education and training. Athabasca University Press.

Alrushiedat, N., & Olfman, L. (2013). Collaborative learning using social media tools in higher education. Journal of Educational Technology, 9(2), 45-58.

Ateloye, A. B. (2019). *A public-private partnership model for higher education infrastructure* (Doctoral dissertation, Heriot-Watt University).

Bailenson, J. N. (2021). Nonverbal overload: A theoretical argument for the causes of Zoom fatigue. Technology, Mind, and Behavior, 2(1), 1–6.

Baker, R., & Siemens, G. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences (2nd ed., pp. 253-272). Cambridge University Press.

Barhoumi, C. (2015). The effectiveness of WhatsApp mobile learning activities guided by activity theory on students' knowledge management. Contemporary Educational Technology, 6(3), 221-238.

Barrett, H. (2005). White paper: Researching electronic portfolios and learner engagement. The Reflect Initiative. Retrieved from https://electronicportfolios.org/

Bates, A. W., & Sangra, A. (2011). Managing technology in higher education: Strategies for transforming teaching and learning. Jossey-Bass.

Blin, F., & Munro, M. (2008). Why hasn't technology disrupted academics' teaching practices? Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(7), 1349-1360.

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

Bryant, L. H., & Chittum, J. R. (2013). ePortfolio effectiveness: A(n ill-fated) search for empirical support. International Journal of ePortfolio, 3(2), 189–198.

Capdeferro, N., & Romero, M. (2012). Are online learners frustrated with collaborative learning experiences? The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 13(2), 26-44.

Carliner, S. (2015). Training design basics (2nd ed.). ASTD Press.

Choukaier, D. (2024). Enhancing English As A Foreign Language (EFL) Instruction Through Digital Teaching Platforms: Analyzing The Impact Of Microsoft Teams, Zoom, And Google Meet On Communication And Participation. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, *30*(6), 2404-2418.

Crompton, H. (2013). A historical overview of mobile learning: Toward learner-centered education. In Z. Berge & L. Muilenburg (Eds.), Handbook of mobile learning (pp. 3-14). Routledge.

Dabbagh, N., & Kitsantas, A. (2012). Personal learning environments, social media, and self-regulated learning: A natural formula for connecting formal and informal learning. The Internet and Higher Education, 15(1), 3-8.

Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2011). From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining "gamification." In Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments (pp. 9-15).

Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines. John Wiley & Sons.

Gee, J. P. (2003). What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy. Computers in Entertainment, 1(1), 20-20.

Hanus, M. D., & Fox, J. (2015). Assessing the effects of gamification in the classroom: A longitudinal study on intrinsic motivation, social comparison, satisfaction, effort, and academic performance. Computers & Education, 80, 152-161.

Hrastinski, S. (2008). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. Educause Quarterly, 31(4), 51-55.

Hrastinski, S. (2008). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. Educause Quarterly, 31(4), 51-55.

Johnson, L., Adams Becker, S., Estrada, V., & Freeman, A. (2016). NMC Horizon Report: 2016 Higher Education Edition. The New Media Consortium.

Junco, R., Heiberger, G., & Loken, E. (2014). The effect of Twitter on college student engagement and grades. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 27(2), 119-132.

Kearney, M., Schuck, S., Burden, K., & Aubusson, P. (2012). Viewing mobile learning from a pedagogical perspective. Research in Learning Technology, 20(1), 14406.

Kerr, P., et al. (2017). The benefits of adaptive learning in higher education. McGraw-Hill Education.

Kessler, G., Bikowski, D., & Boggs, J. (2020). Collaborative writing among second language learners using Google Docs. Language Learning & Technology, 24(2), 92-115.

Kim, J. (2018). Instructors' use of social media in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 40, 1–8.

Kirschner, P. A., Kester, L., & Corbalan, G. (2018). Cognitive load theory and technology-enhanced learning. In R. Zheng (Ed.), Cognitive effects of multimedia learning (pp. 19–35). IGI Global.

Laal, M., & Laal, M. (2012). Collaborative learning: what is it?. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *31*, 491-495.

Landers, R. N., & Landers, A. K. (2014). An empirical test of the theory of gamified learning: The effect of leaderboards on time-on-task and academic performance. Simulation & Gaming, 45(6), 769–785.

Laurillard, D. (2012). Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology. Routledge.

Le, H., Janssen, J., & Wubbels, T. (2018). Collaborative learning practices: Teacher and student perceived obstacles to effective student collaboration. Cambridge Journal of Education, 48(1), 103-122.

Lowenthal, P. R., Snelson, C., & Dunlap, J. C. (2020). Live synchronous web meetings in asynchronous online courses: Reconceptualizing virtual office hours. Online Learning, 24(2), 225-238.

Pardo, A., Jovanović, J., Dawson, S., Gašević, D., & Mirriahi, N. (2019). Using learning analytics to scale the provision of personalized feedback. British Journal of Educational Technology, 50(1), 128-138.

Pereira, J. A., et al. (2019). Effectiveness of adaptive learning platforms in improving student performance. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 22(2), 112-126.

Raes, A., Vanneste, P., Pieters, M., Windey, I., Van Den Noortgate, W., & Depaepe, F. (2020). Learning and instruction in the hybrid virtual classroom: An investigation of students' engagement and the effect of quizzes. Computers & Education, 143, 103682.

Rossing, J. P., Miller, W. M., Cecil, A. K., & Stamper, S. E. (2012). iLearning: The future of higher education? Student perceptions on learning with mobile tablets. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 12(2), 1-26.

Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. American Behavioral Scientist, 57(10), 1510–1529.

Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. F. (2019). The technostress trifecta—Techno eustress, techno distress, and design: Theoretical directions and an agenda for research. Information Systems Journal, 29(1), 6–42.

Tosh, D., Light, T. P., Fleming, K., & Haywood, J. (2005). Engagement with electronic portfolios: Challenges from the student perspective. Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology, 31(3).

Tsai, Y. S., et al. (2020). SHEILA framework: Addressing challenges in learning analytics policy development. British Journal of Educational Technology, 51(4), 911-925.

Turel, O., & Qahri-Saremi, H. (2018). Explaining unplanned online media behaviors: Dual system theory models of impulsive use and swearing. Information Systems Journal, 28(6), 1080–1095.

Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2017). History teachers' conceptions of inquiry-based learning, beliefs about the nature of history, and their relation to the classroom context. Teaching and Teacher Education, 63, 206-217.

Zheng, B., Lin, C. H., & Kwon, J. B. (2018). The impact of self-regulated learning on academic success in online learning environments. International Journal on E-Learning, 17(1), 61-79.