

From Written Analysis to Oral Presentation: How Students Reconfigure Self-Regulated Learning across Sequential Academic Tasks

Mahdalela binti Rahim, *Wan Aisyah Nadiah binti Wan Azman

Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Malaysia

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800667>

Received: 26 August 2026; Accepted: 31 August 2026; Published: 15 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Self-regulated learning (SRL) is sensitive to the demands learners encounter during academic work, yet less is known about how regulatory practices change when students move between sequential and interdependent tasks. This study examined students' reported self-regulatory practices across two connected coursework tasks, namely a written analytical task followed by an oral presentation based on the earlier analysis. Structured progress reflections from the two tasks (Task 1, $n = 19$, Task 2, $n = 20$) were analysed to identify the challenges students encountered and the regulatory practices they reported using in response. A paired analysis of 18 students with usable reflections for both tasks was then conducted to examine changes in regulatory practices across the task transition. The findings showed that the written task primarily involved challenges related to material selection, analytical decision-making, justification, and revision, whereas the oral task shifted attention towards content selection and condensation, presentation organization, oral delivery, and multimodal monitoring. Cross-task analysis indicated three patterns of regulatory change, namely maintenance, adaptation, and expansion. Some practices, including help-seeking and feedback use, remained evident across tasks. Monitoring, selection, organization, and revision were adapted to new performance demands, and practices such as rehearsal, presentation timing, pronunciation monitoring, and repeated recording emerged in response to the oral task. The findings suggest that self-regulation across connected academic tasks is better understood as a process of reconfiguration rather than a simple increase or decrease in regulatory activity. The study highlights the value of examining how regulatory practices are carried forward and reshaped as students move between different forms of academic performance.

Keywords: self-regulated learning; task transitions; sequential academic tasks; regulatory practices; academic coursework

INTRODUCTION

University students hardly do their assignments in an independent manner. An assignment done to complete a particular task can form the basis of another assignment, meaning that the student not only has to use his or her existing knowledge to complete the new assignment, but also has to change his or her perspective when completing the latter assignment. For instance, the analysis done in writing may later require summarising and communication through oral presentation. While the information may be similar, the pressures on the learners may change substantially.

SRL constitutes an insightful framework from which one can study this process. SRL is normally defined as the way in which learners regulate their learning through such activities such as planning, monitoring, strategy use, evaluation, and adaptation (Panadero, 2017). In terms of a process perspective, regulation need not follow a linear sequence. This implies that learners could be involved in monitoring their progress, discovering that there is a discrepancy between the way in which they have been learning and what the task requires, going back to a previous choice, and adapting (Winne & Hadwin, 1998).

One thing that must be taken into consideration, however, is that the demands of self-regulation themselves might not stay constant over different tasks. Studies have indeed found that students might appraise a previous learning situation and change their own behaviour accordingly (Raković et al., 2022), whereas there may also be differences in the way regulation occurs, depending on the kind of task that needs to be done (Panadero et al., 2025). It has been shown through process-oriented studies that there is much to be gained from studying SRL longitudinally, as opposed to looking at how generally predisposed to self-regulation students are (Saint et al., 2022).

This becomes especially pertinent in cases where academic tasks are sequential as well as interdependent. The student who shifts from one task to another will be able to use strategies that continue to be useful for him or her, adapt current strategies to accommodate new demands, or even develop new strategies to meet demands that did not exist before. Nevertheless, most of the literature available has investigated adaptation over the learning process, variations in tasks, or regulation within each individual task. Very little is known about how regulation varies as students shift between interrelated but demanding tasks differently.

Examining such transitions is relevant to authentic university learning. Sequential assessments are designed to encourage students to make connections between assignments as opposed to doing each in isolation. However, reusing previously written work is more than just moving information from one document to another. It could mean that students need to look at what information is essential, how this information should be structured, how much detail is required, and how the quality of their performance in the new context can be controlled. A change in task format may therefore also change the object of regulation, even when the underlying content remains connected.

Against this background, the current study explores regulatory practices that students reported using within the context of two consecutive and interrelated academic tasks. One was an analytic writing task, whereas the other was a task where students needed to choose and adapt their previously performed analysis for oral presentation. Informed by structured reflections generated by the students as they were completing these tasks, the study will explore the difficulties the students faced, the regulatory practices that they used in the process and how these practices were modified when the tasks were different. This way, this study seeks to move away from simply asking whether the students are demonstrating more or less self-regulation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Self-Regulated Learning as a Dynamic Process

Self-regulated learning (SRL) is usually defined as the learners' efforts to regulate their learning process in order to reach certain academic objectives. This phenomenon includes not only cognitive but also metacognitive, behavioural, motivational and affective aspects of the learners' activities (Panadero, 2017). There are several theoretical frameworks which describe SRL, such as those of Zimmerman, Pintrich, Boekaerts, and Winne and Hadwin. Though there are some differences in the focus of these approaches and in terms used, they all agree on the idea that the learner plays an active role in regulating his or her learning process (Panadero, 2017).

SRL can be best characterised as a process rather than a set of behaviours performed by students. They might think of altering their goals, choosing other strategies, or rethinking their understanding of the given task while working on it. Such a perspective seems evident in the model of Winne and Hadwin (1998), where four main stages of regulation are outlined, namely task definition, goal setting and planning, tactics and strategy implementation, and adaptation. Those stages do not have to follow each other in a linear way as the process of monitoring might result in returning to any previous stage and changing one's mind about how to proceed with the tasks. This particular model is especially well suited for the current study due to the possibility to focus on the way how students perceive, monitor, and adjust to the changes in their performance.

Therefore, the current study largely utilizes the model developed by Winne and Hadwin in assessing regulation among students within two academic tasks. Task definition, monitoring, and adaptation are specifically

considered, since they form an important point of departure in understanding how students react to changes in task demands.

Task Definition, Monitoring, and Adaptation

Task definition in the framework proposed by Winne and Hadwin entails the learner's knowledge of what the task requires and what must be done to complete it. Such knowledge includes the nature of the task requirements, resources available, limitations, and the standards expected of the learner. This component is significant as the plans and strategies developed by students are based, to some extent, on the learner's interpretations of these aspects. For instance, Greene et al. (2012) studied the link between the task definitions and plans of college students and the self-regulation they engaged in while performing an involved science task. The result showed why task interpretation must be considered part of the regulatory process rather than simply something that happens before learning begins.

Monitoring is yet another key component in this sequence of activities. While doing a task, the learners monitor their progress and judge whether they are on the right track for achieving the desired goal or standard. If not, they would have to adjust their strategies accordingly. This could take the form of modifying their plan of action or strategy, getting help, or tapping other available resources. For Winne and Hadwin, such changes are part of the process of adaptation, wherein the knowledge acquired from the learning process informs subsequent actions taken by the learner.

Evaluation and adaptation were considered through the study conducted by Raković et al. (2022) where the research involved university students through different cycles of learning process. The study used the combination of reflection writing and behavioural traces to prove that the evaluation of previous studies done by the students influences their adaptation intentions and those intentions affect the development of desirable behaviour in the future. This study is relevant for the current study since it helps to see how the identification of the problem in one's previous practice could relate to the decision to change something later on. However, it does not mean that reflection always results in behaviour changes.

Self-regulation, in this case, should not only mean having a wide repertoire of strategies for learning. In addition to it, it is necessary to realise that certain strategies do not work and something should be done about it. This characteristic of SRL becomes important when learners switch from one activity to another as some strategies which work well in one task require modification or complementation in others.

Task-Sensitive and Process-Oriented Self-Regulation

While self-regulation learning comprises such aspects as planning, monitoring, and adaptation, learners are likely not going to apply the same strategies in different educational activities. The needs for regulation of a learners depend on the requirements of the particular task. For instance, according to Seufert et al. (2024), learners' reported usage of cognitive and metacognitive strategies differed depending on the perceived complexity of the exams, cognitive load being a significant variable in this regard. This indicates that self-regulation depends on both the learner and the context of the activity.

Further evidence on task-dependence of SRL can be provided by Panadero et al. (2025). The researchers investigated students' SRL during reading, oral analysis and written analysis tasks. The use of a repeated measures design, which combined both self-reports and think-aloud protocol, revealed that regulatory behaviour varied depending on the type of task. This result confirms that SRL is indeed task-dependent. A strategy, which is effective for one task, may not be applicable for another. Different requirements of each task can force students to apply other methods of planning and self-regulation.

Task-sensitive regulation is also relevant to language-learning contexts. In university EFL writing, Shen and Bai (2024) found that explicit SRL strategy instruction influenced students' use of targeted writing strategies and their writing performance. This illustrates how regulation can be closely tied to the demands of a particular academic activity.

This distinction is useful in distinguishing between a regulatory function and the strategy adopted by the learner to perform that activity. For example, monitoring may continue to be an important activity for students even as the strategy that is employed to monitor work shifts according to tasks. This is also true in case of planning, help seeking, and adaptation. Simply focusing on whether the specific strategy is used more often or less often may therefore fail to capture the underlying purpose that the strategy is fulfilling. In other words, the fact that strategies change according to tasks does not necessarily mean that regulation disappears, rather it means that students adapt to it.

SRL studies have also come to recognise the time and order at which certain regulatory processes take place. In their systematic review on temporality in SRL research, Saint et al. (2022) found that there was increasing attention being paid to investigating the temporality and sequence of regulation. Process-related studies have also made use of data at the task level in the investigation of the development of regulation. An example is the study by Lämsä et al. (2025) where they used digital trace data from an essay writing task to identify latent SRL processes like orientation, first reading, writing and rereading with monitoring.

Digital traces, however, are not always necessary in the case of process-oriented evidence. Specific tasks are also able to show the aspects of regulation which other measures cannot possibly capture. According to Dörrenbächer-Ulrich et al. (2021), there was little convergence between various ways of measuring the same components of SRL among university students, which proves the importance of examining the regulation within specific learning circumstances. Multiple task-specific reflections are another approach, which is able to give an insight into students' experience of learning and the processes associated with it in terms of the difficulties which arise, strategies used and change made during the task. It is important to note that such reflections are self-reports and cannot be regarded as an observation of behaviour.

Task Transitions and the Present Study

Current literature strongly supports the idea that self-regulated learning (SRL) is adaptable based on the learning situation. The research that looks into multiple iterations of learning cycles has found that there is an evaluation of the previous method and planning of adaptation for the next iteration (Raković et al., 2022), whereas research into cross-task studies indicates that the regulatory behaviour may vary depending on the specific academic task in question (Panadero et al., 2025). Current longitudinal research has studied SRL in successive course work activities. For example, Heikkinen et al. (2025) used assignment submissions as key transitions for exploring how changes in self-regulation and engagement occurred throughout the entire process of online learning. There are also studies about the multi-stage assignments in universities in which researchers found that students face regulatory challenges and use resources such as feedback, peers, and classroom discussion to solve them (Apps et al., 2019). Thus, these studies show that SRL is an adaptable, task-dependent, and temporal process.

Yet, these areas of study do not adequately account for what occurs when students engage in the transition from sequentially related to interdependently related coursework activities. In such cases, the second activity is not just another attempt at doing a similar task, nor is it an unrelated activity done in different circumstances. Rather, students will need to draw upon what they have made or learnt in the previous task to then apply this knowledge to another task that has its own distinct set of performance expectations.

The process of transition deserves consideration because there can be various ways of student reaction to the new task. There may be some strategies that can prove to be relevant, but some may require certain changes for being applied under the conditions of the new task. It may also happen that the students will have to use the strategies that were not needed for completing the previous task. Despite the fact that there was enough research on adaptation throughout the learning cycle, differences in SRL between different types of tasks, regulation across successive coursework activities, and reactions of the students to the challenges encountered while performing multi-stage tasks, there is comparatively little research done on how the particular regulatory strategies are transferred and transformed when the output from one task serves as an input for the following task performed in a different way.

The present study addresses this issue by examining students' structured reflections across two sequential

individual coursework tasks. The first required students to conduct a written analysis, while the second required them to select and transform that analysis for oral communication. Rather than measuring whether students became “more” or “less” self-regulated, the study focuses on the challenges they reported, the regulatory practices they used in response, and how those practices changed as the nature of the task shifted.

The study therefore addresses the following research questions:

1. What task-related challenges do students report across two sequential academic tasks with different performance demands?
2. What regulatory practices do students report using in response to these challenges?
3. How are students’ regulatory practices maintained, adapted, or expanded as they transition from a written analytical task to an oral communicative task?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

In the present study, a qualitative longitudinal approach was employed to investigate self-regulated learning of students during two consecutive tasks. Instead of considering self-regulated learning as a general property of learners, this research paid attention to the students’ perceptions of the problems faced by them, actions taken in relation to the problems, and changes in those actions through the process of shifting from one task to another.

Both tasks were done successively, and both tasks were related in terms of content but were different in terms of execution. In the first task, the students were expected to do an analytic task, whereby they were to select a particular text, analyse the problems within the text, and justify the reasons for analysing that particular problem in a written report. In the second task, the students were expected to use the analysis made in the first task and present the results in an oral presentation using the presentation slides.

This research was not aimed at measuring changes in self-regulatory abilities among participants, but rather focused on exploring regulatory behaviours described by students during each task and on studying whether such behaviours persisted, modified, or evolved in the process of changing task demands.

Participants and Study Context

The participants in this study comprised diploma level students undertaking an English Language course at a Malaysian public university. The tasks were conducted as part of the normal course work assigned to the participants. To keep the identity of the participants and the particular course undisclosed, any information that could reveal these aspects were stripped out of the data used in this research study.

For Task 1, there were 19 students who offered useable reflections, while for Task 2, there were 20. In terms of the pair-wise cross-task analysis, 18 students gave useable reflections for both tasks and so they were considered in the analysis. While the task specific analysis made use of all useable data for that particular task, the cross-task analysis could make use only of the matched participants. Each individual participant was given an anonymous label, namely S01, S02, and so on.

Structured reflections by the students were carried out at various points during the process of completing each task. These structured reflections were not carried out retrospectively after the completion of coursework but while the work was still being done. Therefore, they offered an insight into the problems faced and changes made during the process.

Data Source

The primary data involved students’ reflection progress written reports which were done by the students during the two activities. These reflections were based on three questions which asked the students to report what they planned to do, challenges experienced when doing the activity and the progress that they made or what they

did after experiencing the challenges.

For the current research, the analysis centered mainly on the problems mentioned and their responses since these were the most explicit indicators of monitoring and modification. Planning was another factor included in the analysis in cases where it explained how the students understood the task, prioritised, or altered their previous line of action.

Reflections were considered as students' reports of their regulative activity, but not the actual records of behaviour itself. As such, the statements made in the reflections were understood as evidence of the behaviours reported by students to be occurring, and not as external verification of such an occurrence.

Data Analysis

The data were analysed in two stages. In the first stage, each of the tasks was analysed individually. Descriptive coding was done in order to see the problems that the students faced and the solutions they came up with. At this point, coding was very much aligned to what the students had said rather than assigning codes to the data in accordance with the predefined codes for self-regulated learning. Example codes of initial problems coded were suitability of the material, difficulty in classifying analytically, difficulty in providing justification, selecting appropriate content, and oral presentation.

Other codes were then classified into wider categories. The categories formed from the data for Task 1 included problems with task and material choice, analysis, explanation and organisation, and quality control. The categories from Task 2 included those of content choice and compression, organisation of presentation, oral presentation, and technical or production requirements. Responses to regulations were classified in the same manner according to patterns found in the students' narratives.

Two researchers coded the dataset independently to ensure the qualitative coding was accurate and reliable. After this initial stage, they followed a structured coding reconciliation process to compare their results and resolved any differences. They then discussed the variations in the way of interpreting and categorizing of the data. Through this, all coding discrepancies were fully resolved, achieving 100% final consensus between both coders.

Frequencies at participant level were provided as an indication of the extent to which specific categories occurred within each task dataset. A category was included only once per participant when there was unambiguous evidence of the occurrence of that category in the participant's responses regarding the given task. Therefore, multiple instances of the occurrence of the same category within the responses of one participant were not included in the frequency tally. Since students could identify several challenges or regulatory practices, the categories were not mutually exclusive. Percentage calculations were based on the number of valid reports regarding each task (Task 1, $n = 19$, Task 2, $n = 20$).

The second stage entailed paired cross-task analysis of the 18 students whose reflections were available for both tasks. Reflections from each participant were analysed separately to see how the regulation practices of that participant had been altered from Task 1 to Task 2. There were three types of comparisons made based on the patterns that emerged. These patterns include maintenance, adaptation, and expansion. Maintenance involved a particular regulatory practice being observed in the two tasks. Adaptation included a regulatory practice being maintained but being implemented differently owing to the second task. Expansion entailed new regulatory practices emerging in response to second task demands that were not part of the first task.

For instance, monitoring during Task 1 consisted of rereading the source texts and verifying analytical choices, while in Task 2, it consisted of looking at the slides, practicing, monitoring the presentation time, and verifying performance via recording. All these actions were viewed as extensions of monitoring in general rather than separate actions. On the other hand, activities like pronunciation monitoring and recording were considered extensions only when they resulted directly from the performance aspect of the second task.

The Winne and Hadwin Model of Self-Regulated Learning was applied in interpreting the findings especially

with regards to task definition, task monitoring, and task adaptation. The model was not used as a rigid coding guide during the first level of coding. However, it was used later after having identified task-related patterns from the participants' statements.

Ethical Considerations

The study received the necessary ethical clearance from the relevant institutional ethics committee before using the students' reflections for research purposes. The participants were all over the age of 18 and gave their informed consent for their reflections from their coursework to be used as research data. The participant in the study was entirely voluntary, and the choice whether to participate or not to participate in the study did not affect students' assessment.

Since the reflections were based on the coursework done by the students under one of the researchers, it was important to consider the power issue arising between the lecturer and student. Research involving the reflections was done after grading of the students' work had taken place to ensure that involvement in the research does not affect assessment in any way.

Any information that may lead to direct identification of the participants, such as names, identification number and course code, among others, were removed from the research data set. The participants were given an anonymous identifier (S01, S02, etc.) for use during analysis and presentation of results. Excerpts from the reflections were checked to eliminate any information that may unintentionally identify the participants.

FINDINGS

The analysis showed that students' reported challenges and responses changed across the two sequential tasks. In Task 1, the main difficulties centred upon selecting suitable material, carrying out the analysis, and explaining analytical decisions. Task 2 introduced a different set of demands, particularly selecting and condensing information for presentation, organising information for slides, and managing oral delivery. Across the two tasks, some regulatory practices continued, while others changed in form or emerged in response to the demands of the second task.

Challenges and Regulatory Responses in Task 1

Task 1 required students to select suitable material, analyse it, and present their analysis in a written report. Table 1 summarises the challenges and regulatory response identified across the 19 reports.

Table 1. Reported challenges and regulatory responses in Task 1

Category	n	%
Reported challenges		
Selecting or judging suitable material	18	94.7
Content/context analysis	16	84.2
Explaining or justifying analytical decisions	13	68.4
Detecting sufficient or varied problems	12	63.2
Understanding task requirements or concepts	9	47.4
Organisation, formatting, or requirement-related difficulty	9	47.4
Regulatory disruption (e.g., time, focus, frustration)	9	47.4
Uncertainty about final quality or completeness	9	47.4
Classifying identified problems	6	31.6
Reported regulatory responses		
Repeated review or reanalysis	16	84.2
Lecturer consultation	15	78.9
Reorganisation or elaboration	15	78.9
Revision following feedback	14	73.7

Final verification or proofreading	10	52.6
Peer or family help-seeking	9	47.4
Digital-tool assistance	8	42.1
External research or reference resources	7	36.8
Material replacement or major search adjustment	6	31.6

Note. N = 19. Frequencies represent the number of students whose reports contained evidence of each category. Categories were not mutually exclusive; therefore, percentages do not total 100%.

As shown in Table 1, the most widely reported challenge was selecting or judging the suitability of material (n = 18, 94.7%). Students sometimes found that their initial choices contained too few suitable problems for analysis, which led them to continue searching or replace the material. Difficulties with content and context analysis were also common (n = 16, 84.2%), followed by problems explaining or justifying analytical decisions (n = 13, 68.4%). These patterns show that students' difficulties went beyond identifying surface-level problems. They also had to determine whether their material was workable, distinguish between analytical categories, and explain the reasoning behind their decisions.

Repeated review or reanalysis was the most frequently reported response (n = 16, 84.2%). Students returned to their material or analysis when they were uncertain about earlier decision. Lecturer consultation was also prominent (n = 15, 78.9%) and was often followed by changes to the students' work. Fourteen students (73.7%) reported revision following feedback, while 15 (78.9%) reorganised or elaborated parts of their work.

The reports also showed that progress was not always straightforward. Students sometimes returned to earlier decisions after discovering that their material or analysis was unsuitable. In one case, a student changed the selected material at a late stage, which created renewed uncertainty about the analysis. The student later used lecturer consultation to regain direction and complete the task. Another student initially attempted to identify errors independently, later used Grammarly and Quillbot when uncertain, sought peer assistance when struggling with content and context analysis, and finally asked a peer to check the completed report.

A broader pattern was visible across the weekly reports. Early concerns tended to focus on understanding the task and finding workable material. Attention then shifted towards identifying and classifying problems and developing adequate justifications. Towards the end of the task, students increasingly focused on revision, completeness, formatting, and final checking. The focus of monitoring therefore changed as students moved through different stages of the task.

Changing Demands in Task 2

Task 2 required students to transform work produced in the earlier written task into an oral presentation. This created a different set of challenges. Rather than locating and analysing new material, students had to decide what information from their existing work should be retained, how much detail was necessary, and how the analysis could be communicated effectively in a more concise and visual format. Table 2 summarises the challenges identified across the 20 Task 2 reports.

Table 2. Reported challenges in Task 2

Reported challenge	n	%
Selecting representative information or examples	12	60.0
Organising slides or visual information	11	55.0
Managing presentation duration	10	50.0
Condensing detailed written information	9	45.0
Oral delivery, fluency, pronunciation, or confidence	8	40.0
Understanding presentation requirements	7	35.0
Ensuring final quality or completeness	7	35.0
Technical or recording difficulties	6	30.0
Regulatory disruption or time-management difficulty	5	25.0

Note. N = 20. Frequencies represent the number of students whose reports contained evidence of each category. Categories were not mutually exclusive; therefore, percentages do not total 100%.

The most widely reported challenge involved selecting representative information or examples for the presentation (n = 12, 60.0%). Students frequently had more material available from their written work than could reasonably be presented and therefore had to decide which findings were most important. Difficulties organising slides and visual information were also common (n = 11, 55.0%), while half of the students reported challenges associated with managing the required presentation duration (n = 10, 50.0%).

Condensing detailed written information was reported by nine students (45.0%). This involved more than simply shortening sentences. Students had to determine which information could be reduced, which points needed to remain visible on the slides, and which details could instead be communicated orally. One student, for example, reported difficulty shortening the written report and deciding which examples were most suitable for the presentation. The student responded by selecting keywords for the justification, reducing unnecessary information, and preparing speaking notes. During practice, the presentation exceeded the required duration and the student experienced stuttering and difficulty remembering some points. Further practice allowed the presentation to be delivered within the required time.

Another student described difficulty turning “long academic sentences” into shorter presentation points. The written material was subsequently paraphrased into shorter points, while additional information was reserved for oral explanation. When the presentation exceeded the required duration, the student reduced the speech length before recording again.

These accounts show that students were not simply reproducing their earlier written work in another format. They were making decisions about what should remain visible, what could be communicated orally, and what could be omitted. The information developed in Task 1 was therefore reconsidered according to the communicative demands of Task 2.

Organisation also remained important, although its form changed. Students had to consider slide sequence, visual density, speaking points, and the relationship between written and spoken information. In some cases, consultation prompted substantial revision. One student, for example, reported omitting unnecessary pages, simplifying information, reorganising the analysis, converting justifications into bullet points, and shortening the conclusion following feedback.

Regulating Oral and Multimodal Performance

The transition to oral presentation introduced regulatory demands that had little equivalent in the written task. Ten students (50.0%) reported difficulties related to presentation duration, while eight (40.0%) described problems involving oral delivery, fluency, pronunciation, or confidence. Technical or recording difficulties were reported by six students (30.0%).

Rehearsal, timing, script adjustment, and repeated recording consequently became important ways of responding to these demands. One student reported making multiple recordings because stuttering and unintended slurring affected the quality of the presentation. Another described conducting several practice sessions to improve pronunciation, articulation, confidence, timing, and reliance on notes before completing the final recording.

Timing also took on a different role in Task 2. In the written task, time-related concerns were generally associated with workload, delays, or completing the assignment before submission. In Task 2, presentation duration became a specific performance standard against which students could monitor their work. One student reported recording several times after exceeding seven minutes and shortening the script before completing the final recording within the required duration. Another described the difficulty of deciding how much information could be included without exceeding the allotted time or producing an incomplete explanation.

Technical demands also became part of the regulatory process. Students reported problems involving

presentation software, devices, internet connectivity, recording, saving, and video playback. One student, for example, experienced repeated problems with presentation software and a laptop before discovering that the recorded video was playing at an incorrect speed and required further editing.

The object of monitoring therefore broadened in Task 2. Whereas Task 1 monitoring was directed primarily towards textual and analytical concerns, the presentation required students to attend simultaneously to content, visual organisation, oral performance, timing, and technical production.

Continuity, Adaptation, and Expansion Across Tasks

The paired analysis examined the 18 students for whom usable structured reflections were available for both tasks. Comparison of their reports showed that students did not simply abandon the regulatory practices used in Task 1 when they moved to Task 2. Instead, three broad patterns were evident: maintenance, adaptation, and expansion.

Some regulatory practices continued across both tasks. These included help-seeking, responding to feedback, revising work, monitoring progress, and carrying out final checks. However, even where the broader regulatory function remained, the way it was enacted often changed.

Table 3 summarises these cross-task patterns.

Table 3. Changes in reported regulatory practices across the two sequential tasks

Regulatory function	Task 1: Written analytical task	Task 2: Oral presentation task	Cross-task pattern
Monitoring	Rereading source material; reanalysing problems; checking justifications	Reviewing slides; rehearsing; checking timing, pronunciation, and recordings	Adapted
Selection	Selecting suitable material and analysable problems	Selecting representative findings and essential information	Adapted
Organisation	Organising categories, tables, and written sections	Organising slides, visual information, and speaking points	Adapted
Revision	Rewriting and elaborating analytical explanations	Condensing, paraphrasing, and restructuring content	Adapted
Help-seeking	Lecturer and peer support for task clarification and analysis	Lecturer and peer support for presentation and content decisions	Maintained / Adapted
Feedback use	Revising analysis following feedback	Revising slides and presentation content following feedback	Maintained
Final checking	Checking accuracy, completeness, formatting, and references	Checking slides, speech, timing, and recording	Adapted
Oral-performance regulation	Not prominent	Scripting, rehearsal, timing, pronunciation/fluency monitoring, and rerecording	Expanded
Technical regulation	Limited	Recording, editing, and technical troubleshooting	Expanded

The clearest cross-task pattern was adaptation. Students continued to perform regulatory functions such as monitoring, selecting, organising, and revising, but the behaviours used to carry out these functions changed as the task demands shifted.

Selection provides a clear example. In Task 1, students were concerned with finding material that offered sufficient opportunities for analysis. In Task 2, the material had already been analysed, so selection became a question of deciding which findings were important enough to communicate to an audience. Organisation changed in a similar way, moving from the arrangement of analytical categories and written sections to the

coordination of slides, visual information, and speaking points.

Revision also changed noticeably. During Task 1, revision often involved adding detail, correcting the analysis, or expanding weak justifications. Task 2 frequently required the opposite response. Detailed written explanations had to be shortened, paraphrased, or converted into keywords and bullet points so that they could function effectively in a presentation. The student who described converting “long academic sentences” into shorter points while reserving additional information for oral explanation provides a clear example of this shift.

At the same time, some practices remained recognisable across the two tasks. Help-seeking continued to appear, although the reason for seeking assistance sometimes changed. In Task 1, students commonly sought help with analytical decisions, task requirements, or content and context distinctions. In Task 2, assistance was more often connected with presentation structure, content selection, slide organisation, and final checking. The regulatory function was therefore maintained, but its immediate purpose changed with the task.

The transition also expanded the range of reported regulatory practices. Script and speaking-note preparation, rehearsal, presentation timing, pronunciation monitoring, repeated recording, and technical troubleshooting became more visible in Task 2. These practices responded to performance conditions that were not central to the earlier written task.

Overall, the findings do not point to a simple increase or decrease in self-regulation. Rather, students’ reported regulatory practices were reconfigured as the demands of the task changed. Some practices remained relatively stable, others were adapted to serve a different purpose, and additional practices emerged in response to the oral and multimodal demands of the second task.

DISCUSSION

This study examined students’ reported self-regulatory practices across two sequential academic tasks with different performance demands. Three findings are particularly important. First, students’ regulation within a task was not always linear, as difficulties sometimes led them to revisit earlier decisions and modify their approach. Second, although several regulatory functions remained visible across the two tasks, the way these functions were carried out changed when students moved from written analysis to oral presentation. Third, the second task introduced additional demands that led students to report regulatory practices that were largely absent from the first task. Together, these findings suggest that self-regulation is shaped not only by what learners are able to do, but also by what a particular task requires them to regulate.

Regulation as a Recursive Process

The findings from Task 1 provide support for viewing self-regulation as a recursive rather than strictly linear process. Students did not consistently move from planning to task completion without returning to earlier decisions. Some discovered that their selected material was unsuitable after beginning the analysis, while others revisited classifications, explanations, or earlier interpretations after encountering difficulties or receiving feedback. In several cases, progress involved reconsidering an earlier choice and changing the approach before the task could continue.

This pattern is consistent with Winne and Hadwin’s conceptualisation of SRL, in which task definition, goal setting and planning, strategy enactment, and adaptation can operate recursively rather than as a fixed sequence (Winne & Hadwin, 1998; Panadero, 2017). Monitoring is central to this process because information generated while completing a task may lead learners to reassess whether their current approach is adequate. A student who initially considers a source suitable, for example, may later revise that judgement after attempting to analyse it. The change of material observed in several reports can therefore be understood as more than a practical response to difficulty. It reflects a change in the learner’s assessment of the task conditions and the suitability of the original approach.

The findings also show that adaptation did not always occur immediately. Some reports included periods of uncertainty, frustration, procrastination, or stalled progress before a different strategy was adopted. This is

worth noting because accounts of SRL can sometimes give the impression that monitoring naturally produces an effective adjustment. The present data show a less orderly process. Students could recognise a problem without immediately knowing how to resolve it, and an initial response could itself prove ineffective.

This adds some nuance to the relationship between evaluation and adaptation reported by Raković et al. (2022). Their findings showed that students' evaluations of previous studying predicted plans for adaptation, which were subsequently associated with changes in learning behaviour. The present study similarly suggests a connection between recognising that an existing approach is inadequate and modifying subsequent action. However, the progress reflections also show the uncertainty that can occur between these points. Recognising a mismatch did not necessarily provide students with an immediate solution. In some cases, additional resources, lecturer feedback, peer support, or repeated attempts were needed before progress resumed.

Another pattern within Task 1 was the changing object of monitoring. At the beginning of the task, students were largely concerned with understanding what was required and whether they had selected workable material. As the task progressed, monitoring shifted towards analytical accuracy, classification, and justification. Towards submission, students increasingly checked the quality and completeness of the final product. Monitoring therefore remained relevant throughout the task, but what was being monitored changed.

This supports a process-oriented view of SRL in which regulatory activity develops alongside the task rather than occurring as a single planning or checking event. It also suggests that examining students' reflections at several points during authentic coursework can reveal changes that may be obscured when SRL is measured only as a general tendency.

Self-Regulation as Task-Sensitive

The comparison between the two tasks provides clearer evidence that regulatory activity was sensitive to task demands. The students entered Task 2 with work already produced in Task 1, but this did not mean that the regulatory demands simply continued unchanged. Moving from written analysis to oral presentation changed what students needed to select, organise, monitor, and revise.

This finding is consistent with research showing that SRL can vary according to the nature and conditions of a task. Panadero et al. (2025), for example, found differences in students' regulatory activity across reading, oral-analysis, and written-analysis tasks. The present study extends this perspective by examining sequential and interdependent tasks rather than separate task types. The second task was connected directly to the first because students had to work with material they had already analysed. At the same time, it required them to use that material for a different communicative purpose.

This distinction was particularly visible in selection. During Task 1, selection concerned finding material that provided sufficient opportunities for analysis. During Task 2, the issue was no longer whether the material was workable. Instead, students had to determine which parts of an already completed analysis were important enough to communicate within the constraints of an oral presentation. The regulatory function of selection remained, but the criteria used to make those decisions changed.

A similar change occurred in revision. Task 1 frequently required students to elaborate: explanations had to be expanded, justifications strengthened, and analytical gaps addressed. Task 2 often required the reverse. Students had to reduce written explanations, identify keywords, paraphrase longer sentences, and decide which information could be moved from the slides into oral delivery. What counted as an effective revision therefore depended on the communicative demands of the task. Adding detail could improve performance in one context while making the product less effective in another.

The findings consequently support the argument that identifying a strategy without considering its purpose and context provides only a partial account of regulation. "Revision," "monitoring," or "organisation" may appear in more than one task, but the same label can describe quite different actions. What matters is not simply whether a learner reports using a strategy, but what the strategy is being used to regulate at that particular point.

Continuity, Adaptation, and Expansion Across the Task Transition

The paired analysis adds another dimension to task-sensitive SRL by showing that the transition between tasks involved more than differences in strategy frequency. The students' reports pointed to three forms of cross-task change: maintenance, adaptation, and expansion.

Maintenance was evident when broader regulatory practices continued to serve similar purposes. Help-seeking, feedback use, revision, and final checking appeared in both tasks. Students continued to draw on lecturers and peers when uncertain and continued to review their work before submission. This continuity suggests that a change in task does not necessarily require learners to replace their existing regulatory repertoire.

Adaptation was more prominent. Monitoring, selection, organisation, and revision remained visible across both tasks, but their form changed. Rereading and reanalysis in the written task developed into slide review, rehearsal, timing, and recording checks in the oral task. Report organisation became the organisation of visual information and speaking points. Elaborating analytical explanations gave way to condensing those explanations for presentation.

This distinction between regulatory function and regulatory form may be useful for understanding how students manage transitions between related academic tasks. A strategy may appear different at the behavioural level while continuing to perform a similar regulatory function. Conversely, the same broad strategy label may conceal meaningful changes in what learners are attempting to achieve.

The transition also involved expansion. Oral delivery introduced requirements that had little equivalent in the written analytical task, including rehearsal, speech timing, pronunciation monitoring, repeated recording, and the management of technical problems. These practices expanded what students needed to regulate because the final product now involved spoken and visual performance as well as content.

The findings therefore suggest that movement between interdependent tasks can lead to a reconfiguration of students' reported regulatory repertoires. Existing practices may be retained where they remain useful, modified where the task changes their purpose, and supplemented where new demands emerge. This interpretation differs from treating SRL development simply as an increase in the amount or frequency of strategy use. In the present study, the important change was not that students necessarily became "more self-regulated" in Task 2. Rather, they reported regulating different aspects of their performance in different ways.

The increased complexity of monitoring in Task 2 illustrates this particularly well. During the written task, monitoring was directed largely towards textual and analytical concerns. The presentation required students to monitor content while also considering visual organisation, speech, fluency, timing, and recording quality. The regulatory environment had therefore become multimodal. Students' reported practices changed accordingly. This highlights how self-monitoring demands in traditional monomodal writing tasks changed in multimodal presentation. A multimodal presentation forces students to cope with two cognitive demands concurrently: visual slide design and real-time speech timing while monomodal only requires them to monitor text structure and logical analysis. Multimodal presentation also demands students to manage visual layout (such as creating text on slides) which creates visual cognitive load while managing oral delivery (such as controlling pronunciation, pace, and time limits) demands an auditory cognitive load. They also need to focus on body movement demands, (such as maintaining appropriate gestures). As students need to focus on these demands simultaneously, their self-monitoring becomes more active and complex. This will prompt them to adopt new regulatory practices such as rehearsing, timing their speech and re-recording their performances.

This finding contributes to existing work on task-sensitive and process-oriented SRL by drawing attention to the transition between connected tasks. Previous studies have shown that regulatory activity varies according to task conditions and that learners may adapt across learning cycles. The present findings suggest that it may also be useful to examine what is carried forward when one academic task becomes the basis for another, and how existing regulatory practices are reshaped when the expected form of performance changes.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings have several implications for the design of sequential coursework. If students are expected to transfer work from one task to another, it may not be sufficient to assume that strategies developed during the first task will automatically suit the second. Students may need support in recognising which aspects of their existing approach can be retained, and which need to change. More broadly, evidence from university settings indicates that SRL-focused training can improve students' use of metacognitive and resource-management strategies as well as academic performance (Theobald, 2021).

One example concerns the movement from written to oral communication. Previous work has likewise positioned self-assessment and self-regulation as relevant to the development of university students' oral presentation skills (Benraghda et al., 2022). Students in this study often struggled to reduce detailed written explanations without losing important information. Explicit instruction in selecting key ideas, converting extended explanations into speaking points, and deciding what belongs on a slide rather than in oral delivery may therefore support this transition. Similarly, rehearsal can be framed as more than presentation practice. Timing a presentation, listening to a recording, noticing problems, and modifying the next attempt can provide students with opportunities to monitor and adapt their performance.

The findings also highlight the role of feedback and help-seeking across both tasks. Lecturer and peer support did not appear only when students lacked knowledge; it often helped them evaluate an existing decision and determine what needed to change. Providing opportunities for consultation at points where task demands shift may therefore be particularly useful in sequential assessment.

More broadly, task design can provide opportunities for students to reuse knowledge while requiring them to regulate that knowledge differently. A second task that simply repeats the first may offer fewer opportunities for adaptation. In contrast, connected tasks with different communicative demands can require students to reconsider how existing knowledge should be selected, organised, revised, and presented.

CONCLUSION

This study focused on students' self-reported self-regulation strategies in two sequential and interdependent academic activities where different types of performance were required. It was found that the regulation shifted along with the students' required activity. While the first task (written) focused on material choice, analysis, justification and revision of the writing, the second task (oral) had additional requirements regarding content choice and compression, visual organisation, delivery, timing, and technical aspects of the performance.

During the shift between the two tasks, the regulatory activities revealed continuity as well as change. Some regulatory activities such as help-seeking and feedback were used consistently during both tasks. Others such as monitoring, selection, organisation, revision, and checking were modified to meet the demands of the oral presentation. In the second task, new regulatory activities such as rehearsal, monitoring pronunciation and fluency, controlling time, rerecording, and technical problem-solving also appeared. Such changes do not simply reveal that students were becoming more or less self-regulated, rather they reveal a transformation of regulation.

The findings therefore highlight the importance of examining self-regulation between, as well as within, academic tasks. Sequential assessments may allow students to build on earlier work, but a change in purpose or performance mode can require them to reconsider how that work is selected, organised, monitored, and communicated. Supporting students through these transitions may help them recognise which regulatory practices remain useful, which require adaptation, and when new forms of regulation are needed.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study was based on students' structured written reflections. These reflections provide access to what students reported noticing, experiencing, and doing as they progressed through the tasks, but they do not provide direct evidence of the

regulatory processes themselves. Students may have omitted strategies they used, described their actions selectively, or differed in the amount of detail they provided. The findings should therefore be understood as patterns in reported regulatory activity rather than as a complete record of students' behaviour.

Second, the reflections were originally produced as part of regular coursework rather than designed specifically as a research instrument for measuring SRL. This offered the advantage of capturing students' experiences within naturally occurring academic tasks, but the prompts did not systematically target every dimension of self-regulation. Future studies could combine progress reflections with stimulated-recall interviews, observations, screen recordings, digital trace data, or other process-oriented measures to examine how reported strategies correspond with students' actions during task completion.

Third, the study involved a relatively small group of students within a single educational context and focused on two specific academic tasks. The findings are therefore not intended to represent how students regulate learning across all written and oral tasks. Different disciplines, proficiency levels, task sequences, or modes of assessment may create different regulatory demands. Replication across larger and more diverse student populations would help determine whether similar patterns of maintenance, adaptation, and expansion occur in other contexts.

The present study also examined a particular transition from written analytical work to oral communication. Future research could investigate other interdependent task sequences, such as reading-to-writing, individual-to-collaborative work, written-to-digital production, or formative-to-summative tasks. Comparing different transitions may help establish whether particular forms of regulatory adaptation are specific to certain modes of performance or reflect broader patterns in how students respond when task demands change.

Finally, future research could examine these transitions over a longer period. Following students across several connected tasks or an entire course would make it possible to investigate whether newly introduced regulatory practices are retained and subsequently transferred to later tasks. Such work could help distinguish temporary responses to immediate task demands from more enduring changes in students' regulatory repertoires.

Overall, the present study highlights the value of examining self-regulation between as well as within academic tasks. When one task becomes the starting point for another, the transition itself becomes an important site of regulation. Attention to what students retain, modify, and add during these transitions may provide a fuller understanding of self-regulated learning as it unfolds in authentic academic work.

REFERENCES

1. Apps, T., Beckman, K., Bennett, S., Dalgarno, B., Kennedy, G., & Lockyer, L. (2019). The role of social cues in supporting students to overcome challenges in online multi-stage assignments. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 42, 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2019.03.004>
2. Benraghda, A., Mohd Radzuan, N. R., & Lardhi, F. A. S. (2022). Self-assessment as a self-regulated learning approach in English oral presentations: College students' choices and perceptions. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2123472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2123472>
3. Dörrenbächer-Ulrich, L., Weißenfels, M., Russer, L., & Perels, F. (2021). Multimethod assessment of self regulated learning in college students: Different methods for different components? *Instructional Science*, 49, 137–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-020-09533-2>
- Greene, J. A., Hutchison, L. A., Costa, L.-J., & Crompton, H. (2012). Investigating how college students' task definitions and plans relate to self-regulated learning processing and understanding of a complex science topic. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 37(4), 307–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2012.02.002>
4. Heikkinen, S., Saqr, M., Malmberg, J., & Tedre, M. (2025). A longitudinal study of interplay between student engagement and self-regulation. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22, Article 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00523-3>
5. Lämsä, J., de Mooij, S., Aksela, O., Athavale, S., Bistolfi, I., Azevedo, R., Bannert, M., Gašević, D., Molenaar, I., & Järvelä, S. (2025). Measuring secondary education students' self-regulated

- learning processes with digital trace data. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 118, Article 102625. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2024.102625>
6. Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, Article 422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>
7. Panadero, E., Fernández-Ortúe, A., Zamorano, D., Pinedo, L., Sánchez-Iglesias, I., & Barrenetxea-Mínguez, L. (2025). Tracking self-regulated learning in action: How individual differences shape positive and negative regulation across three types of tasks. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 124, Article 102808. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2025.102808>
8. Raković, M., Bernacki, M. L., Greene, J. A., Plumley, R. D., Hogan, K. A., Gates, K. M., & Panter, A. T. (2022). Examining the critical role of evaluation and adaptation in self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 68, Article 102027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.102027>
9. Saint, J., Fan, Y., Gašević, D., & Pardo, A. (2022). Temporally-focused analytics of self-regulated learning: A systematic review of literature. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3, Article 100060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100060>
10. Seufert, T., Hamm, V., Vogt, A., & Riemer, V. (2024). The interplay of cognitive load, learners' resources and self-regulation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36, Article 50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09890-1>
11. Shen, B., & Bai, B. (2024). Enhancing Chinese university students' writing performance and self-regulated learning (SRL) writing strategy use through a strategy-based intervention. *System*, 122, Article 103249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103249>
12. Theobald, M. (2021). Self-regulated learning training programs enhance university students' academic performance, self-regulated learning strategies, and motivation: A meta-analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 66, Article 101976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.101976>
13. Winne, P. H., & Hadwin, A. F. (1998). Studying as self-regulated learning. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in educational theory and practice* (pp. 277–304). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410602350>