Journal of Learning for Development 13(4), 2026, 771-779.

When Access Does Not Become Engagement: Rethinking Learner Readiness in Post-Pandemic Blended Higher Education

Chamil Arkhasa Nikko Mazlan[1, 2]

[1]*Department of Music and Music Education, Faculty of Music and Performing Arts, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Perak, Malaysia*
[2]*Faculty of Music, Akademi Seni Budaya dan Warisan Kebangsaan, Wilayah Persekutuan, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

Keywords
blended learning, learner readiness, student engagement, self-regulated learning, learning management system, higher education

Abstract

Post-pandemic higher education has normalised blended learning through learning management systems, uploaded materials, online instructions, and flexible access to digital resources. Yet, access does not automatically become engagement. This commentary argues that low student engagement in blended learning should not be interpreted simply as learner unreadiness or lecturer failure. Instead, it reveals an access-engagement gap: a condition in which digital platforms, course materials, and instructions are available, but the learning ecosystem does not sufficiently convert this provision into learner agency, self-regulation, interaction, and sustained participation. The access-engagement gap is proposed as a diagnostic lens rather than as a new psychometric construct. Its contribution lies in identifying an implementation-level problem: the tendency to treat the provision of digital access as evidence that learner readiness and engagement have already been secured. Drawing on a reflective 14-week blended teaching experience, foundational theories of self-regulated learning and educational presence and recent literature on blended learning readiness, student engagement, and self-regulated learning, the paper argues that readiness for blended learning is ecological rather than merely technological. Higher education must therefore move beyond uploading materials toward designing learning pathways that help students learn, relearn, and unlearn how learning happens across physical and digital spaces.

Introduction: When Materials Are Uploaded but Engagement Remains Low

Post-pandemic higher education has normalised blended learning. Lecturers upload materials, prepare weekly instructions, provide links to readings and activities, and use learning management systems (LMSs) to organise teaching across the semester. Yet the presence of digital access does not necessarily produce meaningful engagement. The LMS may be active, the weekly structure may be visible, and the resources may be available, but student participation can still remain uneven, minimal, or passive.

This commentary begins from that pedagogical tension. In one blended teaching experience, a complete 14-week learning structure was provided through the LMS, including instructions, learning resources, and activity expectations. The course site was organised across

Published by Commonwealth of Learning, Canada
CC BY-SA 4.0

the semester so that students could locate weekly materials and identify the activities expected of them. Nevertheless, the visibility and availability of these resources did not consistently result in sustained or active participation. This experience is used here as a reflective pedagogical starting point rather than as formal empirical evidence; no systematic student data, identifiable information, or participant quotations were reported. This raised a difficult but important question: if access has been provided, why does engagement remain limited? Is the problem located in student readiness, lecturer pedagogy, institutional support, or the wider learning culture?

The argument advanced here is that low engagement in blended learning should not be interpreted simply as learner unreadiness or lecturer failure. Rather, it reveals an access-engagement gap: a condition in which platforms, materials, and instructions are available, but the learning ecosystem does not sufficiently support learner agency, self-regulation, interaction, and sustained participation. When access is mistaken for engagement, institutions may assume that blended learning has been successfully implemented simply because resources are online. The more important question is whether the blended learning ecosystem supports students to become autonomous, reflective, and active learners. The argument is not that previous research has overlooked the relationship between readiness and engagement. That relationship is already well established. The contribution of the access-engagement gap is more specific: it names the mistaken institutional and pedagogical inference that providing technological access is equivalent to establishing the conditions through which purposeful engagement can develop. It therefore shifts attention from whether students possess readiness as an individual attribute to whether the learning environment actively helps transform access into participation.

The Access-Engagement Gap in Blended Learning

Research on e-learning and blended learning readiness has grown substantially in higher education. Maan and Malhotra's (2024) bibliometric analysis shows that students' readiness for e-learning has become an expanding area of inquiry across countries, institutions, and disciplines. However, readiness is often framed through measurable dimensions such as technological competence, access, self-efficacy, and attitudes. These dimensions are useful, but they do not fully explain why students who can access online materials may still not engage meaningfully. Research also indicates that the components of readiness should not be treated as interchangeable. Yasin et al. (2020), for example, found that technology access contributed positively to blended-learning readiness but did not directly improve students' attitudes. Saqui and Al-Amin (2024) similarly conceptualise readiness through multiple relationships involving technological support, flexibility, satisfaction, and attitudes towards blended and face-to-face learning. These findings show that technological provision is an important condition, but it is not sufficient to generate the motivational, behavioural, and pedagogical conditions required for engagement.

This is where the access-engagement gap becomes important. Dimo et al. (2024) link technological readiness with online learning self-efficacy, while Weng and Wirda (2025) show that online learning readiness influences engagement and satisfaction, with engagement functioning as an important pathway toward academic outcomes. Together, these studies indicate that readiness is not merely technical. It is also motivational, behavioural, pedagogical, and relational.

Clarifying the Contribution of the Access-Engagement Gap

The access-engagement gap does not replace existing readiness or engagement frameworks. Weng and Wirda (2025), for example, examine the relationship through which online-learning readiness influences engagement, satisfaction, and achievement. De Bruijn-Smolders and Prinsen (2024), meanwhile, synthesise the academic, behavioural, cognitive, and affective dimensions of engagement and examine the design features associated with effective participation. The access-engagement gap operates at a different analytical level. It identifies an implementation-level assumption that providing access to a platform, resources, or instructions is sufficient evidence that students are ready and meaningfully engaged.

Its novelty therefore lies not in claiming that readiness affects engagement, but in exposing a recurrent implementation error within post-pandemic blended learning. This error occurs when the visible provision of technology and content obscures less visible weaknesses in learning design, teaching presence, interaction, assessment alignment, self-regulatory support, or institutional culture. Used in this way, the access-engagement gap is a diagnostic question: What conditions are missing between the availability of a learning opportunity and students' sustained participation in it?

An LMS may provide access, but it does not automatically create engagement. Uploaded slides do not guarantee reading. Weekly instructions do not guarantee planning. Online forums do not guarantee discussion. Flexible access does not guarantee learner autonomy. A systematic review by de Bruijn-Smolders and Prinsen (2024) further highlights that engagement in blended learning is multidimensional, involving academic, behavioural, cognitive, and affective dimensions. Therefore, engagement cannot be reduced to platform analytics, attendance, or task submission. It concerns the quality of students' relationship with learning itself.

Is the Issue the Learner, the Pedagogy, or the Ecosystem?

When blended learning does not produce the expected engagement, it is tempting to ask whether students are truly ready for online or blended learning. This question is valid, but it can easily become deficit oriented. It may imply that students are passive, unmotivated, or lacking discipline. While learner responsibility matters, this explanation is incomplete.

Another response is to blame pedagogy. Low engagement may reflect weak instructional design, unclear tasks, insufficient interaction, or limited lecturer facilitation. This explanation is also partly valid. Blended learning requires more than transferring conventional materials into an LMS. It requires purposeful sequencing, meaningful interaction, feedback loops, and structured opportunities for students to prepare, apply, reflect, and revise.

However, the deeper issue is not only the learner or the lecturer. It is the ecosystem. Blended learning involves interrelations among students, lecturers, digital platforms, course design, institutional policies, assessment expectations, infrastructure, and learning culture. Earlier work on blended learning ecosystems emphasised the importance of stakeholder relationships and e-learning infrastructure (Nikolaidou et al., 2009), while El Habti et al. (2022) describe the ecosystem as involving learners, teachers, technologies, infrastructure, and e-learning culture.

The Community of Inquiry framework provides a foundational explanation for why access alone is insufficient. Garrison et al. (2000) conceptualise meaningful educational experience through the interaction of cognitive presence, social presence, and teaching presence. From this perspective, an LMS may contain extensive content while still offering weak opportunities for knowledge construction, interpersonal participation, or visible instructional

guidance. The availability of learning materials therefore represents only part of the educational environment; meaningful engagement depends on how students encounter ideas, people, guidance, feedback, and opportunities to contribute.

This ecological view moves the discussion beyond blame. If students are not engaging with online materials, they may not simply be unwilling to learn. They may be used to teacher-directed learning cultures where independent preparation is treated as optional unless it is assessed, monitored, or visibly connected to classroom activity. They may also prioritise assessed products over formative engagement because assessment culture rewards completion more than learning process does.

Lecturers, too, are adapting. Many were required to use LMSs and blended formats rapidly during and after the pandemic, but not all were supported to redesign pedagogy for these environments. Watuleke et al. (2026) emphasise the importance of collaborative course design, peer mentorship, institutional recognition, and relational digital pedagogy. Thus, low engagement should be read as a signal that higher education may have adopted blended learning tools faster than it has transformed learning culture.

Self-Regulated Learning as the Missing Bridge

A recurring issue in blended learning research is self-regulated learning. Blended environments require students to manage time, plan learning, monitor progress, control distractions, and decide when and how to engage. This makes self-regulation central to learner readiness rather than an optional study skill. Foundational self-regulated learning theory helps explain why the provision of resources cannot be expected to produce these capacities automatically. Zimmerman (2002) conceptualises self-regulation as a cyclical process involving forethought, performance, and self-reflection. Pintrich (2000) likewise shows that learners regulate not only cognition but also motivation, behaviour, and aspects of the learning context. These processes require learners to establish goals, select strategies, monitor their performance, respond to feedback, and adapt their subsequent actions.

Lobos et al. (2024) conceptualised self-regulated learning in blended learning as a process through which students structure, monitor, and evaluate their learning using reflection and digital technologies. Similarly, Nikolopoulou (2023) found that self-regulated and mobile-mediated learning in blended tertiary environments is shaped by course structure, online activities, educational materials, infrastructure, and the roles of both students and teachers. These studies suggest that self-regulation should not be treated only as an internal student trait; it is also enabled or constrained by the design of the learning environment. This distinction is central to the access-engagement gap. Students may be able to enter an LMS and retrieve a resource without necessarily knowing how to plan its use, judge its importance, connect it to subsequent learning, or monitor whether they have understood it. Access enables an action, but self-regulation gives that action purpose, sequence, and continuity. An integration of personalised learning, self-regulated learning, and technology is essential in enhancing the quality of student learning (Adhya & Panda, 2026).

This has direct implications for LMS-based teaching. A course site should not function merely as a file repository but as a learning pathway that helps students understand what to do before, during, and after class. Yang and Yahaya (2025) argue that blended instructional design should intentionally incorporate self-regulated learning strategies to bridge technological adoption and deep cognitive engagement. In practical terms, students need visible links between online preparation, classroom interaction, assessment, and feedback.

They also require explicit support in goal-setting, study planning, strategy selection, time management, and help-seeking. Zhang (2019) identified these as areas in which students in blended and flipped environments particularly needed guidance. Reminders, progress checkpoints, low-stakes participation, and modelling can therefore be understood not as excessive lecturer control, but as temporary scaffolds through which students learn to regulate their own participation.

Therefore, the LMS should not only answer the question, "Where are the materials?" It should also help students answer: What should I do first? How do I know I am prepared? How does this activity connect to assessment? How do I monitor my progress? How do I seek support? These questions are central to learner readiness because they connect access with purposeful engagement.

Research also suggests that instructional refinement can improve engagement and readiness. Ngo (2026), in a qualitative evaluation of a flipped blended learning model, found that students initially experienced cognitive overload and limited readiness for self-regulated learning, but later reported improved clarity, workload manageability, and motivation after design revisions. This supports the argument that low engagement should not be treated as fixed learner weakness. It can be addressed through scaffolding, clearer task sequencing, stronger teacher presence, and iterative course redesign.

Learn, Relearn and Unlearn Blended Learning

The post-pandemic moment requires higher education to learn, unlearn, and relearn. Although the phrase is often associated with future-oriented discussions of literacy and adaptability, it is more useful here as an analytic lens for institutional and pedagogical change. In organisational learning literature, unlearning refers to the difficulty of letting go of routines, assumptions, or practices that no longer fit changed conditions, while relearning involves developing new ways of acting and understanding after disruption (Sharma & Lenka, 2019; Starbuck, 2017).

Its transfer from organisational learning to blended teaching is justified because the challenge is not solely one of changing individual student behaviour. Blended learning also requires educators and institutions to reconsider collectively established routines concerning course design, content delivery, assessment, workload, technology use, and learner responsibility. The lens therefore helps explain why digital adoption alone may not transform learning culture when the routines surrounding teaching and learning remain largely unchanged.

First, institutions and educators must learn how students actually engage in blended environments. Engagement cannot be assumed from access. Students' learning habits, digital distractions, emotional readiness, workload pressures, and assessment priorities must be better understood.

Second, educators must unlearn the assumption that teaching has occurred when content has been delivered. Uploading materials is not the same as facilitating learning. Providing instructions is not the same as developing readiness. Giving access is not the same as ensuring equity. The danger is that "readiness" becomes a polite way of blaming students, when low engagement may actually reveal how learning has been designed, rewarded, and understood.

Third, higher education must relearn pedagogy for spaces that are no longer purely physical or purely online. Blended learning is not simply a combination of face-to-face and online delivery. It is a redesign of learning relationships across time, space, tools, and interaction. Effective blended learning requires decisions about what is best done independently,

what requires teacher presence, what benefits from peer interaction, and what should be assessed or reflected upon.

This does not remove learner responsibility. Students must still develop planning, time management, digital discipline, and reflective habits. However, these capacities should not be expected to emerge automatically. They need to be taught, practised, supported, and valued through assessment and feedback.

From Reflection to Action: Implications for Learner Success

The reflective 14-week teaching experience introduced earlier illustrates the practical significance of the access-engagement gap. The course already contained weekly materials, instructions, and activity expectations. The central issue was therefore not simply the absence of resources. The reflection suggests that a further design question is necessary: Did the course structure make the purpose, sequence, expected effort, and subsequent use of each learning activity sufficiently visible to students? Reframing the LMS as a pathway rather than a repository provides a practical response to this question. Four implications follow.

First, LMS design should shift from storage to pathway. Course sites should not merely provide documents; they should guide students through learning sequences. Weekly sections can include preparation tasks, interaction points, reflection prompts, and explicit links to assessment so that students understand how online engagement contributes to learning. More specifically, each weekly section can identify:

1. the purpose of the week's learning;
2. what students should complete before class;
3. the expected time or level of effort;
4. how students can check whether they are prepared;
5. how the activity will be used during class, peer interaction, or assessment; and
6. where students can obtain support.

A brief preparatory question, completion check, discussion contribution, or reflection prompt can make the pathway visible without converting every activity into high-stakes assessment.

Second, self-regulated learning should be taught rather than assumed. Students need guidance in planning, monitoring progress, managing distractions, and preparing before class. These are not merely personal habits; they are academic learning practices that can be modelled, scaffolded, and reinforced through low-stakes tasks, feedback, and reflection.

At the beginning of a course, lecturers can model how to interpret weekly instructions, estimate the time required for a task, establish a study plan, identify distraction risks, and evaluate whether preparation has been adequate. Progress prompts, short planning templates, assessment wrappers, and reflective checklists can initially provide structure. These scaffolds should then be reduced gradually as students develop greater independence. The intention is not to monitor students indefinitely, but to make the processes of self-regulation visible until students can perform them more autonomously.

Third, interaction and educational presence must be designed deliberately. Online forums, video meetings, and collaborative documents do not produce interaction simply because they are available. Students need a clear reason to contribute, an identifiable audience, and evidence that their participation influences subsequent learning. Lecturers can connect

preparatory work to classroom discussion, respond selectively to emerging misconceptions, use peer contributions in later activities, and provide feedback that shows students how their participation contributes to cognitive development. In Community of Inquiry terms, cognitive, social, and teaching presence must operate together rather than as isolated platform features.

LMS analytics may help identify patterns of access or non-participation, but they should be interpreted cautiously. A login or page view does not demonstrate cognitive or affective engagement, just as the absence of a recorded click does not necessarily demonstrate the absence of learning. Analytics are most useful as prompts for pedagogical inquiry and supportive communication rather than as complete measures of learner commitment.

Fourth, blended learning requires institutional as well as pedagogical support. Lecturers need more than technical LMS training. They need professional development in blended learning design, workload recognition for digital pedagogy, and communities of practice where course redesign can be discussed critically. Sustainable blended learning requires an academic culture that values relational, reflective, and developmental teaching. Wilson (2009) similarly demonstrates that professional development for blended learning must address course planning, pedagogical adaptation, and the purposeful combination of face-to-face and online environments rather than merely technical proficiency. Institutions can support this work by recognising course redesign within workload allocation, providing instructional-design consultation, facilitating peer review of LMS structures, and offering student orientation to blended-learning expectations. Periodic course reviews should examine not only whether materials are available but whether the relationship among preparation, interaction, assessment, and feedback is understandable from a student perspective.

Conclusion

The challenge of post-pandemic blended learning is not only technological. It is pedagogical, cultural, and ecological. Higher education has become more capable of providing digital access, but access alone does not ensure engagement, readiness, or learner success. When students do not engage with LMS materials despite clear instructions and available resources, the response should not be immediate blame. It should prompt deeper reflection on how learning is designed, supported, assessed, and understood. This commentary has argued that low engagement reveals an access-engagement gap. The term does not claim that the relationship between readiness and engagement was previously unknown, nor is it proposed as a new measurement scale. Instead, it offers a diagnostic lens for identifying the educational conditions that remain absent when digital provision does not become sustained participation. Its contribution is to direct attention to the space between making learning available and enabling students to act on that availability purposefully.

To address this gap, higher education should move beyond uploading materials toward cultivating learner readiness through self-regulation, interaction, reflection, and agency. This requires learning pathways that make purpose and sequence visible, and make explicit the teaching of self-regulatory practices, meaningful cognitive and social interaction, sustained teaching presence, and institutional support for pedagogical redesign.

The future of blended learning will not be determined by platforms alone. It will depend on whether higher education can build ecosystems where access becomes participation, participation becomes reflection and reflection becomes success for the learner.

Ethics and AI Use Statement: This commentary does not report empirical research data from human participants. The reflective teaching example is used as a professional and pedagogical starting point and does not include identifiable student information, quotations, or institutional details.

Funding: This work received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest: The author declares no competing interests.

Data Availability: No new empirical data were generated or analysed for this commentary.

Generative AI Use Statement: Generative AI was used to support language refinement, structural organisation, and clarity during manuscript preparation. The author reviewed, revised, and verified the content, argument, and references, and takes full responsibility for the final manuscript.

References

Adhya, D.H., & Panda, S. (2026). An integrative systematic review analysis of research on technology-enabled self-regulated learning and personalised learning. *Smart Learning Environments*, *13*(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-025-00428-8

de Bruijn-Smolders, M., & Prinsen, F.R. (2024). Effective student engagement with blended learning: A systematic review. *Heliyon, 10*(23), Article e39439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39439

Dimo, S., Abalayan, J.D., Celestial, E., Achas, M., Majarucon, N.J., Tolentino, R., Setiawan, E., & Lobo, J. (2024). Students' technological readiness and online learning self-efficacy in physical education. *Journal of Learning for Development, 11*(3), 463–477. https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v11i3.1124

El Habti, F.E., Chrayah, M., Bouzidi, A., & Ali, H.A. (2022). Blended learning platform model. *2022 XII International Conference on Virtual Campus (JICV)* (pp. 1–4). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/JICV56113.2022.9934732

Garrison, D.R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2–3), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6

Lobos, K., Cobo-Rendón, R., Bruna Jofré, D., & Santana, J. (2024). New challenges for higher education: Self-regulated learning in blended learning contexts. *Frontiers in Education, 9*, Article 1457367. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1457367

Maan, A., & Malhotra, K. (2024). Mapping students' readiness for e-learning in higher education: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Learning for Development, 11*(1), 27–51. https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v11i1.1036

Ngo, P.A. (2026). Implementing a flipped blended learning model in EFL instruction for engineering students: A qualitative evaluation. *Arab World English Journal, 17*(1), 339–356. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol17no1.21

Nikolaidou, M., Sofianopoulou, C., Alexopoulou, N., Abeliotis, K., Detsis, V., Chalkias, C., Lazaridi, K., & Anagnostopoulos, D. (2009). Exploring a blended learning ecosystem in the academic environment. *IADIS International Conference on Cognition and Exploratory Learning in Digital Age*, 489–490. https://mara.dit.people.hua.gr/publications/celda09.pdf

Nikolopoulou, K. (2023). Self-regulated and mobile-mediated learning in blended tertiary education environments: Student insights from a pilot study. *Sustainability, 15*(16), Article 12284. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612284

Pintrich, P.R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451–502). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50043-3

Saqui, F.Z., & Al-Amin, M. (2024). Unveiling the path to acceptance for blended learning adoption through an SEM-based model. *SN Social Sciences, 4*, Article 206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-024-01006-4

Sharma, S., & Lenka, U. (2019). Exploring linkages between unlearning and relearning in organizations. *The Learning Organization, 26*(5), 500–517. https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-10-2018-0164

Starbuck, W.H. (2017). Organizational learning and unlearning. *The Learning Organization, 24*(1), 30–38. https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-11-2016-0073

Watuleke, J., Onen, D., & Muyinda, P.B. (2026). Ground-up innovation in blended learning: Faculty experiences toward digital transformation at Makerere University: Toward sustainable digital transformation in a resource-constrained higher education context. *Journal of Learning for Development, 13*(1), 175–185. https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v13i1.2019

Weng, C., & Wirda, M.A. (2025). The effect of student's online learning readiness to student's engagement, satisfaction and achievement in higher education, Indonesia. *Education and Information Technologies, 30*(7), 9711–9736. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13204-x

Wilson, G. (2009). Case studies of ICT-enhanced blended learning and implications for professional development. In *Effective blended learning practices: Evidence-based perspectives in ICT-facilitated education* (pp. 239–258). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-60566-296-1.ch013

Yang, J., & Yahaya, W.A.J.W. (2025). Reimagining instructional design for blended learning in Chinese higher education: A self-regulated learning perspective. In *Assessing educational digital transformation in the AI era* (pp. 385–403). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-7508-3.ch013

Yasin, N.M., Ong, M.H.A., & Aziz, N.N.A. (2020). Attitude as mediator of technical usage self-efficacy, online communication self-efficacy, technology access and online media on the blended learning readiness. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, 29(*6s*)*, 713–724. http://sersc.org/journals/index.php/IJAST/article/view/8895

Zhang, S. (2019). Chinese-as-a-foreign-language learners' use of self-regulated learning in flipped/blended learning environments: A descriptive study. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 10*(2), 181–204. https://doi.org/10.37237/100205

Zimmerman, B.J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15430421TIP4102_2

Author Notes

Dr Chamil Arkhasa Nikko Mazlan is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Music and Music Education, Faculty of Music and Performing Arts, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia. He holds a Bachelor of Music (Performance) from the National Academy of Arts, Culture and Heritage (ASWARA), as well as a Master of Music Education and a PhD in Music Education from UPSI. His research interests encompass music education, higher education pedagogy, educational assessment, curriculum development, digital learning, and artificial intelligence in education. His scholarly work focuses on pedagogical innovation, learner engagement and the integration of emerging technologies into educational practices. Email: jazzerlogy@gmail.com (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0088-3849)

Cite as: Mazlan, C.A.N. (2026). When access does not become engagement: Rethinking learner readiness in post-pandemic blended higher education. *Journal of Learning for Development*, *13*(4), 771-779.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56059/3rrqxh45