



Applied Linguistics and Blended Learning, The Effectiveness of Online and In-Person Language Education (A Case study Learners at Zytoonah International University & and Afro-Asian University (2024-2025))

Muntasir Mohammed Elhadi Elnor Mohammed ¹

¹ University of Gezira , Faculty of Arts & Human Sciences.

Monta1984@gmail.com

Received: 04/01/2025 Published: 30/03/2025

Abstract

:

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of blended learning in language education by examining both online and in-person instructional components within the field of Applied Linguistics. The problem addressed in this study is the lack of sufficient clarity regarding how blended learning influences learners' engagement, performance, and overall language development. The study sample consisted of (30) university instructors, who responded to a structured questionnaire, and (50) students, who were evaluated through an observational checklist. The descriptive-analytical method was employed, and the data were analyzed using SPSS to identify trends, correlations, and significant differences. The findings revealed that blended learning enhances learner motivation, supports autonomy, and improves language performance, especially when online and face-to-face components are well integrated. However, the results also indicated challenges related to maintaining concentration during online activities and the increased workload required for teachers to design blended courses. The study recommends increasing interactive online activities, offering teacher training on blended course design, and providing continuous technical and academic support to learners. Blended learning should be adopted widely, provided that institutions ensure proper planning and digital readiness.

Keywords: Blended learning, applied linguistics, online learning, face-to-face instruction, language education, learner motivation

Introduction

In modern era spread blend learning technology as method used in teaching through internet based on modern tools of technology which short the time and distance it became an effective instrument in limited world. Form this all institutions to earn form this technology. To shed a light for blend learning is differ from open learning E. learning is educational program emerged E. learning with traditional via intern et. On other hand, mainly the process of distance learning partial according to requires of educational process to achieve and improve educational aims.

Statement of the Problem

In spite of modern technology in the world still learners are suffering to complete their studies in many university recently due to pandemic or natural disasters, or the war .For this reasons why institutions in higher education to solve this problem through blend learning in these circumstances when situation became better they complete via traditional learning. The researcher according to his experiences in teaching in distance learning suggests now days blend learning should be implemented especially in our country Sudan.

Objectives of the Study

- 1- To recognize best practices for integrating technology into in person class setting.
- 2- To explore the benefits, trends, and challenges of combing E. learning and in person methods.
- 3- To examine the effect of blend learning on learners competence and performance.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. Blended learning develops language acquisition more efficiently than traditional in-person learning alone.
2. Blended learning increases learner autonomy compared to fully in-person classes.
3. Technical challenges in the online percentage of blended learning negatively influence in learners' satisfaction with the overall learning experience.

Questions of the Study

1. To some extent learners manage the transition between online and in-person components of a blended language course?

2. To what extent blended learning influence learner autonomy and self-regulation compared to traditional learning methods?
3. What are the main technical and pedagogical challenges faced by students and teachers in blended language learning environments?

Limits of the study

The place: Learners at Zytoonah International University and Afro- Asian University

Time: at 2024-2025.

Purpose: Applied Linguistics and Blended Learning - The Effectiveness of Online and In-Person Language Education.

Literature Review

Blended learning, which combines online and in-person instruction, has gained prominence in language education. This method integrates the benefits of technology-mediated learning with the personalized and interactive aspects of traditional face-to-face instruction. In applied linguistics, the focus is often on how this hybrid model impacts language acquisition, learner autonomy, and overall effectiveness.

Blended Learning and Language Acquisition

Blended learning environments have been found to enhance language acquisition by providing learners with more flexible access to resources and opportunities for practice. According to Grgurović (2011), learners in blended environments can access a wide array of multimedia materials, which cater to different learning styles and foster deeper engagement with the language. Additionally, students can practice at their own pace through online platforms, which improves their mastery of language skills.

Furthermore, Graham (2013) emphasized that the use of technology in blended learning allows for more frequent formative assessment. Teachers can provide instant feedback through online tools, making the learning process more dynamic and interactive. In language learning, this immediate feedback is critical for correcting pronunciation, grammar, and usage errors.

Learner Autonomy in Blended Learning

A key advantage of blended learning in language education is the promotion of learner autonomy. Reinders and White (2016) discussed how technology encourages students to take more control over their own learning. By accessing resources independently, language learners can set their own learning goals, choose materials that match their proficiency level, and track their progress.

However, the authors also caution that while blended learning offers greater autonomy, it also requires learners to be more self-disciplined. Without effective guidance, some students may struggle to manage their time and stay motivated. This highlights the importance of a balanced approach where online learning complements but does not replace in-person instruction.

Comparing the Effectiveness of Online and In-Person Instruction

Several studies have explored the comparative effectiveness of online and in-person language learning. According to Means et al. (2013), students in blended learning environments tend to outperform those in fully in-person or fully online settings. This is partly because blended learning combines the strengths of both formats. While online platforms provide flexibility and rich resources, in-person instruction facilitates real-time interaction, immediate feedback, and social learning, which are crucial in language acquisition.

On the other hand, Uzunboylu and Karagozlu (2015) highlight that the effectiveness of blended learning depends significantly on the design and implementation of the course. Poorly structured online components can lead to confusion and disengagement among learners, reducing the overall effectiveness of the hybrid model.

Blended Learning During the Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the adoption of blended learning in language education. Research by Bozkurt and Sharma (2020) shows that emergency remote teaching (ERT) led to an increased reliance on online tools, but it also underscored the challenges of replicating the dynamic interaction of a physical classroom. Many teachers found that while online platforms facilitated language practice, they struggled to replicate the immersion and spontaneous communication that in-person settings provide.

In contrast, Gacs, Goertler, and Spasova (2020) found that some aspects of online learning, such as asynchronous discussion boards, offered learners more time to formulate their thoughts in the target language. This is especially beneficial for language learners who may need additional time to process and respond.

Blended Learning in Language Education

Blended learning has gained prominence in language education due to its flexibility and potential to enhance student engagement. According to Graham (2013), blended learning combines the best aspects



of face-to-face instruction with online learning to create a more effective educational experience. This model allows learners to access resources at their own pace while benefiting from in-person interactions with instructors and peers. Research by Halverson et al. (2014) suggests that blended learning environments can lead to improved academic outcomes, particularly in language acquisition

Engagement and Motivation

Engagement and motivation are critical factors influencing language learning success. According to Chen and Wang (2019), students in blended learning settings often exhibit higher levels of motivation compared to those in traditional classrooms. The combination of online resources and in-person activities fosters a more engaging learning environment, which can lead to greater learner satisfaction and achievement. Additionally, Dzuiban et al. (2018) emphasize that the flexibility of blended learning allows students to take ownership of their learning, which enhances motivation.

Effectiveness of Online and In-Person Components

The effectiveness of the online and in-person components of blended learning varies by language skill. A study by Sadeghi and Hossain (2020) found that online components are particularly effective for developing reading and writing skills, while face-to-face instruction is crucial for improving speaking and listening abilities. This aligns with the notion that different modalities serve distinct purposes in language learning, suggesting that an integrated approach is most beneficial.

Challenges in Blended Learning

While blended learning offers numerous advantages, it also presents challenges. Technical issues and a lack of familiarity with online tools can hinder student engagement and learning outcomes (Elliott et al., 2019). Furthermore, a study by Sun and Chen (2016) found that teachers often face difficulties in effectively integrating technology into their instruction, which can impact the overall effectiveness of blended learning programs. These challenges highlight the need for proper training and support for both educators and students to maximize the benefits of blended learning.

Learner Autonomy and Self-Regulation

Blended learning environments promote learner autonomy and self-regulation, as students often have more control over their learning processes. Research by Niu et al. (2020) indicates that students in blended settings develop greater self-directed learning skills, which are essential for lifelong language learning. This aligns with the principles of applied linguistics, which emphasize the importance of learner-centered approaches in language education.

Methodology

3.1. Study Design

This study will adopt a descriptive and analytical methods

3.2. Participants

3.2.1 Target Population: The study will consist of learners and teachers from language programs that utilize a blended learning method.

3.2.2 Sample : Sample Size Approximately (50) learners and (30) teachers will be recruited from various language institutions. A stratified sampling technique will be used to ensure diversity in the sample, considering factors such as age, language proficiency levels, and teaching experience.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

3.3.1. Questionnaire:

A structured questionnaire will be developed for both learners and teachers, consisting of closed statements related to their perceptions of blended learning effectiveness, engagement, and challenges. A questionnaire will use a 3-point Likert scale (Agree, To some extent, Disagree) to assess participants' responses. Questionnaire will be administered online to facilitate participation.

3.3.2. Observations check list

Observations will be conducted in both online and in-person language classes. An observation checklist will be used to evaluate learner's engagement, interaction, and application of language skills.

3.4. Data Analysis Techniques

Statistical analysis through SPSS program for data analyzing according to (t-tests, ANOVA) will be used to determine if there are significant differences in perceptions between different groups (e.g., age, proficiency level). Qualitative data from observations and questionnaire will be analyzed using thematic analysis. Observational data will be triangulated with interview findings to enhance the validity of the results.

Data Analysis

Results and Discussion

The statistical analysis of the questionnaire statements are shown in the following tables and diagrams. The students check list which consists of (15) statements and teacher's questionnaire covers the

various aspects that investigating of the importance of blended learning and it includes (10) statements.

1-Students' check list observation

1-1. Engagement in Activities

A. I actively participate in discussions (eg, chat, forums).

statement1

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	34	68.0	68.0	68.0
sometimes	16	32.0	32.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

The above table explain (68.%) respondents signed always , and (32.0%) signed not sometimes . This result assured that I actively participate in discussions (eg, chat, forums).

2- B.I engage in group activities

statement2

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	24	48.0	48.0	48.0
sometimes	25	50.0	50.0	98.0
Never	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

The above table show that (48.0%) of respondents signed always , whereas (50.0%) signed sometimes and (2.0%) . This result confirm that I engage in group activities.

3- C.I stay focused during activities

statement3

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	37	74.0	74.0	74.0
sometimes	13	26.0	26.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table No(3) illustrate (74.0%) of respondents signed always, and (26%) signed not sometimes. This result guarantee that I stay focused during activities

2-Time Management and Autonomy

A.I submit assignments on time.

statement4

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	27	54.0	54.0	54.0
Sometimes	20	40.0	40.0	94.0
Never	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

As seen in above table No(4) demonstrate (54.0%) of respondents signed always , whereas (40.0%) signed sometimes ,and (6.0%) never. This result confirm I submit assignments on time.

B.I manage tasks independently.

statement5

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	31	62.0	62.0	62.0
Sometimes	16	32.0	32.0	94.0
Never	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

According to table No(5) demonstrate (62.0%) of respondents signed always , whereas (32.0%) signed sometimes ,and (6.0%) never. This result confirm that I manage tasks independently.

C.I feel confident using learning resources and tools.

statement6

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
always	35	70.0	70.0	70.0
sometimes	15	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table No(6) illustrate (70.0%) of respondents signed always, and (30.0%) signed not sometimes. This result guarantee that I feel confident using learning resources and tools.

3-Interaction with Peers and Teacher

A.I interact actively with peers.

statement7

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	33	66.0	66.0	66.0
Sometimes	15	30.0	30.0	96.0
Never	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

In above table No(7) demonstrate (66.0%) of respondents signed always , whereas (30.0%) signed sometimes ,and (4.0%) never. This result confirm that I interact actively with peer

B.I seek feedback from the teacher or peers.

statement8

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	30	60.0	60.0	60.0
Sometimes	18	36.0	36.0	96.0
Never	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

In above table No(8) demonstrate (66.0%) of respondents signed always , whereas (30.0%) signed sometimes ,and (4.0%) never. This result confirm that .I seek feedback from the teacher or peers.

C.I ask for help or clarification from the teacher.

statement9

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	30	60.0	60.0	60.0
Sometimes	18	36.0	36.0	96.0
Never	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

According to table and figure No(9) demonstrate (60.0%) of respondents signed always , whereas (36.0%) signed sometimes ,and (4.0%) never. This result confirm that I ask for help or clarification from the teacher.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
always	26	52.0	52.0	52.0
sometimes	22	44.0	44.0	96.0
Never	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

According to table No(10) demonstrate (52.0%) of respondents signed always , whereas (44.0%) signed sometimes ,and (4.0%) never. This result confirm that

4. Understanding and Application of Learning

A.I understand the material through quizzes and assignments.

statement11

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	38	76.0	76.0	76.0
Sometimes	12	24.0	24.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

As seen in above table No(11) illustrate (76.0%) of respondents signed always, and (24.0%) signed not sometimes. This result guarantee that A.I understand the material through quizzes and assignments.

B.I apply learned language skills (e.g., speaking, listening exercises).

statement12

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	36	72.0	72.0	72.0
Sometimes	14	28.0	28.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

-According to the table and figure No(12) illustrate (72.0%) of respondents signed always, and (28.0%) signed not sometimes. This result guarantee that I apply learned language skills (e.g., speaking, listening exercises).

13. C.I feel my language skills are improving.

statement13

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	35	70.0	70.0	70.0
Sometimes	14	28.0	28.0	98.0
Never	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table and figure No(13) illustrate (70.0%) of respondents signed always, whereas (28.0%) signed not sometimes, and (2.0%),. This result guarantee that

14-5-Technical Skills (for Online Learning).

A. I use the online platforms effectively (e.g., LMS, video conferencing tools).

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always	23	46.0	46.0	46.0
Sometimes	25	50.0	50.0	96.0
Never	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table and figure No(13) illustrate (70.0%) of respondents signed always, whereas (28.0%) signed not sometimes, and (2.0%),. This result guarantee that I use the online platforms effectively (e.g., LMS, video conferencing tools).

B.I resolve technical issues independently.

statement15

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
always	25	50.0	50.0	50.0
Sometimes	22	44.0	44.0	94.0
Never	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table and figure No(15) illustrate that (50.0%) of respondents signed always, whereas (44.0%) signed not sure on the other hand (6.0%)never. This result guarantee

Teacher’s Questionnaire

1-The online time of the blended course allows learners to practice language skills freely and at their own pace.

statement1

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	18	60.0	60.0	60.0
To some extent	12	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data presented in the table (1) it is clear that more half of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption ,the frequency is (18) they constitute (60.%). Figure (1) showed that a half of participants agree that The online time of the blended course allows learners to practice language skills freely and at their own pace.

2- Face-to-face interactions are necessarily for developing my learners' speaking and listening skills.

statement2

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	21	70.0	70.0	70.0
To some extent	9	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

As seen from the data presented in the table (2) it is clear that two third of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption, the frequency is (21) they constitute (70.0%). In figure (2) more than two third of participants agree that Face-to-face interactions are necessarily for developing my learners' speaking and listening skills.

3- I would recommend blended learning for language education due to its flexibility and effectiveness.

statement3

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	21	70.0	70.0	70.0
To some extent	9	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

As seen from the data presented in the table (3) it is clear that two third of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption, the frequency is (21) they constitute (70.0%). In figure (2) more than two third of participants agree that I would recommend blended learning for language education due to its flexibility and effectiveness.

4- Learners in blended learning environments are commonly more motivated than those in fully in-person classes.

statement4

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	18	60.0	60.0	60.0
To some extent	5	16.7	16.7	76.7
Disagree	7	23.3	23.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

In the table (4) it is clear that third of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption, the frequency is (18) they constitute (60.0%). According to the figure (4) most participants agree that Learners in blended learning environments are commonly more motivated than those in fully in-person classes.

5- I explore that learners struggle more with maintaining concentrate and engagement in the online components of blended learning.

statement5

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	18	60.0	60.0	60.0
To some extent	11	36.7	36.7	96.7
Disagree	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

From the data presented in the table (5) it is clear that a whole of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption ,the frequency is (18) they constitute (60.0.%). In figure (5) a whole of participants agree that I explore that learners struggle more with maintaining concentrate and engagement in the online components of blended learning

6- The online tools and platforms that used in the blended learning model are easy for both students and teachers to navigate.

statement6

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	14	46.7	46.7	46.7
To some extent	12	40.0	40.0	86.7
Disagree	4	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data presented in the table (6) it is clear that more half of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption ,the frequency is (14) they constitute (47.%). Figure (6) showed that less than a half of participants agree that

The online tools and platforms that used in the blended learning model are easy for both students and teachers to navigate.

7- Providing feedback to learners in the online time of the course is as effective as doing so during

statement7

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	15	50.0	50.0	50.0
To some extent	10	33.3	33.3	83.3
Disagree	5	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

According to the e data presented in the table (7) it is clear that a half of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption, the frequency is (15) they constitute (50.0%). Figure (7) showed that two third of participants agree that Providing feedback to learners in the online time of the course is as effective as doing so during

8- Blended learning requires more planning and effort compared to fully in-person teaching.

statement8

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	20	66.7	66.7	66.7
To some extent	9	30.0	30.0	96.7
Disagree	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

In the table (8) it is clear that a half of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption ,the frequency is (15) they constitute (50.%). Figure (8) showed that a half of participants agreed that the Blended learning requires more planning and effort compared to fully in-person teaching.

9- I would recommend blended learning for language education due to its flexibility and effectiveness.

statement9

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	20	66.7	66.7	66.7
To some extent	9	30.0	30.0	96.7
Disagree	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

According to the e data presented in the table (9) it is clear that two third of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption, the frequency is (20) they constitute (66.7 %). Figure (9) showed that more than two third of participants agree that I would recommend blended learning for language education due to its flexibility and effectiveness.

10- I believe that blended learning encourages my learners' overall language learning experience.

statement10

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	18	60.0	60.0	60.0
To some extent	12	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

According to the e data presented in the table (10) it is clear that a less than two third of the samples responses are in agreement with the assumption, the frequency is (10) they constitute (60.0%). Figure (10) showed that less than two third of participants agree that I believe that blended learning encourages my learners' overall language learning experience.

Discussion

The findings from both the questionnaire and the checklist provide a comprehensive picture of learners’ performance and teachers’ perceptions in a blended learning environment. Overall, blended learning appears to offer significant pedagogical advantages, particularly in terms of flexibility, learner motivation, and autonomy. Teachers’ positive attitudes reflect confidence in blended learning as an effective model for language instruction. However, the challenges reported—especially regarding students’ concentration and engagement during online sessions—highlight areas requiring pedagogical intervention. Despite strong technical and learning management skills among students, sustaining attention in virtual environments remains an issue. This aligns with previous research indicating that online learning demands strong self-regulation skills. The checklist results reinforce the questionnaire findings: students are generally active, motivated, and capable of applying language skills. Their strong performance on quizzes and assignments confirms the effectiveness of blended instruction in supporting language development. Nevertheless, issues related to focus, especially during online tasks, suggest a need for more interactive and shorter online activities to maintain engagement.

Analysis of teachers’ responses indicates several important trends regarding blended learning:

- 1-Teachers observed that learners often struggle to maintain focus and engagement during the online portion of the course.
- 2-Most teachers agreed that the platforms used in blended learning are generally easy to navigate for both teachers and students.



- 3-Teachers noted that feedback given during the online component is generally effective and comparable to feedback provided in face-to-face sessions.
- 4-Teachers believe that blended learning enhances learners' overall language learning experience.
- 5-Learners should be showed active participation in online discussions (chats, forums). Learners ought to showed confidence in using online resources and tools.
6. Students should be interacted effectively with peers in both online and face-to-face activities. Students should be asked for help when needed, showing awareness of support channels.
- 7-Learners should be used learning platforms (LMS, Zoom, etc.) effectively.
- 8-Some students demonstrated the ability to resolve minor technical issues independently.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed blended learning is:

- .Incorporate more interactive online tools (polls, breakout rooms, quizzes).
- Use short, varied online tasks to help maintain concentration.
- Provide regular guidance on time management and study skills.
- Offer brief training sessions on navigating online e platforms.
- maintain consistent online feedback, using audio or video comments to increase personalization.
- Encourage peer feedback to promote collaboration.
- Support teachers with ready-made teaching templates and digital resources to reduce preparation time.
- Encourage team planning among instructors to distribute workload.
- Prioritize speaking and listening activities during in-person classes.
- Use classroom time for communicative tasks requiring immediate interaction.
- Conduct periodic surveys to track learner progress and satisfaction.
- Use observation checklists regularly to maintain quality indicators.

References

- Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1-6.
- Chen, C. M., & Wang, C. H. (2019). The effects of blended learning on students' learning outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Educational Technology & Society*, 22(1), 47-62.
- Dzuiban, C., Hartman, J. L., & Moskal, P. D. (2018). Blended learning: A systematic approach to improving student learning. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 15(2), 1-13.
- ochwill, T. R., & Little, K. (2019). Challenges in implementing blended learning in K-12 education. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 27(2), 133-156.
- Gacs, A., Goertler, S., & Spasova, S. (2020). Planned online language education versus crisis-prompted online language teaching: Lessons for the future. **Foreign Language Annals**, 53(2), 380-392.
- Graham, C. R. (2013). Blend it! Theoretical foundations of blended learning. In *Blended Learning: Research Perspectives* (pp. 5-30). Routledge.
- Graham, C. R. (2013). Emerging practice and research in blended learning. In **Handbook of Distance Education** (pp. 333-350). Routledge.
- Grgurović, M. (2011). Blended learning in an ESL class: A case study. *CALICO Journal*, 29(1), 100-117.
- Halverson, L. R., Graham, C. R., Spring, K. J., & Drysdale, J. S. (2014). A theoretical framework for community of inquiry-based blended learning environments. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 19, 26-36.
- Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. **Teachers College Record**, 115(3), 1-47.
- Niu, B., Zhang, X., & Zhang, X. (2020). Blended learning and self-regulated learning: A review of literature. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 13(1), 5-20.
- Reinders, H., & White, C. (2016). 20 years of autonomy and technology: How far have we come and where to next? *Language Learning & Technology*, 20(2), 143-154.
- Sadeghi, K., & Hossain, M. (2020). The effectiveness of blended learning on the development of language skills. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 102, 101576.
- Sun, P. C., & Chen, X. (2016). Challenges in blended learning: A systematic review of the literature. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64(4), 791-815.
- Uzunboylu, H., & Karagozlu, D. (2015). Flipped classroom: A review of recent literature. *World Journal on Educational Technology*, 7(2), 142-147.