International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education
Volume 5 Issue 2 | June 2024
ISSN: 2799 - 1091
Page No. 241-257

# STUDENTS' READINESS AND ATTITUDES ON BLENDED LEARNING: BASIS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FLIPPED-CLASSROOM LANGUAGE MATERIAL

**Gannaban, Genalyn R.[1] , Eustaquio, Ma. Theresa L.[2]**
[1]*Central Graduate School, Isabela State University, Echague Campus, Philippines*
[2]*College of Arts and Sciences, Isabela State University, Echague Campus, Philippines*
**Corresponding Author**: Genalyn R. Gannaban E-mail: gmgannaban14@gmail.com

## | ABSTRACT
This paper investigates students' attitudes and readiness for blended learning. It explores how prepared students are for this kind of learning as well as how they feel about language learning that takes place in flipped classrooms. It employed descriptive quantitative research design and based on the results, the respondents have positive attitudes on blended learning finding it flexible and engaging, and they are already ready to this new kind of teaching-learning environment. Thus, these students are generally familiar with and at ease with the required technology tools and platforms, indicating a moderate to high degree of preparation for blended learning. This positive attitudes and preparedness provide a strong basis for the creation of customized language resources that maximize blended learning's advantages.

## | KEYWORDS
*language learning, readiness, board courses, language classroom, technology*

## | ARTICLE DOI:

## 1. Introduction
The COVID-19 pandemic quickly led to the closure of universities and colleges worldwide in hopes that public health officials' advice of social distancing could help to flatten the infection curve and reduce total fatalities from the disease. Face-to-face schooling is constructed as a specific threat from which the learners must be protected, and emergency flexible learning is the safety measure proposed to protect the learners within the community. The CHED advisories have consistently advised HEIs to refrain from conducting face-to-face or in-person classes or mass gatherings in their campuses. These advisories have been disseminated in the print and broadcast media and several zoom meetings with HEIs considering the threat of community transmission due to the mass these are essential skills, students' ability to acquire these skills will depend on their attitude and readiness to learn in a blended learning environment. A significant potential to inform curriculum enhancement efforts in board courses through a thorough examination of students' attitudes, and readiness for blended learning. This focus on curriculum enhancement not only benefits the institutions but also ensures that students receive a more personalized, engaging, and effective educational experience.

The reports provided by the U.S. Department of Education (2010) indicating, on average, students in online learning conditions performed better than those receiving face-to face instruction. Students mentioned better overall satisfaction in blended learning courses rather than in traditional lecture as reported in the International Journal of Technology in Education (IJTE) (Martinez-Caro & Campuzano-Bolarin, 2011). One of the reasons for BL mode being more preferred and effective is assumed to be the

requirement to involve students in active learning through diverse learning approaches that include active peer communication, processing the information gained by constant self-reflection and "checking their understanding, organizing their knowledge, and making connections with what they already know" (Glazer, 2012). The key features of blended learning pedagogy are interaction, flexibility, and suitable assessment forms (Smith & Hill, 2019). The study of López-Pérez et al. (2011) shows that blended learning positively affects reducing dropout rates and a positive attitude on improving exam marks. Moreover, the students' perceptions on the attitude and readiness for blended learning are interrelated, with their final marks depending on the blended learning activities and the students' age, background, and class attendance rate (Graham, Woodfield & Harrison, 2013).

Blended learning improves students' attitude towards study management, which motivates them to organize their time when studying online as well as their familiarity with digital technologies which enables them to collaborate with other students for assignments and to interact with the lecturer. Birbal, (2009) emphasizes that the attitude on learning flexibility reflects good points of blended learning, including better access to learning materials and freedom to decide where and when to study and at what pace. Blended learning improves students' attitude towards study management, which motivates them to organize their time when studying online as well as their familiarity with digital technologies which enables them to collaborate with other students for assignments and to interact with the lecturer. The five learning aspects are learning flexibility, online learning, study management, technology, and online interaction.

Learner characteristics, which are the system's inputs if blended learning environments are thought of as a system, have a significant impact on the system's outcomes. This is because of attitudes toward the use of these technologies at various levels as well as issues observed in blended learning processes, which has led to the need to assess learners' preparedness for blended learning. One of the essential components of this approach is preparedness for e-learning. As a result, numerous research identify the learners' ready characteristics for using e-learning settings as a crucial construct. This study therefore, looked into the readiness and attitudes of the students enrolled in board courses on blended learning to come up with an appropriate flipped classroom language material. Specifically, it answered the following research questions :

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
    a. age;
    b. gender; and
    c. course?
2. What are the perceptions and attitude of the respondents toward blended learning in language courses?
3. What is the level of readiness of the respondents on blended learning?

## 2. Literature Review

Blended learning is the learning accomplished through using various communication methods to teach a specific subject. These methods may include a mixture of direct lecturing in the time of lectures, communicating through the internet and self-leaning which mixes traditional learning and its usage and the usage of various educational technologies which gives freedom to the teacher to use communication skills inside the classroom. This was defined by (Khames, 2003, p. 211) as an integrated system that aims at helping the student in every stage of high education level, based on mixing the traditional learning and e-learning in different forms inside the classrooms.

The case study conducted by Tshabalaha et al. (2014) in South Africa investigated academic staff's perception of blended learning to allow for the identification of challenges encountered. It was determined that "the absence of a policy on blended learning; inadequate staff training; limited access to the computer laboratory for students" were problematic to the success of Blended Learning (Tshabalaha et al., 2014). Moreover, due to their study, Smith and Hill (2019) postulate that additional teacher training should be conducted for the staff before implementing blended instruction. This concept could be done through the appropriate governance and strategic leadership within an institution (Namyssova, Tussupbekova, Helmer, Malone, Mir, & Jonbekova, (2019).

It is also defined by (Ismail, 2009) as using the mixture of learning methods of collaborative learning, e-learning and traditional classrooms face to face, and education management systems, self-learning in learning strategies to get the suitable content in a suitable form for suitable individuals and at suitable times. Synthesis learning includes various presentation methods to complete each other and enhancing the learning of the learned behavior and its application. Showing these detentions about blended learning makes us conclude that blended learning is a process done by mixing techniques with traditional learning, learning by using the technology in various forms from technological devices, audio-video, communication and internet technology and by using the technology as a supportive technique for traditional teaching.

Blended learning systems combine face to face instruction with computer mediated instruction (Graham, 2005). Many researchers share the view that the most common reason for adopting blended learning is that it combines “the best of both worlds”. Beyond this general statement, Graham, Allen and Ure (2003) found that people chose blended learning for three reasons:

(1) Improved pedagogy, (2) increased access or flexibility, and (3) increased cost effectiveness. Some researchers have argued that blended learning approaches increase the level of active learning strategies, peer to peer learning strategies, and learner centered strategies used (Collis, Bruijstens & Veen, 2003; Morgan, 2002). It provides a balance between flexible learning options and the high touch, human interactive experience (e.g., Dziuban, Hartmann, Juge, Moskal & Sorg, 2005; Reynolds & Greiner, 2005).

In addition, blended learning systems provide an opportunity for reaching a large, globally dispersed audience in a short period of time with consistent, semi-personalized content delivery (Bersin & Associates, 2003). Future learning systems will be differentiated not based on whether they blend but rather by how they blend (Ross & Gage, 2005). However, how to create effective blended learning experiences is still a challenge for researchers and practitioners. This challenge is highly context dependent with a practically infinite number of possible solutions (Bonk & Graham, 2005). Many researchers are still seeking out best practices for how to combine instructional strategies in face to face and CMC environments that exploit the strengths of each environment and minimize their weaknesses (Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003). Although there is extensive research done on blended learning, the focus is invariably on the application of online learning in an off-class, or after class, setting. There is little practice reported or research conducted into online discussions in face-to-face classroom settings. This study depicts an innovative example of blended learning, using online discussion in a face-to-face classroom setting among a group of adult learners.

The body of literature on blended learning proves that there is no unity on the definition of blended learning. Driscoll (2002) defined blended learning as a combination of instructional methods. On the contrary, Delialioglu and Yildirim (2007) claimed that systematic and strategic combination of ICT tools into academic courses introduces a new way to approach instructional goals. This instructional method has been given many names: blended learning, mediated learning, hybrid instruction, web-assisted instruction, or web-enhanced instruction. Delialioglu and Yildirim (2007) and Gülbahar and Madran (2009) believed that blended learning is the same as hybrid instruction, which combines the

potentials of web-based training with those of classroom techniques. Likewise, through their study on the transformational potential of blended learning, Garrison and Kanuka (2004) found that blended learning environments seize the values of traditional classes, which improve the effectiveness of meaningful learning experiences.

Koohang's (2004) study of the students' perceptions towards a Blended Learning management course showed that there were gender and experience differences among students. Men were more inclined to use the blended environment than women. A comparative study of accounting principles by Vamosi, Pierce and Slotkin (2004) touched upon the students' attitudes toward face-to-face and online lectures during the second half of the course. They found no significant differences in the attitudes of the students. Yet, in the post course survey, the students' reactions towards the online courses were positive. For that reason, the study affirms that students' satisfaction increased as the course progressed due to becoming familiar with the elearning system. Chen and Jones (2007) tried to find out the students' satisfaction with a blended course and revealed that students were more interested in taking a blended course. However, Jones and Chen (2008) found in a different study that the students in the blended course said that they had better contact with the teacher directly in the classroom, and they were concerned that one or two students of the group had to shoulder the load when their work was done in groups on the forum.

Akkoyunlu and Soylu (2006) conducted a study to investigate the view of students regarding the Blended Learning environment. The results of the study revealed that the more the students participated in the online discussion forums, the more they achieved and the more positive views they developed towards Blended Learning. Moreover, the study came up with the conclusion that both the face-to-face lectures and the online tasks contributed to the learning process. In the same vein, Sauers and Walker (2004) found that students in a blended course indicated that their course system is more beneficial than the traditional face-to-face lectures. Hwang and Arbaugh (2006) examined the students' feedback regarding a blended management course and found that students who had positive attitude towards the Blended Learning material participated more in the discussion forums. Moreover, the students who expressed a negative attitude were not active participants in the online activities. Cottrell and Robinson (2003) investigated the students' attitudes towards the use of Blended Learning in an accounting course and came up with the conclusion that students preferred the Blended Learning approach. Relatedly, Humbert & Vignare (2005) examined the students' perceptions towards introducing Blended Learning to their courses and found that the students liked the blended approach. However, other researchers came up with the idea that (Parkinson et al., 2003) proposed that the students in the traditional classes were satisfied with the class climate and indicated that the Blended Learning settings had no class community. As far as the asynchronous approach is adopted, Wu & Hiltz (2004) investigated the students' perception of using the asynchronous online discussions and came up with the conclusion that students expressed that their learning increased due to the online activities.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Design

This paper evaluates the perception, attitude, acceptability and level of readiness of students enrolled in board courses on blended learning using a descriptive quantitative research design. Gillaco (2014) discussed that descriptive method seeks the real facts in relation to a current situation. Furthermore, this method works primarily on the description, comparison, analysis and interpretation of data that exists.

### 3.2. Respondents of the Study

This research was conducted at the different colleges with board courses in a State University in Northern Philippines this SY 2023-2024. The respondents were the 1st year students with 327 population from 9 different board courses.

### 3.3. Materials and Procedure

Adapted questionnaires were used in this proposed study to come up with the needed data. The first part of the questionnaire was consisted of the profile of the respondents which includes age, gender and year level. The researcher secured permission from the Dean of the Central Graduate School to conduct the study. A permission was also secured from the Dean of the different colleges with board courses through the recommendations of the thesis adviser prior to administering the questionnaire to the respondents of the study.

Moreover, the researcher also requested for the list of first year students who were enrolled during the school year 2023-2024.The researcher secured permission from the Dean of the Central Graduate School to conduct the study. A permission was also secured from the Dean of the different colleges with board courses through the recommendations of the thesis adviser prior to administering the questionnaire to the respondents of the study. Moreover, the researcher also requested for the list of first year students who were enrolled during the school year 2023-2024. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the data of the study, employing frequency counts, percentages, means, and t-tests with the aid of statistical software.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Profile of the Respondents

| | Frequency N=327 | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | |
| 17-18 years old | 246 | 75.2 |
| 19 years old and above | 81 | 24.8 |
| **Gender** | | |
| Male | 96 | 29.4 |
| Female | 201 | 61.5 |
| LGBTQ | 30 | 9.2 |
| **Course** | | |
| CAS | 10 | 3.1 |
| IOF | 8 | 2.4 |
| CCJE | 27 | 8.3 |
| SVM | 24 | 7.3 |
| CA | 47 | 14.4 |
| CBAPA | 35 | 10.7 |
| COE | 38 | 11.6 |
| CON | 42 | 12.8 |
| CED | 96 | 29.4 |

In terms of their profile, the results of the study revealed that the majority of the respondents who answered the survey were female. As to their age, the respondents were first-year students the result

revealed that the age of 17-18 years old respondents were the most answered in the survey. As to their courses, the highest population were the College of Education (COEd), and lowest population were the Institute of Fisheries (IOF).

### 4.2. Perceptions, Attitudes and Level of Readiness towards Blended Learning

| ***Perception*** | **Mean** | **Qualitative Description** |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Combination of an online class learning and traditional in- class learning is more effective than using one-way delivery of information. | 3.13 | Agree |
| 2. With blended learning the information is obtained by more than one way. | 3.22 | Agree |
| 3. Blended learning assignments give me opportunity to read and learn more. | 3.38 | Agree |
| 4. Blended learning improves my learning skills. | 3.24 | Agree |
| 5. Blended learning enables a student to become more involved in the learning process. | 3.12 | Agree |
| 6. Blended learning involves joint participation and work. | 3.17 | Agree |
| 7. A course designed for blended learning useful and interesting. | 3.22 | Agree |
| 8. Blended learning reinforces interaction between teacher and students. | 3.21 | Agree |
| 9. Tasks in the blended learning are understandable. | 3.08 | Agree |
| 10. Blended learning provides me enough time for performing tasks. | 3.27 | Agree |
| 11. I can always get course knowledge from online resources used with blended learning eLearning platform | 3.20 | Agree |
| 12. Blended learning sessions are more meaningful because after face to face learning they include discussion in online learning environment. | 3.17 | Agree |
| 13. I think that using blended learning helps me to improve my listening skills. | 3.19 | Agree |
| 14. I think that using blended learning helps me to improve my speaking skills | 3.02 | Agree |
| 15. I think that using blended learning | 3.28 | Agree |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| helps me to improve my reading skills. | | |
| 16. I think that using blended learning helps me to improve my writing skills | 3.27 | Agree |
| 17. I think that using blended learning helps me to improve my pronunciation. | 3.04 | Agree |
| 18. I think that using blended learning helps me to improve my spelling. | 3.14 | Agree |
| 19. I think that using blended learning helps me to improve my grammar. | 3.18 | Agree |
| 20. I think that using blended learning helps me to improve my vocabulary. | 3.27 | Agree |
| 21. I think the course materials in blended learning English class are relevant for me. | 3.18 | Agree |
| 22. I think the course materials are designed accurately. | 3.16 | Agree |
| 23. I think the course materials are designed at an appropriate level. | 3.16 | Agree |
| 24. I think the course materials meet my needs. | 3.22 | Agree |
| 25. I think the course materials are well structured. | 3.31 | Agree |
| 26. I think the course syllabus is well presented. | 3.31 | Agree |
| 27. I think the course materials are easy to be accessed at any time. | 3.28 | Agree |
| 28. I would find blended learning to be useful in keeping track of my learning progress. | 3.18 | Agree |
| 29. I can improve my English more in blended learning approach. | 3.16 | Agree |
| 30. I will accomplish tasks more quickly in blended learning approach. | 3.21 | Agree |
| 31. I know the effectiveness of blended learning in learning English. | 3.23 | Agree |
| 32. I find blended learning useful in learning English. | 3.22 | Agree |
| 33. I find blended learning approach easy to be understand. | 3.04 | Agree |
| 34. I understand English more in blended learning. | 3.08 | Agree |
| 35. I can interact more clearly in blended learning. | 3.11 | Agree |
| 36. I find blended learning to be flexible to use. | 3.29 | Agree |
| 37. I become skillful in English language with the use of blended learning. | 3.17 | Agree |
| 38. I find blended learning easy to use. | 3.14 | Agree |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 39. I think that I will find it easy to get the blended learning course components to do what I want them to do. | 3.15 | Agree |
| 40. I feel motivated to learn English using blended learning approach. | 3.10 | Agree |
| 41. I prefer blended learning. | 2.98 | Moderately Agree |
| 42. I feel excited to learn English in blended learning classroom. | 3.10 | Agree |
| 43. I find blended learning save my time. | 3.29 | Agree |
| 44. I would enjoy my learning more if all my classes were blended. | 3.04 | Agree |
| 45. I enjoy studying English subject using blended learning. | 3.06 | Agree |
| 46. I look forward to studying using blended learning in the future. | 3.03 | Agree |
| 47. I learn more efficiently in a blended classroom. | 3.00 | Agree |
| 48. I can get sufficient resources in this blended course. | 3.15 | Agree |
| 49. Overall, I am satisfied with this blended learning course. | 3.14 | Agree |
| | **3.17** | **Agree** |

In terms of perceptions on blended learning, the respondents mostly Agree that blended learning is beneficial to them having an overall mean value of 3.17. The top five (5) statements which had the highest mean percentage are the following: Item 3, “Blended learning assignments give me opportunity to read and learn more” with the qualitative description of “Agree,” and a mean value of “3.38.” Based on the statement, assignments utilizing blended learning have the potential to greatly increase students' reading and learning opportunities. Students now have access to a wealth of materials that they can study outside of the classroom due to the integration of online resources with traditional classroom instruction. This method promotes self-directed learning, enabling students to learn more about subjects that stimulate their interest or ask for additional comprehension. Diverse materials, including e-books, films, articles, and interactive content, are readily available to accommodate different learning styles and encourage lifelong learning outside of the conventional classroom. Next, item 25 with the qualitative description of “Agree,” and a mean value of “3.31” was “I think the course materials are well structured.” This statement highlights that in a blended learning setting, the impression of well-structured course materials is crucial. Well-structured resources facilitate better course navigation for students, minimize confusion, and guarantee that learning goals are reached. An organized body of information that logically builds from basic to sophisticated topics is helpful in creating a strong foundation. The organization of course materials becomes even more crucial when creating a flipped classroom, as students interact with the material outside of class and apply what they have learned during in-class activities. Smoother transitions between individual study and group projects in the classroom are made possible by proper arrangement and alignment with learning goals. Third, item 26 with the qualitative description of “Agree,” and a mean value of “3.31,” was “I think the course syllabus is well presented.” This statement state that an attractive course syllabus is essential to successful blended learning. It lays out goals, establishes clear expectations, and offers a schedule for the course's online and in-person components. The syllabus for a flipped classroom model needs to make it very clear when and how students are supposed to interact with online resources and how those resources will be incorporated into class activities. Students who have a

thorough syllabus are better able to manage their time and are better equipped to participate actively in class discussions and assignments. Additionally, it strengthens the link between the online preparatory work and the in-class application, improving the coherence of the entire learning process. Fourth, item 36 with the qualitative description of "Agree," and a mean value of "3.29" was "I find blended learning to be flexible to use." One of blended learning's most praised features is its flexibility. The ability to access course materials and finish homework whenever it is convenient for them is very helpful for students who are balancing other obligations. This flexibility helps students prepare for active learning sessions by allowing them to interact with the course material at their own pace prior to class in a flipped classroom setting. This flexibility supports a more individualized educational experience by accommodating a range of study schedules and learning styles. In blended learning, flexibility promotes a more welcoming and inclusive atmosphere, which is essential for student preparedness and favourable sentiments around this type of instruction. Lastly, item 43 with the qualitative description of "Agree," and a mean value of "3.29" was "I find blended learning save my time." Eliminating the need for transportation and enabling more effective learning, blended learning can help students save time. Using this technique of flipped learning makes classroom sessions more engaging and concentrates on advanced thinking abilities by moving the learning of new material to the student's own time. With this approach, students spend less time in class passively learning and more time participating in conversations, problem-solving, and hands-on activities with their classmates and teachers. This model's efficiency can result in enhanced learning outcomes and better time management.

The foundations for successful flipped classroom model implementation are students' preparation and attitudes toward blended learning. An efficient and interesting educational experience is facilitated by blended learning's time-saving features, well-structured content, flexible scheduling, and possibilities for better learning. Teachers may create and improve flipped classroom strategies more effectively by being aware of and responsive to these aspects, which will ultimately result in a more accommodating learning environment that meets the requirements and preferences of the students.

The result of the study conforms to the statement of Chen and Jones (2007) who stated that students' perceptions indicated that in the traditional setting, they were more satisfied with the clarity of instruction. On the other hand, students in blended learning class gained an appreciation of the class and indicated more strongly that their analytical skills improved. This study indicated that when students are in traditional setting, instruction becomes clearer but when they are in blended class, learning process may become doubtful for them although they see more improvements in their analytical skills.

| ***Attitudes*** | **Mean** | **Descriptive Equivalent** |
|---|---|---|
| 1. With Blended learning you can control how fast or slow you move through lessons. | 3.29 | Agree |
| 2. I can understand better from the materials given by the instructor. | 3.16 | Agree |
| 3. I find the lecture notes used in blended learning course facilitate my learning of English. | 3.23 | Agree |
| 4. I feel encouraged to discuss with friends about the course content. | 3.24 | Agree |
| 5. I feel encouraged to think critically in learning English. | 3.26 | Agree |
| 6. I feel encouraged to apply problem-solving skills in English learning activities. | 3.22 | Agree |
| 7. I have improved my writing skills through the course materials in blended learning course. | 3.23 | Agree |
| 8. I have improved my listening skills through the course materials in blended learning course. | 3.23 | Agree |
| 9. I have improved my reading skills through the course materials in blended learning course. | 3.25 | Agree |

The respondents' attitudes on blended learning resulted to an overall mean of 3.19 and a descriptive equivalent of Agree. Likewise, the three statements which had the highest mean percentage were statement (Number 21) "Low speed internet and connectivity problems causes to reach difficulties with blended learning online resources," with the qualitative description of "Agree" and mean value of 3.64; Statement (Number 17) "I can quickly check what learning material I should use in class using the blended approach" with a qualitative description of "Agree" and a mean value of "3.34;" and Statement (Number 13) "I can quickly check what learning material I should use in class using the blended approach" with the qualitative description of "Agree" and a mean value of 3.31. These statements further emphasize the effectiveness and flexibility provided by the blended learning approach, echoing the viewpoint expressed in the prior one. Technology and internet resources have combined to give educators' access to a multitude of educational resources that they can easily access and use in their instruction. In the current fast-paced educational environment, the capacity to swiftly evaluate and choose

learning resources is especially beneficial. Lesson plans can be modified by teachers in real time to satisfy the changing needs of their students as well as the requirements of the curriculum. The blended method affords educators numerous chances for customization and innovation, be it assigning a multimedia assignment for independent study, facilitating a virtual discussion forum, or supplementing a lecture with an active online tutorial. Additionally, instructors can access online learning materials from anywhere at any time due to their portability and accessibility. Instructors can use digital resources to improve their teaching and students' learning experiences, whether they are studying for a class at the convenience of their workplace or while traveling. Though the mixed approach offers never-before-seen convenience and flexibility, it also necessitates thoughtful preparation and methodical execution. Instructors are responsible for making sure that the learning resources they have selected support the intended learning outcomes, promote student success, and remain in line with the course objectives. They also need to be aware of how differently each student has access to technology and the internet, and they should make modifications where needed to guarantee that all students have equal access to the course materials.

### 4.3. Respondents' Level of Readiness on Blended Learning

| ***Level of Readiness*** | **Mean** | **Descriptive Equivalent** |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I can easily access a laptop/desktop/smartphone at home. | 3.30 | Approaching Readiness |
| 2. I have convenient access to a reliable internet connection. | 3.11 | Approaching Readiness |
| 3. I can access internet multiple times a week. | 3.28 | Approaching Readiness |
| 4. I have a university email account. | 3.17 | Approaching Readiness |
| 5. I have a quiet and personal space for studying that is free from distractions. | 3.15 | Approaching Readiness |
| 6. I know the basic functions of computer hardware and its peripherals like the printer, speaker, keyboard, mouse, etc. | 3.32 | Approaching Readiness |
| 7. I know how to log on to an Internet Service Provider (connect to the internet?). | 3.43 | Approaching Readiness |
| 8. I know how to navigate web pages. | 3.35 | Approaching Readiness |
| 9. I know how to open/send an email with file attachments. | 3.56 | Approaching Readiness |
| 10. I know how to upload and download documents through browsers. | 3.54 | Approaching Readiness |
| 11. I have confidence that I can join online discussions/forums. | 3.37 | Approaching Readiness |
| 12. I prefer to work alone. | 3.35 | Approaching Readiness |
| 13. When I have important assignments, I can meet tough deadlines. | 3.34 | Approaching Readiness |
| 14. I can understand instructions for assignments/tutorials/quizzes by myself. | 3.27 | Approaching Readiness |
| 15. I prefer to figure out instructions for assignments by myself. | 3.14 | Approaching Readiness |
| 16. I do not need direct lectures to understand study materials. | 2.83 | Undecided |
| 17. When asked to learn new technologies, I do not put it off or avoid it. | 2.97 | Undecided |
| 18. I am determined to stick to studies despite challenging situations. | 3.23 | Approaching Readiness |
| 19. I can communicate effectively with the lecturer and my classmates using online technology and get difficult things in the course clarified. | 3.17 | Approaching Readiness |
| 20. Online discussions with other participants would help me to develop a sense of collaboration. | 3.22 | Approaching Readiness |
| 21. I can take responsibility for my Learning. | 3.43 | Approaching Readiness |
| 22. Learning through online platform makes me responsible for the course. | 3.26 | Approaching Readiness |
| 23. Attending the class with online preparation helps me learn a lot. | 3.20 | Approaching Readiness |
| 24. Learning through an online platform is much more interesting than the materials used in class. | 3.02 | Approaching Readiness |
| 25. I can refer to study materials anytime. | 3.27 | Approaching Readiness |
| 26. I can learn by myself in a quiet and comfortable environment. | 3.40 | Approaching Readiness |
| 27. I can easily discuss things with the lecturer and students outside of class. | 3.20 | Approaching Readiness |
| | **3.26** | **Approaching Readiness** |

In terms of respondents' level of readiness on blended-learning, it reaveled an overall mean score of 3.26 and Approaching Readiness descriptive equivalent. The four statements which had the highest mean percentage were statement (Number 9) "I know how to open/send an email with file attachments" with the qualitative description of "Approaching Readiness" and mean value of 3.56. Next, statement (Number 10) "I know how to upload and download documents through browsers," with a qualitative description of "Approaching Readiness" and a mean value of 3.54. Third, statement (Number 7) "I know how to log on to an Internet Service Provider (connect to the internet)" with a qualitative description of "Approaching Readiness" and a mean value of "3.43." These statements state that in order to engage in blended learning and flipped classroom approach, having an internet connection is a fundamental yet necessary ability. To access online platforms, resources, and communication tools, you need consistent internet access. Students who are proficient at handling and fixing their internet connections will be more equipped to participate in virtual classrooms, access digital content, and take part in online learning activities. This preparedness guarantees that technical problems won't interfere with their education. Lastly, statement (Number 21) "I can take responsibility for my learning" with the qualitative description of "Approaching Readiness" and a mean value of 3.43. Accepting accountability for one's education is a critical mindset for success in flipped classrooms and blended learning settings. These methods frequently call for a high level of self-motivation and self-control since they encourage students to work individually through the learning materials before engaging in interactive, in-class activities. Students who can successfully manage their time, create goals for learning, and look for extra resources when needed are more likely to succeed in this setting. More meaningful learning experiences and deeper engagement are facilitated by this freedom of choice.

In order to implement a flipped classroom model within a blended learning framework, students must meet specific technical as well as behavioural requirements. Fundamental skills such as managing email attachments, uploading and downloading papers, and keeping a steady internet connection allow students to effectively traverse online learning settings. These abilities guarantee that students can effectively communicate, access resources, and engage in all aspects of digital learning. Students' preparedness in these areas shows how well they can adjust to and perform in a mixed learning environment. Teachers can help students develop into independent learners who can participate in the in-person and online components of the flipped-classroom approach by helping them develop these technical abilities. Their learning experience has been enhanced, and they are more equipped to handle the growing amount of digitalization in the workplace and in education.

## 5. Conclusion

The study shows that students generally have a positive attitude towards blended learning, finding it flexible and engaging. The favorable attitudes of students and their preparation for the flipped classroom model are positively correlated, indicating a supportive environment for its adoption. This preparedness and positive attitude provide a strong basis for the creation of customized language resources that maximize blended learning's advantages. Therefore, the study concludes that educational institutions can proceed with confidence in incorporating flipped-classroom approaches into their language learning curricula. It is advised that the creation of these resources focus on boosting digital literacy, offering precise instructions on how to utilize technology, and creating a stimulating and

dynamic learning environment to optimize efficacy. Eventually, a blended learning framework that effectively integrates flipped-classroom language materials has the potential to enhance the educational process, encourage active learning, and improve language acquisition outcomes.

**Funding**: This study is not funded by any organization or institution.

**Conflicts of Interest**: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**ORCID iD (if any)**

**References :**

Akkoyunlu, B. & Yilmaz Soylu, M. (2006). A study on students' views on blended learning environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 7*(3). 43-56.

Aladwan, F., Fakhouri, H. N., Alawamrah, A., & Rababah, O. (2018). Students' attitudes toward blended learning among students of the University of Jordan. *Modern Applied Science, 12*(12), 217.

Alammary, A., Sheard, J., & Carbone, A. (2014). Blended learning in higher education: Three different design approaches. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 30*(4).

Baehr, C. (2012). Incorporating user appropriation, media richness, and collaborative knowledge sharing into blended e-learning training. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 55*(2).

Bernard, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Lou, Y., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Wozney, L., Wallet, P. A., Huang, B. (2004). How does distance education compare with classroom instruction? A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(3), 379–439

Beyer, S. (2008). Gender différences and intra-gender differences amongst management information systems students. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 19*(3), 301-310.

Bimber, B. (2000). Measuring the gender gap on the internet. *Social Science Quarterly, 81*(3), 868-876.

Birbal, R., Ramdass, M., & Harripaul, M. C. (2018). Student teachers' attitudes towards blended learning. J. *Educ. Hum. Dev, 7*(2), 9-26.

Bliuc, A., Goodyear, P., & Ellis, R. A. (2007). Research focus and methodological choices in studies into students' experiences of blended learning in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education, 10,* 231-244.

Braak, J. (2004). Domains and determinants of university students' self-perceived computer competence. *Computers & Education, 43*(3), 299–312.

Bulman, G., & Fairlie, R. W. (2016). *Technology and Education*. In Handbook of the Economics of Education (pp. 239–280). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-63459-7.00005-1

Chen, C.C., & Jones, K.T. (2007). Blended learning vs. traditional classroom settings: Assessing effectiveness and student perceptions in an MBA accounting course. *The Journal of Educators Online, 4*(1), 1-15.

Chen, P. S. D., Lambert, A. D., & Guidry, K. R. (2010). Engaging online learners: The impact of web-based learning technology on college student engagement. *Computers & Education, 54*(4), 1222–1232.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39*(7), 3-7.

Chuanpit, S., (2020). Students' readiness and problems in learning English through blended learning environment. *Asian Journal of Education and Training, 6*(1): 23-34.

Cole, R. A. (2000). *Issues in web-based pedagogy: A critical primer*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Mapping the developing landscape of mixed methods research*. SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research, 2, 45-68.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Delialioğlu, Ö., & Yıldırım, Z. (2007). Students' perceptions on effective dimensions of interactive learning in a blended learning environment. *Journal of Educational Technology and Society, 10*, 133-146.

Dunaway, M. M. (2013). IS learning: The impact of gender and team emotional intelligence. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 24*(3), 189-202.

Dziuban, C., Hartman, J., Juge, F., Moskal, P., & Sorg, S. (2006). *Blended learning enters the mainstream*. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs (pp. 195-208). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

El-Deghaidy, H., & Nouby, A. (2008). Effectiveness of a blended e-learning cooperative approach in an Egyptian teacher education programme. *Computers & Education, 51*, 988-1006.

Firdaus, F., Muntaqo, R., & Trisnowati, E. (2020). Analysis of Student Readiness for Blended Learning Model Implementation in Industrial Era 4.0. *Indonesian Journal of Science and Education, 4*(1), 48-56.

Garrison, D.R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education, 7*(2), 95-105.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). *Moral foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism.* In Advances in experimental social psychology. Academic Press.

Hamilton, J., & Tee, S. (2010). Smart utilization of tertiary instructional modes. *Computers & Education, 54*(4), 1036–1053.

He, J. & Freeman, L. A. (2010). Are Men More Technology-oriented than women? The role of gender on the development of general computer self-efficacy of college students. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 21*(2), 203-212.

Hinkle DE, Wiersma W, Jurs SG (2003). *Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences 5th ed*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hoic-Bozic, N., Dlab, M. H., & Mornar, V. (2016). Recommended system and web 2.0 tools to enhance a blended learning model. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 59*(1), 39–44.

Holley, D., & Oliver, M. (2010). Student engagement and blended learning: Portraits of risk. *Computers & Education, 54*(3), 693–700.

Holsapple, C. W., & Lee-Post, A. (2006). Defining, assessing, and promoting e-learning success: An information systems perspective. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 4*(1), 67.

Horn, M. B., & Staker, H. (2014). *Blended: Using disruptive innovation to improve schools.* John Wiley & Sons.

Hung, M.-L., Chou, C., Chen, C.-H., & Own, Z.-Y. (2010). Learner readiness for online learning: Scale development and student perceptions. *Computers & Education, 55*(3), 1080–1090. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.05.004.

Hwang, A. & Arbaugh, J. B. (2006). Virtual and traditional feedback-seeking behaviors: Underlying competitive attitudes and consequent grade performance. *Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 4. 1–28.

Johnson, L., Becker, S. A., Cummins, M., Estrada, V.Freeman, A., & Hall, C. (2016). *NMC horizon report: 2016 higher education edition* (pp. 1-50). The New Media Consortium.

Johnson, R. D., Hornik, S., & Salas, E. (2008). An empirical examination of factors contributing to the creation of successful e-learning environments. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 66*(5), 356–369.

Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. Studies in Higher Education, 38(5), 758–773.

Kenney, J., & Newcombe, E. (2011). Adopting a Blended Learning Approach: Challenges encountered and lessons learned in an action research study. *Online Learning, 15*(1).

Keskin, S., & Yurdugül, H. (2020). Factors affecting students' preferences for online and blended learning: Motivational vs. cognitive. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning, 22*(2), 72-86.

Lim, D. H., Morris, M. L., & Kupritz, V. W. (2007). Online vs. blended learning: Differences in instructional outcomes and learner satisfaction. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 11*(2), 27-42.

López-Pérez, M. V., Pérez-López, M. C., & Rodríguez- Ariza, L. (2011). Blended learning in higher education: Students' perceptions and their relation to outcomes. *Computers & Education, 56*(3), 818-826.

Machtmes, K., & Asher, J. W. (2000). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of telecourses in distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education, 14*(1), 27–46.

Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing research, 40*(2).

Mortera-Gutiérrez, F. (2006). Faculty best practices using blended learning in e-learning and face-to-face instruction. *In-ternational Journal on Elearning, ProQuest Education Journals, 5*(3), 313-337.

Motteram, G. (2006). Blended education and the transforma- tion of teachers: A long-term case study in post graduate UK Higher Education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 37*(1), 17-30.

Moussa-Inaty, J. (2017). Student experiences of a blended learning environment. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 16*(9), 60–72. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.16.9.5

Mozelius, P., & Hettiarachchi, E. (2017). Critical factors for implementing blended learning in higher education. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technologies in Education, 6(*2), 37-51.

Muilenburg, L. Y., & Berge, Z. L. (2005). Student barriers to online learning: A factor analytic study. *Distance Education, 26*(1), 29–48.

Nunan, T., George, R., & McCausland, H. (2000). Rethinking the ways in which teaching and learning are supported: The Flexible Learning Centre at the University of South Australia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 22*(1), 85-98. doi:10.1080/713678130.

Oliver, M., & Trigwell, K. (2005). Can 'blended learning' be re- deemed? *E-learning, 2* (1), 17-26.

Ong, Ch. S., & Lai, J. Y. (2006). Gender differences in perceptions and relationships among dominants of e-learning acceptance. *Computers in Human Behavior, 22(*5), 816–829.

Osguthorpe, R. T., & Graham, C. R. (2003). Blended learning environments definitions and directions. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 4*(3), 227-233.

Pereira, J. A., Pleguezuelos, E., Meri, A., Molina-Ros, A., Moli- na-Tomas, M. C., & Masdeu, C. (2007). Effectiveness of using blended learning strategies for teaching and learning human anatomy. *Medical Education, 41*, 189–195.

Rossett, A. (2002). *Waking in the night and thinking about e-learning.* In A. Rossett (Ed.), The ASTD e-learning handbook (pp. 3–18). New York:McGraw-Hill.

Sánchez-Franco, M. J., & Roldán, J. L. (2005). Web acceptance and usage model: A comparison between goal-directed and experiential web users. *Internet Research, 15*(1),21–48.

Schumacher, P., & Morahan-Martin, J. (2001). Gender, internet and computer attitudes and experiences. *Computers in Human Behavior, 17*(1), 95–110.

Singh, H. (2003). Building effective blended learning pro- grams. *Educational Technology, 43*(6), 51-54.

Sloman, M. (2007). Making sense of blended learning. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 39*(6), 315-318. doi:10.1108/00197850710816782

Slomanson, W. R. (2014). Blended learning: A flipped classroom experiment. *J. LegaL educ., 64*, 93.

Smith, K., & Hill, J. (2019). Defining the nature of blended learning through its depiction in current research. *Higher Education Research & Development, 38*(2), 383-397.

Spodark, E. (2001). Integrating online techniques into undergraduate french language instruction. *The French Review, Special Issue on Pedagogy, 74*(6), 1206-1217.

Tshabalala, M., Ndeya-Ndereya, C., & van der Merwe, T. (2014). Implementing Blended Learning at a Developing University: Obstacles in the Way. *Electronic Journal of e- Learning, 12*(1), 101-110.

Vamosi, A. R. Pierce, B. G. & Slotkin, M. H. (2004). Distance learning in an accounting principles course—Students' satisfaction and perceptions of efficacy. *Journal of Education for Business, 79.* 360–366.

Vaughan, N. (2007). Perspectives on blended learning in higher education. *International Journal on E-Learning*.

Voogt, J., Almekinders, M., Akker, J., & Moonen, B., A. (2005). 'Blended' in-service arrangement for classroom technology Integration: Impacts on teachers and students. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 21*, 523–539.

Wang, Y., Han, X., & Yang, J. (2015). Revisiting the blended learning literature: Using a complex adaptive systems framework. *Educational Technology and Society, 18*(2), 380–393.

Whitley, B. E. (1997). Gender differences in computer-related attitudes and behavior: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior, 13*(1), 1–22.

Woltering, V., Herrler, A., Spitzer, K., Spreckelsen C. (2009). Blended learning positively affects students' satisfaction and the role of the tutor in the problem-based learning process: Results of a mixed-method evaluation. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 14*(5), 725-738.

Yen, J.-C., & Lee, C.-Y. (2011). Exploring problem solving patterns and their impact on learning achievement in a blended learning environment. *Computers & Education, 56*(1), 138-145. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.08.012

Yilmaz, R. (2017). Exploring the role of e-learning readiness on student satisfaction and motivation in flipped classroom. *Computers in Human Behavior, 70*, 251-260.

Zhang, X., Yu, P., Yan, J., & Spil, T. A. (2015). Using diffusion of innovation theory to understand the factors impacting patient acceptance and use of consumer e-health innovations: a case study in a primary care clinic. *BMC health services research, 15*(1), 1-15.

Zhao, Y., Lei, J., Yan, B., Lai, C., & Tan, H. S. (2005). What makes the difference? A practical analysis of research on the effectiveness of distance education. *Teachers College Record, 107*(8), 1836–1884.