

A study of ELT teacher attitudes towards blended learning as an alternative course model, and the barriers and opportunities presented for teachers and students.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This research project will examine the possibilities and practicalities of having blended learning as an alternative course model to the one currently offered by publishers of English language teaching (ELT) materials, to either replace or supplement current linear courses. The feasibility of such a move will be considered before examining the barriers and opportunities presented when implementing a new model like blended learning.

2.0 CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

For the past 14 years, I have been working in ELT having worked in Japan, Spain, China and now the UK. For the past five years, my work in ELT publishing has involved the conceptualisation and development of materials for a wide variety of English language learners around the world, initially focusing on China, Russia and Indonesia. These materials have been produced both in print and digitally.

However, now that I am based in London, my publishing context has much more of a global remit. Recently, there has been a greater emphasis on the production of ELT related content for online platforms and my work now has a digital focus, involving

several projects that are moving much more towards blended learning. This move is one that is strongly supported by senior management throughout their education business, albeit one that is influenced by market forces as well as pedagogy.

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

ELT classrooms in many different educational contexts present teachers with unique situations for them to deal with on an almost daily basis. Such situations might arise from the students themselves in terms of the knowledge they bring to the class and their own language resources. Nevertheless, despite this ever-changing environment, publishers produce traditional textbooks, course syllabuses and other materials that provide a very specific path through the topics, grammar and vocabulary that will be taught, and when it will be taught, producing, "*a manageable and marketable product*" that is like, "*a discrete item on a shop shelf*" (Wajnryb in Gray, 2010:716). This linear progression through a course is very transparent in terms of what the course provides but it can cause difficulties for students who are not able to keep up with the pace of the course. This situation very much goes against Crotty's constructivist perspective of, "*meaning making of the individual mind*" (Crotty, 1998:58), with learners as discreet beings taking different journeys through the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) towards their zone of actual development. While students at, for example, private ELT language schools typically go through an initial placement test to determine the most suitable level and course for them, it is still clear in the classroom that there are differences of ability, interest and level of readiness (Little et al., 2009). Although teachers work hard to address such differing needs, it is difficult for them to do so in situations where, in my

experience, they may be under pressure to fulfil syllabus requirements for a large class of students that perhaps meet only once or twice a week. Consequently, many ELT language schools are experiencing a situation where they are applying linear course materials to a classroom that is, in fact, an incredibly diverse and complex environment, where it is difficult for teachers to predict exactly what is going to happen.

Kuhn (2008) views education as multidimensional, non-linear, interconnected and unpredictable, resonating with Vygotsky's description of learning as a, "*complexly woven tapestry of functions*" (Jörg, 2009:4), with the tapestry being representative of the non-linearity of complex reality. Wang et al. (2015) see complexity theory as being able to provide understandings of systems that are both dynamic and non-linear, with such systems being stable and transformative. Larsen-Freeman (1997) adds that it is the constant actions, interactions and reactions of those actors and components within a complex system that produces an environment that is not fixed and is, therefore, non-linear. Such definitions could be applied at the classroom level to describe the unpredictable nature of teaching as well as the social interconnectedness of the teacher and learners, echoing Kuhn's (2008) views.

Nevertheless, ELT publishing has produced a model of language learning through the linear ELT courses they develop and publish, and it could be argued that this is an attempt to reduce the complexity of the classroom into a workable model, albeit a commercial publishing model. According to Osberg et al. (2008), it is not possible to understand a complex system in its entirety, such systems instead being reduced to aid understanding. However, a complex system cannot be reduced completely,

something will always be left out (Osberg et al., 2008). This is perhaps the case with the ELT publishing model. While it develops a syllabus for what will be presented by the teacher and when, it does not, for example, always allow for differing student needs, a further component of the classroom complex system. Furthermore, Osberg et al. (2008:218) indicate that there is no single, "*meta-model*" that produces complete understandings. Instead, there are many variants that, in and of themselves, produce understanding. Therefore, the ELT course model currently adopted by publishers is but one means of reducing the complex classroom environment, but it is not the only possible model available. For example, Wang et al. (2015) propose the use of a Complex Adaptive Blended Learning System (CABLS) with the institution, teacher, content, learner, learning support and technology as the six components of the model. Each component has its own characteristics and interacts with the other components in different and, possibly, unpredictable ways, thus acknowledging the complexity of classroom environments.

The complexity and diversity of learning has already been acknowledged in many areas outside of ELT, particularly in the corporate world and higher education who have turned to blended learning as an alternative means of learning delivery (Sharma & Barrett, 2007). Many mainstream schools in the United States, such as Summit Public Schools, have similarly adopted blended learning models that offer greater flexibility through more of a non-linear approach, potential cost savings as well as a differentiated learning experience (Wilka & Cohen, 2012).

Although there is no single definition of blended learning accepted by all, the Christensen Institute (The Christensen Institute, n.d.) describes it as, "*a formal*

education program in which a student learns at least in part through online learning, with some element of student control over time, place, path and/or pace" and adds that having greater student agency, personalisation and ensuring that education is mastery-based would move towards a high-quality model of blended learning.

Osguthorpe and Graham (2003:228) suggest that those schools and institutions aiming to implement blended learning should try and, "*find a harmonious balance between online access to knowledge and face to face human interaction,*" a suggestion that such a balance be suitable, sustainable and appropriate for that school's context. In ELT, blended learning, for now, seems limited to classroom learning being enhanced by online learning, what Singh and Reed (2001) would see as being closer to blended learning's original definition. Moreover, Çepik at al. (2016) believe there are several factors that would affect the quality of blended learning offerings. For example, if the likes of internet connectivity, allocation of time or the level of support provided for students were to be lacking in any way, educational quality would suffer as a result.

Nevertheless, while there is not universal agreement over how blended learning is defined, non-ELT schools like Summit Public Schools place emphasis on the personalisation and tailoring of content to student needs through technology (Wilka & Cohen, 2012). While there are core modules to follow, students have a degree of choice in how they approach their learning. While this acknowledges the diversity and complexity of learning, it does question whether ELT publishing could try and move away from the production of linear courses for use in non-linear, complex classroom environments.

Many mainstream ELT publishers, including my own work context, have moved into the development of digital course content, for example e-textbooks with embedded video, audio and practice activities, as well as online course work for students. Some, such as Cambridge University Press and their Touchstone course, have taken larger steps towards blended learning with the possibility of 100% classroom and print textbook instruction, 100% online and e-textbook instruction, or a combination thereof. While this could be considered a step forward, Touchstone remains a linear course format with units and modules taught in a specific order. However, it does offer flexible study options and a degree of personalisation for the learner. Although some ELT publishers are attempting to build high quality blended learning courses, such scenarios are still under development and it remains to be seen how successful they will be.

Nevertheless, those scenarios could represent a more differentiated form of instruction (Tomlinson & Allan, 2000) encapsulated in constructivism and complexity theory. They would acknowledge that there is difference in student interest and ability while working with those differences to improve motivation, engagement as well as academic achievement. Having a non-linear system of delivering course content could move away from the banking style of education apparent in some educational contexts where students are simply passive consumers of the knowledge they receive (Freire, 2005) from their teachers as, "*knowledge surrogates*" (Taylor Webb, 2005:189). This could represent a more transformative experience for students while also moving teachers towards empowered professionalism, with a greater balance between accountability and autonomy (Wilkins, 2011). Moving away from a linear course model would enable students to

play a greater role in and have more responsibility for their own language development with the full support of their teacher. While this represents an opportunity for ELT publishing, it remains to be seen if an alternative publishing model like blended learning can be successfully applied to the ELT classroom.

In my experience of teaching and publishing in China, Japan, Spain and the UK, teachers are often under great pressure to ensure they have achieved the course aims and covered all the content necessary, often in a short space of time. There is frequently a considerable focus on exam preparation with students also under pressure to succeed. In addition, teachers as well as some publishers, may well be more comfortable with a linear form of course progression that stipulates exactly what is to be taught and when. Not only is this a fairly tried and tested course format, it is also beneficial when teacher workloads are high and the opportunity to explore the individualised needs of ones' students might be limited. Indeed, learners like to be able to see what they are going to learn as it may well provide them with a sense of progression and development as they continue through the course. Additionally, adult learners, according to Slaouti et al. (2013:73) have very clear learning preferences having developed, "*very strong perceptions of what works for them, and how they want to learn.*" Consequently, their past learning and cultural experiences will shape their attitudes towards the implementation of something new like blended learning.

Whether it is blended learning or an alternative course model that is selected to enhance or replace that which is currently adopted by ELT publishers, it will never be a complete reduction of the complex environment it seeks to model. One would need

to consider carefully the benefits the new publishing model provides as well as the elements of the complex environment that are omitted.

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to consider blended learning as an alternative to linear ELT courses, the research questions for this project will be as follows:

1. To what extent do ELT teachers believe it possible and practical to move away from current ELT course models to blended learning as an alternative model?
2. What are the barriers and/or opportunities for ELT teachers and students of potentially adopting blended learning as an alternative model?

5.0 PARADIGMATIC STANCE & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Throughout my research career, my paradigmatic standpoint has moved between post-positivism and interpretive enquiry, depending on the work being undertaken at the time. School management decision-making required more of a post-positivist outlook while classroom-based research was predominantly an interpretive endeavour, investigating problems arising for specific teachers with specific classrooms and groups of students. This classroom-based enquiry is akin to Crotty's (1998:58), "*meaning making of the individual mind*," suggestive of the non-

generalisability of interpretive research but also acknowledging the complexity of the classroom environment and the students within it.

My move into ELT publishing has involved the production of course materials that are driven by market demands, much more of a post-positivist approach to decision-making with the, "*hard, objective and tangible*" data senior management often looks for (Cohen et al., 2007:7). I have, therefore, moved along a spectrum between post-positivism and interpretivism to select, "*the best opportunities for answering important research questions*" (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004:16). Consequently, my own paradigmatic standpoint has emerged as something akin to Dewey's pragmatism, with transactions taking place between the human mind and the environment being experienced. Osberg et al. (2008:214) argue that while they see education as a, "*representational practice*", complexity is more "*emergentist*." Dewey argues that transactions are constantly being built and rebuilt as the environment changes, thus creating new understandings, a form of transactional constructivism (Biesta & Burbules, 2003). As changes to the environment occur, so too does the response one takes, similar to Larsen-Freeman's (1997) view of the actions and reactions taking place within a complex system.

Due to this constant rebuilding through transactions, there will be something omitted from the representation, just as there is when trying to reduce a complex system to a model of that system (Osberg et al., 2008); there is no meta-model and some aspect is inevitably sacrificed. Consequently, Dewey's thinking on pragmatism and its transactional nature could work in parallel with complexity. Furthermore, pragmatism with its anti-epistemological perspective sits well with Baert's (2005) hermeneutic

circle and Sayer's (2000) double hermeneutic, a joining of the natural sciences fallibilist philosophy with the social sciences, this being representative of the paradigmatic spectrum I frequently travel along.

Due to my pragmatic standpoint and the nature of the research questions, a mixed methodology research design can be used in this project, specifically a sequential explanatory design that encompasses a main quantitative element followed by a secondary qualitative element.

6.0 RESEARCH DESIGN, DATA COLLECTION TOOLS & METHODS

A sequential explanatory research design was used to collect a primary phase of quantitative data related to research question one with there being a second phase of qualitative data that relate to the second research question. This second phase provided deeper understandings of that initial primary phase of quantitative data. The qualitative data, therefore, plays much more of a supportive role according to Creswell and Plano Clark (2007). Furthermore, Morse (1991) suggests that such supportive qualitative data can reveal surprising and unexpected insights that were perhaps not evident during the analysis of the primary quantitative data alone.

6.1 PRIMARY QUANTITATIVE DATA COLLECTION PHASE – RESEARCH

QUESTION 1

This quantitative data collection phase involved the piloting and distribution of a questionnaire survey to 80 ELT teachers and teaching professionals to gain understandings of their teaching situation, how courses are produced in their schools, the extent of their autonomy in the classroom and their thoughts on an alternative course production model like blended learning. They were also asked their opinions on the extent to which they think the courses they teach could be moved away from existing course production formats to blended learning.

Of the 80 questionnaires sent out, there were 51 responses, a return rate of 64%. The questionnaire predominantly comprised closed question types although there were a small number of open questions included as well as initial biographical-type questions (see Appendix 1). The biographical questions helped build an overall picture of the questionnaire sample, as can be seen in Tables 1 to 4 below.

Table 1: Q6_job

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Teacher	44	86.3	86.3	86.3
	Manager	7	13.7	13.7	100.0
	Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Table 2: Q7_location

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	English speaking countries	12	23.5	23.5	23.5
	Non-English speaking countries	39	76.5	76.5	100.0
	Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Q8_time_teaching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Less than 1 year	4	7.8	7.8	7.8
	1-4 years	12	23.5	23.5	31.4
	5-9 years	14	27.5	27.5	58.8
	Over 10 years	21	41.2	41.2	100.0
	Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Table 4: Q11_teaching_interaction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Face to face teaching	38	74.5	74.5	74.5
	Online teaching	2	3.9	3.9	78.4
	Mix of face to face and online	11	21.6	21.6	100.0
	Total	51	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire was initially piloted by three experienced ELT professionals. They were asked to check the wording of each question and the instructions and to provide sample answers. They also timed themselves completing the questionnaire. Consequently, some of the question wording was altered to clear up misunderstandings and ambiguity. Furthermore, some less relevant questions were removed so that overall, it took from 20 to 25 minutes to complete. Following piloting,

the questionnaire was distributed via both email and social media to teaching contacts based mainly in the UK, Spain and China.

6.2 INTERMEDIATE STAGE

During this intermediate stage, the data arising from the quantitative questionnaire survey was analysed as detailed in the data analysis section below. Furthermore, to connect the primary quantitative phase with the following qualitative phase of data collection, Ivankova et al. (2006) suggest such an intermediate stage so that the initial data can inform the selection of participants for the upcoming qualitative data collection, in this case the semi-structured interviews.

6.3 SECONDARY QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTION PHASE – RESEARCH QUESTION 2

The secondary qualitative phase of the project involved conducting interviews with four of the questionnaire respondents to explore their thoughts on blended learning as an alternative model along with the potential barriers and opportunities. In the questionnaire, respondents were asked if they would be prepared to take part in an interview. Of the 51 respondents, 21 indicated they would be prepared to take part in the interview stage. Of those 21, eight were invited to interview with four interviewees accepting. The interviewees were selected based on their experience of both face-to-face and online teaching as well as having defined blended learning appropriately at the questionnaire stage. Also, they teach English as a foreign language. Interviewee 1 is Spanish and is based in Germany teaching adults

primarily online at a large private language school. Interviewee 2 is an American teaching students at a university in Seoul, South Korea. Interviewee 3 is British and teaches adults face-to-face at a private academy in Spain. This academy currently has six schools and is looking to expand into online teaching. Finally, interviewee 4 is Filipino and teaches children and teenagers at a large private language school in China. This school offers face-to-face teaching with access to online study components.

These interviews were semi-structured but also flexible enough so that responses could be followed up on and explored in more depth as necessary, a form of hierarchical focusing (Tomlinson, 1989). The interviews were conducted over Skype with the call being recorded and subsequently transcribed for analysis. The interviews lasted up to 30 minutes each.

7.0 LIMITATIONS

The relatively small sample size of this project is the primary limitation in terms of the ability to generalise the results to a wider population. Nevertheless, this project can still provide useful insights that may well induce catalytic and educative authenticity (Creswell, 2009). While other studies have focused on student opinions towards the likes of blended learning, this study chose to focus on teaching staff. Although this may reveal insights different from those of students, it would be interesting to later include a student as well as publisher voice to obtain a more complete picture. However, this is something that can be further expanded upon in terms of future research.

Questionnaires as a data collection method can be limited in terms of the number of questions that can be asked along with the open or closed nature of such questions. The questionnaire in this study was designed so that teachers would be able to complete it relatively quickly so as not to take up too much of their time. However, respondents may not have been able to provide as full an answer as they may have liked. Nevertheless, the follow up interviews, albeit with a small number of participants, helped address that issue to an extent.

8.0 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Prior to starting data collection, ethical approval was obtained from the University of Exeter on 4 March 2017.

In respect of the questionnaire survey, informed consent was obtained from each participant immediately prior to them completing the survey (see Appendix 1). The British Educational Research Association (2011:5) defines informed consent as, "*participants understand and agree to their participation without any duress.*" Consequently, the project title and a description of the project were included at the beginning of the questionnaire for all participants to read and sign. As part of the informed consent process, questionnaire participants were notified that they had the right to confidentiality and anonymity (Corden & Sainsbury, 2005) and that they would not be identified in the final research report. Furthermore, all participants had the right to withdraw their participation at any point and request that their data not be used in the final report.

Further informed consent and information documents were drawn up for the interview participants and they similarly outlined the title and nature of the project (see Appendix 2). Participants also had the right to confidentiality, anonymity and withdrawal. In addition, as the interviews were audio recorded, participants were given access to the final transcript of their interview and were asked to make any changes as necessary.

Sugirin (1999:2) talks about the need for, "*reality checks*" on qualitative data to ensure the integrity of intended meaning. Indeed, as I have something of a dual role of ELT publisher and ELT researcher, it is important that my own thoughts and potential biases do not influence the participants. For example, the informed consent documentation was written and checked to ensure it remained as neutral as possible, thus not influencing any of the participants. In addition, there were retrospective follow ups with questionnaire and interview participants to check and clarify information provided. Furthermore, questionnaire and interview participants had the opportunity to edit any responses even after submission.

9.0 DATA ANALYSIS

9.1 QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

The questionnaire included 24 questions that were divided into 60 variables, the variable names being derived from the questionnaire itself. There were three categorical ordinal variables (requiring a ranking answer), 56 categorical nominal variables (requiring a yes/no response) and one string variable (comprising a typed response). Each variable was assigned values depending on its type. For example, the 56 categorical nominal variables requiring a yes/no response were given a value of '0' for no or '1' for yes. Certain questions required respondents to select all answers that were relevant. In those situations, each possible answer option was created as a categorical nominal variable with a yes/no response depending on whether it was selected.

The questionnaire also contained open questions requiring a written response from the respondents. For example, question 21 asked respondents to provide their own definition of blended learning. In this situation, the responses were examined and placed into one of two possible categories; either categorised as '1' where an appropriate definition of blended learning was provided (one that, at the very least, indicated an amalgamation of physical classroom learning with an online learning component, as per Singh and Reed (2001)), or it was marked '0' as being inappropriate or unknown. The other open response questions were dealt with in a similar fashion with, in one instance, the analysis of respondent answers prompting the creation of the variables. For example, the final questions asked respondents about their thoughts on the barriers and opportunities presented by blended learning

in their context. The variables that were created came out of the responses provided (see Appendix 3), allowing those responses to be appropriately categorised.

Consequently, any responses indicating financial or cost-related barriers were categorised under 'Q27_barriers_managerial' with the response being given a value of '1' as having been mentioned by the respondent.

The variable names and values that were produced based on the questionnaire and prior to analysis can be seen in Appendix 4.

Using these variable names and values, the responses were entered into SPSS as dummy variables or ranked variables. The one string variable was not analysed due to lack of relevance. The resulting values produced from the 51 respondents to each question can be seen in Appendix 5.

9.2 REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Although there were only 51 responses to the questionnaire, and this introduces issues relating to error and generalisability, an attempt was made to not only analyse through descriptive statistics but also inferential statistics. Using the ease of implementation ('Q26_implementation') as the dependent variable, this was tested against five groups of independent variables in a linear regression analysis in SPSS to determine any points of significance. The independent variables were grouped according to the main sections of the questionnaire, namely:

- Biographical information
- Current teaching practice (course organisation)

- Attitudes towards blended learning (quality)
- Implementing blended learning (barriers)
- Implementing blended learning (benefits/opportunities)

This identified three areas of significance from the biographical information and barriers groups. No other group showed areas of significance.

Table 5a: Biographical information - location and online access

Model	Unstandardized B	Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	4.251	1.026		4.145	.000
Q5_age	.204	.230	.179	.889	.379
Q6_job	.299	.483	.087	.619	.539
Q7_location	-.979	.436	-.353	-2.245	.030
Q8_time_teaching	-.373	.260	-.310	-1.436	.158
Q10_tech_experience	-.005	.182	-.004	-.026	.978
Q16_online access	.982	.402	.343	2.443	.019
Q21_BL_definition	-.255	.400	-.094	-.637	.527

Table 5b: Biographical information – model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.457	.209	.080	1.14042

According to Table 5a, there was a significant negative correlation between the dependent variable and location, with a significance of 0.030 when $p < 0.05$.

Furthermore, there was also a significant positive correlation between the dependent variable and online access, with the significance being 0.019, $p < 0.05$. The effect size R suggests a moderate practical significance.

Table 6a: Barriers - technological barriers

Model	Unstandardized B	Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	4.173	.383		10.901	.000
Q27_barriers_managerial	-.079	.359	-.033	-.219	.828
Q27_barriers_logistical	-.583	.438	-.221	-1.332	.190
Q27_barriers_content	-.481	.551	-.132	-.873	.387
Q27_barriers_teacher	-.032	.387	-.012	-.082	.935
Q27_barriers_student	-.400	.380	-.166	-1.052	.299
Q27_barriers_tech	-.727	.364	-.301	-1.997	.052

Table 6b: Barriers – model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.333	.111	-.011	1.19950

Of the barriers to implementation, Table 6a indicates a significant negative correlation between the dependent variable and technological barriers, albeit a borderline significance of 0.052, $p < 0.05$. In this instance, the effect size R suggests a small to moderate practical significance.

These three significant predictors were then tested against the dependent variable to check their level of significance without any of the original grouped independent variables being present (see Table 7).

Table 7a: Significant predictors

Model	Unstandardized B	Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	3.473	.441		7.881	.000
Q27_barriers_tech	-.388	.324	-.161	-1.198	.237
Q16_online_access	.832	.380	.291	2.191	.033
Q7_location	-.657	.372	-.237	-1.765	.084

Table 7b: Significant predictors – model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.423	.179	.126	1.11151

Although online access remains significant, with an effect size R indicating moderate practical significance, both barriers to technology and location are no longer significant. However, it is interesting to note that the coefficient standard error for each of the significant predictors has decreased in Table 7a as compared to Table 6a. This suggests that with a larger sample size, perhaps through further research, the standard error may continue to fall resulting in these predictors (and perhaps others) becoming more significant (Stock & Watson, 2007).

9.3 INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

In addition to the inferential statistics, SPSS was used to provide descriptive statistics. These statistics formed the basis of the semi-structured interview sessions along with the areas of significance identified above. Appendix 6 outlines the questions prepared in advance of the interview sessions. All interviewees were provided with an information sheet about the interview along with an informed consent form, which they all read and signed. The completed transcripts were sent to

each interviewee so they could check and ensure the transcription was accurate and preserved their intended meaning. Interviewees were asked to make any changes and return the transcript.

Subsequently, the transcripts were uploaded to Nvivo where a first round of initial coding was performed (Saldaña, 2009) using the pre-set codes in Table 8 below as a starting point. During initial coding, the emergent codes developed. Appendix 7a outlines examples from the initial coding phase.

Table 8: Initial coding

Pre-set codes from questionnaire	Emergent codes from interviews
Barriers	Confidence in the new model
Confidence with technology	Evolution of ELT
Definition of blended learning	Training & transitioning
Ease of implementation	
Opportunities	
Student autonomy	
Teacher autonomy	

A second round of pattern coding was then conducted to break the data down into, "*smaller sets, themes and constructs*" (Miles & Huberman, 1994:69) (see Appendix 7b). That provided the opportunity to develop explanations relating back to the two research questions.

10.0 FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

While the questionnaire data influenced the development of questions and areas of enquiry for the interview, both were initially analysed individually before being considered together as a whole (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

10.1 RESEARCH QUESTION 1 – BLENDED LEARNING AS AN ALTERNATIVE ELT MODEL

The first research question considers the possibility and practicality of blended learning being adopted as an alternative to the current ELT teaching model. The location of the school represented a significant negative correlation in the regression analysis. This suggests that ELT schools and teachers in non-English speaking countries may be less likely to see blended learning as being possible to implement in their context.

This point was raised during interview with confidence with a new model such as blended learning giving rise to several themes interviewees saw as being crucial within their own contexts. Both Interviewees 1 and 2 indicated that there is a stigma surrounding the use of online components in certain educational settings with them often being considered inferior. Such countries often promote a pedagogy that has, *"the teacher as the authority figure and sort of based on the banking model"* (Interviewee 2), a reference to Freire's image of the teacher depositing chunks of knowledge to students as passive consumers (Freire, 2005). This has created certain expectations among English language learners as to how they will learn, with

Interviewee 1 suggesting, *"they feel more secure learning in the traditional way"* and Interviewee 3 also suggesting that a student's educational history promotes certain expectations as to what the class will be like, as was indicated by Slaouti et al. (2013). Although this does not completely preclude the idea of implementing blended learning, it does suggest that it would take time in locations that are perhaps more culturally sensitive to online education, and that it may be that key stakeholders in such an implementation (such as students, teachers and parents), *"are still not open to embrace all these changes or new developments"* (Interviewee 4), thus negatively influencing the practicality and possibility of a successful implementation.

This theme of lack of confidence and caution surrounding the new technologies used in a blended learning model is also strongly related to the confidence teachers and students have in using that technology as shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Confidence with technology

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Not confident	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Somewhat confident	2	3.9	3.9	5.9
	Neutral	17	33.3	33.3	39.2
	Confident	17	33.3	33.3	72.5
	Very confident	14	27.5	27.5	100.0
	Total	51	100.0	100.0	

39% of questionnaire respondents indicated they were 'not confident', 'somewhat confident' or 'neutral' about their confidence with technology in the classroom. The theme of low confidence with technology was further developed with Interviewee 3 suggesting there was a *"fear"* and *"reluctance"* among some teachers about

technology in the classroom with interviewee 2 indicating that if that is the case then those teachers, *"would probably not be keen to implement that technology in classes."* Interviewee 1 argued that when implementing an alternative like blended learning, which involves technological components, there may be hesitancy from some people (teachers and students), because, *"for them, it's not proven yet."*

For schools to move away from their current teaching model to something like blended learning, there would need to be training courses for teachers as well as transition time for them to get used to the new model. Interviewee 4 indicated that in her context, there was a lack of training and knowledge about blended learning and because teachers did not have that experience, training would be a necessity for them. Interestingly, Interviewee 3 extended the argument to include external training. She mentioned that in ELT industry standard training programmes such as the Cambridge Diploma in English Language Teaching to Adults (DELTA), even though there is a focus on new techniques and theories as part of the course modules, *"there was nothing about blended learning."* The lack of training in new technologies generally and blended learning specifically, along with the costs associated with such training, was a theme that could significantly diminish the possibilities of a successful implementation.

In terms of the possibility and practicality of implementing a new model like blended learning, while it may be possible in many contexts, the main theme emerging from the interviews seems to sound a note of caution regarding the practicalities of doing so. A further emergent theme suggested there was a reluctance and fear of new technology and a continued stigma in certain contexts towards online education

potentially complicating a change to a blended learning model. Consequently, the extent to which a new model like blended learning can be implemented to replace, or even support, existing courses is limited to the extent to which schools are willing and able to do so. There are many barriers and opportunities that come out of new models like blended learning, these being explored in the second research question.

10.2 RESEARCH QUESTION 2 – BARRIERS AND OPPORTUNITIES

In Table 10, 53% of respondents indicated that implementing blended learning in their own contexts would be either 'easy' or 'very easy'.

Table 10: Ease of implementation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Very difficult	4	7.8	7.8	7.8
	Difficult	6	11.8	11.8	19.6
	Neutral	14	27.5	27.5	47.1
	Easy	16	31.4	31.4	78.4
	Very easy	11	21.6	21.6	100.0
	Total	51	100.0	100.0	

In my experience, ease and success of implementation depends on several factors, such as size of the school, ability to finance such a change and the country in which the school is based. Consequently, it is not surprising that the remaining 47% felt that implementing blended learning would be 'very difficult', 'difficult' or were 'neutral.' This suggests that there are some crucial barriers that need to be overcome to achieve a successful implementation of blended learning.

In terms of the barriers, there was a significant negative correlation between the technological barrier and the ease of implementation. While this correlation is borderline, it does align with some of the themes that have come out of the interviews regarding low confidence with technology along with the stigma still attached to online education. While technology may be moderately significant in terms of its relationship to implementation as a dependent variable, the other barriers mentioned by questionnaire respondents and detailed by interviewees are no less important. The barriers mentioned by the respondents ranged from managerial barriers (for example, slow pace of change and lack of financial commitment) to student barriers (for example, preference for face-to-face teaching, lack of interest and negative attitudes towards blended learning). Student motivation as a barrier emerged as a significant theme. Interviewee 4 discussed this in terms of the, *"discipline and commitment"* required to both attend class and study online with Interviewee 2 agreeing that university students would similarly find motivation a challenge. In addition, financial considerations came across as potential impediments to implementation. Interviewee 4 discussed whether some schools had the, *"capacity to be able to afford all this equipment in order to support [...] blended learning."*

Despite the challenges presented by motivation, cost, technological fear and reluctance, and location issues, one of the bigger challenges surrounds the definition of blended learning itself.

Table 11: Definition of blended learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Inappropriate definition of BL	13	25.5	25.5	25.5
	Appropriate definition of BL	38	74.5	74.5	100.0
	Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Table 11 shows that 38 respondents provided a definition of blended learning that recognised there was an amalgamation of face-to-face learning with online components. While that is appropriate, it is a somewhat basic view of blended learning as discussed by Singh and Reed (2001). Only three respondents went further and included elements of personalisation and/or student control over time, place or pace of study; something that would be closer to the Christensen Institute's definition. Interviewee 1 suggests the importance of understanding what is expected of you as a teacher with Interviewee 2 indicating that if there is, *"a pretty high number of teachers who don't really understand what blended learning is, that could potentially be problematic for English language teaching programs, for publishers ..."* Consequently, there would need to be clarity throughout the ELT industry as to what is meant by blended learning to maintain consistent expectations.

Despite these barriers, some of which may well come across as insurmountable in the eyes of some ELT schools, there were several opportunities presented by blended learning. Opportunities presented by blended learning for students was a theme running through all interviews. This was supported by 74.5% of questionnaire respondents who saw autonomous learning, increased motivation, engagement and accelerated learning opportunities as being the main benefits for students.

Interviewee 1 argued that providing more of a, "*customized learning opportunity*" for her students would enable them to progress quicker. Interviewee 2 suggesting that through students taking charge of their own learning, there would be instances of increased autonomy and motivation. Interestingly, Interviewee 3 saw this as a chance to "*rejuvenate*" the classroom, perhaps providing more flexible learning opportunities for students.

Interviewee 3 also mentioned "*teacher freedom*" as a potential benefit, with teachers being able to consider alternative means of assessment for their classes. Teacher benefits were mentioned by 33.3% of questionnaire respondents and included increased planning and reflection time, development and training opportunities and teacher autonomy. Nevertheless, it was clear from both respondents and interviewees that the student opportunities were the ones considered most important. One final opportunity relates to the significant positive correlation between online access and the dependent variable. This indicates that as instances of online access increase, so too does the ease of implementation. While this is not entirely surprising, this relates strongly to the view of Çepik et al. (2016) who suggested that various factors need to be in place to promote a high quality blended learning course. One such factor was internet connectivity and should this not be available, quality would be compromised.

Looking at the barriers and opportunities together, the impression is that there are a great deal more barriers to tackle. Furthermore, barriers like financial commitment, lack of facilities and time are potentially more tangible for schools and institutions than student autonomy and motivation. Despite this, the interviewees were

unanimous in stating that they felt the opportunities outweighed the barriers. There was a sense of ELT having to evolve with the technological times, so rather than being an opportunity, this might be more of a necessity. Interviewee 4 indicated that this was, *"something that will evolve in the future"* with Interviewee 3 suggesting, *"you have to offer different ways of learning and it has to be combined some way with technology because that's the way the world is, and it's not going to go backwards."*

The strength of the opportunities, or necessity, is also suggested when looking at the regression analysis correlations from Tables 6a and 7a above. With the decrease in standard error, there is a real need to consider whether blended learning is the best alternative model. As was seen from the first research question, the possibility and practicality of implementing blended learning would be very much in the hands of the schools. Consequently, rather than there being a complex model of the classroom based on a publishing model, such a model should be in place for schools and institutions. As Osberg et al. (2008) indicated, there can be multiple complex models each producing different understandings. Therefore, publishers could produce a basic model, perhaps not dissimilar to the CABLS model proposed by Wang et al. (2015), and enable schools to decide what is and is not included in the model. If such a model was flexible enough, it would allow schools to implement blended learning according to their specific needs and abilities, as suggested by Beetham and Sharpe (2013), potentially finding the *"harmonious balance"* promoted by Osguthorpe and Graham (2003:228). Indeed, Wilka and Cohen (2012:2) indicate that, *"Summit has avoided fixating on the latest model or product in blended learning,"* preferring to examine teacher and student data, feedback and reflection to

determine the next iteration of their blended learning offering. Whether this promotes a movement away from linear courses in ELT is a matter of debate, but this could at least start moving things in that direction in some contexts.

11.0 CONCLUSION

With online components being a common part of ELT courses, it remains to be seen whether blended learning can be adopted as an alternative to the current linear courses produced by ELT publishers. Offering a fixed one size fits all version of blended learning is not necessarily going to succeed when student and school needs are to be carefully taken into consideration. Moreover, the lack of consensus over the definition of blended learning would suggest that such needs and requirements are an important consideration, giving rise to the possibility of a flexible complex model of blended learning that can be implemented in schools according to their specific requirements. Nevertheless, while this may be practical and possible in some contexts, others will need to overcome the stigma and fear surrounding online education pointing to a need for greater training and professional development. Despite this, the sense of ELT needing to evolve is an important one, and one that ELT publishers should certainly heed.

6589 words

12.0 REFERENCES

- Baert, P. (2005). Towards a Pragmatist-Inspired Philosophy of Social Science. *Acta Sociologica: Science, Power and Democracy*, 48(3), 191–203.
- Beetham, H., & Sharpe, R. (2013). An introduction to rethinking pedagogy. In H. Beetham & R. Sharpe (Eds.), *Rethinking pedagogy for a digital age: designing for twenty-first century learning*. Routledge.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2014.940498>
- Biesta, G. J. J., & Burbules, N. C. (2003). *Pragmatism and Educational Research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- British Educational Research Association. (2011). *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. British Educational Research Association. Retrieved from <https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2011>
- Çepik, Ş., Gönen, K., & Sazak, M. K. (2016). ELT instructors' attitudes towards the use of Blended Learning in tertiary level English language programs. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1), 1715–1730.
<http://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v13i1.3719>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. *Education* (6th ed., Vol. 55). Oxon: Routledge.
- Corden, A., & Sainsbury, R. (2005). *Research participants' views on use of verbatim quotations*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/23219357/Research_Participants_Views_on_Use_of_Verbatim_Quotations?auto=download
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications

Ltd.

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process* (1st ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniv). London: The Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Gray, J. (2010). The branding of English and the culture of the new capitalism: Representations of the world of work in English language textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(5), 714–733. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq034>
- Ivankova, N. V, Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3–20. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14–26. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007014>
- Jörg, T. (2009). Thinking in complexity about learning and education: A programmatic view. *Complexity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, 6(1), 1–22. Retrieved from www.complexityandeducation.ca
- Kuhn, L. (2008). Complexity and educational research: A critical reflection. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40(1), 177–189. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00398.x>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/Complexity science and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 141–165.
- Little, C. A., Hauser, S., & Corbishley, J. (2009). Constructing complexity for

- differentiated learning. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School*, 15(1), 34–42. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41182949>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40(1), 120–123.
- Osberg, D., Biesta, G., & Cilliers, P. (2008). From representation to emergence: Complexity's challenge to the epistemology of schooling. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40(1), 213–227. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00407.x>
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Graham, C. R. (2003). Blended learning environments: Definitions and directions. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 4(3), 227–233. <http://doi.org/Article>
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Sayer, A. (2000). Introducing Critical Realism. In *Realism and Social Science* (pp. 2–28). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. <http://doi.org/10.4135/9781446218730>
- Sharma, P., & Barrett, B. (2007). *Blended Learning*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Singh, H., & Reed, C. (2001). *A white paper: Achieving success with blended learning*. Centra software. Retrieved from <http://facilitateadultlearning.pbworks.com/f/blendedlearning.pdf>
- Slaouti, D., Onat-Stelma, Z., & Motteram, G. (2013). Technology and adult language learning. In G. Motteram (Ed.), *Innovations in learning technologies for English language teaching* (pp. 67–86). British Council.
- Stock, J. H., & Watson, M. W. (2007). *Introduction to Econometrics* (2nd ed.).

London: Pearson International Edition.

Sugirin, S. (1999). Exploring the Comprehension Strategies of EFL Readers : A multi-method study. In *Version of a paper presented at an International Workshop on Written Language Processing at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED428548.pdf>

Taylor Webb, P. (2005). The anatomy of accountability. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(2), 189–208. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0268093052000341395>

The Christensen Institute. (n.d.). Blended learning definitions. Retrieved May 30, 2017, from <https://www.christenseninstitute.org/blended-learning-definitions-and-models/>

Tomlinson, C. A., & Allan, S. D. (2000). Understanding differentiated instruction: Building a foundation for leadership. In *Leadership for Differentiating Schools and Classrooms*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, P. (1989). Having it both ways: Hierarchical focusing as research interview method. *British Educational Research Journal*, 15(2), 155–176. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1500577>

Wang, Y., Han, X., & Yang, J. (2015). Revisiting the Blended Learning Literature : Using a Complex Adaptive Systems Framework, 18, 380–393.

Wilka, M., & Cohen, J. (2012). *It's not just about the model: Blended learning, innovation, and year 2 at Summit Public Schools*.

Wilkins, C. (2011). Professionalism and the post-performative teacher: New teachers reflect on autonomy and accountability in the English school system. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(3), 389–409. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2010.514204>

13.0 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE AND INFORMED CONSENT

A study of ELT teacher attitudes towards blended learning as an alternative ELT course model, and the implications and opportunities for teachers, students and publishers.

Thank you for taking part in this research project.

Before you start completing the questionnaire, it is important that you read the 'Research project information' and acknowledge your agreement to the informed consent paragraph. If you have any questions, please get in touch - my contact details are listed below.

Please provide your email address below. This will help with any follow up questions I might have regarding your responses. Your email will not be shared with anyone and you will not be identified in the final research report.

* Required

1. Email address *

Researcher contact details

Should you need to contact this project's researcher at any point, the contact details are as follows:

██████████ Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter, UK Email:
██████████@exeter.ac.uk

The supervisor for this project is Dr Phil Durrant, Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter, UK Email: P.L.Durrant@exeter.ac.uk

Research project information

Thank you for your interest in participating in my research project. The following provides you with additional information regarding the nature of this project in order that you may make an informed decision as to whether or not you wish to participate. Please read through this information carefully and should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

This research project is being completed as part of the University of Exeter's Doctorate in Education (TESOL) program. I am the sole researcher involved in this project and I have no commercial or other interests to declare. Any funding for this project will be provided by me alone.

Synopsis

I have worked in ELT publishing for five years, producing materials for students in many different global markets. One of the main aspects of print-based course production is that the course syllabus (and, therefore, the likes of topics, grammar and vocabulary) is presented in a specific order that does not vary tremendously from publisher to publisher. This format makes it clear what will be taught and when which allows teachers to plan accordingly.

With the opportunities that digital education provides, there is an opportunity to look for alternative course production models. This research project is going to consider blended learning as such an alternative. Consequently, I would like to investigate the extent to which ELT teachers believe that it is possible and practical to move away from the current ELT course production format towards a model like blended learning. In addition, I would like to determine the barriers and/or opportunities for ELT teachers, students and publishers of making such a move.

Data collection

This is the first phase of the research and involves an online questionnaire to gather the views of ELT teachers on the possibility of moving away from the current ELT course model. This questionnaire will take around 20 minutes to complete and is a mix of multiple choice and open answer questions. Once you have completed the questionnaire, you will have an opportunity to check your responses and make amendments as necessary. You can also make amendments after you have submitted your answers.

The second phase of data collection will involve short interviews to follow up on and explore in more detail information coming out of this survey. If you would be willing to take part in the interview stage, please indicate this below.

You will be asked to sign an informed consent form. This explains that your participation is voluntary and that you may withdraw at any time. Your responses will be kept confidential and every effort will be made to ensure that you are not identifiable in the final research report.

Please note that the project and its results may be published in a peer reviewed academic journal and/or presented at a conference relating to the field of education.

Informed consent

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project and I agree to participate.

I understand that:

1. there is no compulsion for me to participate in this research project and, if I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation
2. I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about me
3. any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications
4. I have the right to review and amend any of the answers I provide in the questionnaire
5. the information which I give will form part of an assignment submitted to the University of Exeter but will not be shared with anyone outside of that institution
6. all information I give will be treated as confidential
7. the researcher will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

2. Name *

Please type your full name below to show you have read and understood the above information and give your consent. Your typed name will act as your signature.

3. Date *

4. Would you be willing to take part in a short interview at a later date?

Interviews should take around 30 minutes and can be conducted over Skype at a convenient time. If you select 'yes' or 'maybe' you can still change your mind later. Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Part 2: Current teaching practice

This section will explore in a bit more detail your teaching situation. Some of the questions are open ended so please feel free to write as much as you like.

11. How do you mainly teach your students? *

Mark only one oval.

- Face to face instruction
- Online instruction
- A mix of face to face and online

12. Typically, how many students are in your class? *

Mark only one oval.

- less than 5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21 or over

13. How often do your students attend class? *

Mark only one oval.

- once a week
- 2-3 times a week
- 4-5 times a week
- every day

14. How long are classes in your school or institution? *

15. Thinking about the courses offered at your school or institution, how are they organised? *

For example, is there a set syllabus, set textbook or other materials to use? Or, do you have flexibility over what is taught and the materials you use? Check all that apply.

- Set syllabus determined by, for example, the school
- Syllabus created with teacher input
- Set textbook and materials to use in class determined by the school
- Textbook and materials selected by the teacher
- Course lesson plans/teacher book to follow closely
- Course lesson plans/teacher book with suggestions for use in class
- Course is produced in a specific order (e.g. according to the syllabus)
- Course is produced as determined by the teacher

16. Do students have access to any online course materials at your school? *

This would relate to any online course materials that are offered by your school in order to supplement the in-class teaching. Mark only one oval.

- Yes (please answer the next question)
- No (please skip the next question)

17. If students do have access to online course materials, when are they able to access them?

Check all that apply.

- Before class
- During class
- After class

18. As part of your lesson preparation, do you edit the course materials depending on the students you are about to teach? *

For example, do you simplify materials or make things more challenging depending on the students in the class?

19. How is student progress measured throughout the courses you teach? *

Check all that apply.

- Progress test after every unit
- End of level assessment
- In-class informal assessment

20. What happens if a student falls behind or excels in your class? *

Part 3: Attitudes towards blended learning

In this section, the questions will explore your thoughts and feelings about using a blended learning form of instruction.

21. What is your understanding of the term, "blended learning?" *

Please feel free to add your own definition of what blended learning means to you.

22. Have you taught / Do you teach any blended learning courses? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

23. Compared to regular ELT classroom teaching, how would you rate the quality of the educational experience in a blended learning course? *

If you have taught a blended learning course before, how did this compare to regular ELT classroom teaching? If not, from what you know of blended learning, do you feel the educational quality would be better or worse? Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
	<input type="radio"/>					
Very low quality						Very high quality

24. Thinking about the previous question, can you provide some reasons for your rating?

25. What do you think are the most important elements of a high quality blended learning course? *

If you have taught blended learning courses before, you might like to consider what worked well for both you and your students. However, if you haven't taught such classes, please write about what you think would work best. You might like to consider the following definition of blended learning from the Khan Academy: "a formal education program in which a student learns at least in part through online learning, with some element of student control over time, place, path and/or pace."

Part 4: Implementing blended learning

In this final section, the questions will focus on the extent to which you believe blended learning can be successfully implemented within your school or institution. These questions are open ended so please feel free to write as much as you like.

26. How easy or otherwise would it be to implement blended learning models of instruction within your school or institution? *

If you already teach blended learning courses, how easy or otherwise was it to implement? Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
	<input type="radio"/>					
Very difficult						Very easy

27. What do you believe would be the main barriers to implementing a blended learning course model in your school or institution? *

If you already teach blended learning courses, were there any barriers when this was first introduced?

28. What do you believe would be the main benefits and/or opportunities to implementing a blended learning course model in your school or institution? *

A copy of your responses will be emailed to the address you provided.

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT AND INFORMATION SHEET

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

Project Title: A study of ELT teacher attitudes towards blended learning as an alternative ELT course model, and the barriers and opportunities presented for teachers and students.

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project and I agree to participate.

I understand that:

- there is no compulsion for me to participate in this research project and, if I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation
- I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about me
- any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications
- I have the right to read and amend the transcript produced as a result of the interview
- the information which I give will form part of an assignment submitted to the University of Exeter but will not be shared with anyone outside of that institution
- all information I give will be treated as confidential
- the researcher will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

.....
(Signature of participant)

.....
(Date)

.....
(Printed name of participant)

One copy of this form will be kept by the participant; a second copy will be kept by the researcher

Contact phone number of researcher: +44 [REDACTED]

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact:

██████████ at ██████████@exeter.ac.uk or the above number.

OR

Dr. Philip Durrant, Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter:
p.l.durrant@exeter.ac.uk

Data Protection Act: The University of Exeter is a data collector and is registered with the Office of the Data Protection Commissioner as required to do under the Data Protection Act 1998. The information you provide will be used for research purposes and will be processed in accordance with the University's registration and current data protection legislation. Data will be confidential to the researcher(s) and will not be disclosed to any unauthorised third parties without further agreement by the participant. Reports based on the data will be in anonymised form.

INFORMATION SHEET: INTERVIEWS

Thank you for your interest in participating in the second phase of my research project. The following provides you with additional information regarding the nature of this project in order that you may make an informed decision as to whether or not you wish to participate. Please read through this information carefully and should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

This research project is being completed as part of the University of Exeter's Doctorate in Education (TESOL) program. I am the sole researcher involved in this project and I have no commercial or other interests to declare. Any funding for this project will be provided by me alone.

Project Title

A study of ELT teacher attitudes towards blended learning as an alternative ELT course model, and the barriers and opportunities presented for teachers and students.

Synopsis

I have worked in ELT publishing for almost five years, producing materials for students in many different global markets. One of the main aspects of print-based course production is that the course syllabus (and, therefore, the likes of topics, grammar and vocabulary) is presented in a specific order that does not vary tremendously from publisher to publisher. This format makes it clear what will be taught and when which allows teachers to plan accordingly.

With the opportunities that digital education provides, and taking complexity theory into consideration, there is an opportunity to look for alternative course production models. This research project is going to consider blended learning as such an alternative. Consequently, I would like to investigate the extent to which ELT teachers believe that it is possible and practical to move away from the current ELT course production format towards a model like blended learning. In addition, I would like to determine the barriers and/or opportunities for ELT teachers, students and publishers of making such a move.

Data collection

This is the second phase of the research and involves follow-up interviews over Skype with some of the participants that completed the online questionnaire in phase one. The interviews will explore in greater depth the possibility and practicality of adopting blended learning as an alternative ELT course model. It is anticipated that an interview will take around 30 minutes to complete although this depends on the length of answers and whether any answers are explored in more depth. I will be asking some questions from a pre-prepared list although there may be other follow-up questions.

The interview will be recorded and then transcribed. You will have an opportunity to view the completed transcription to check that it is an accurate representation of the answers you provided. You may make changes to the transcript if necessary.

You will be asked to sign a consent form. This explains that your participation is voluntary and that you may withdraw at any time. Your interview responses will be kept confidential and every effort will be made to ensure that you are not identifiable in the final research report. The consent form will be emailed to you. Please print, sign and scan a copy and return it to me. I will then arrange a suitable time for us to talk over Skype.

Please note that the project and its results may be published in a peer-reviewed academic journal and/or presented at a conference relating to the field of education.

Thank you

Email: [REDACTED]@exeter.ac.uk

Tel: +44 [REDACTED]

Supervisor

Dr Philip Durrant

Email: p.l.durrant@exeter.ac.uk

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE BARRIERS AND OPPORTUNITIES

BARRIERS

1 Managerial/Institutional barriers

- No decision-making power for teachers
- Lack of vision
- Management commitment, reluctance to commit
- Syllabus restrictions
- Ministry of Education restrictions
- Lack of understanding of blended learning by staff and management
- Slow pace of change
- Financial commitment
- Communicating to staff and students about changes to the learning system and product
- Educating students about how to use the blended learning system

2 Logistical barriers

- Time to produce materials
- Content creation resources
- Lack of facilities

3 Content barriers

- Materials would need to match program goals
- Suitable cultural and linguistic information
- Difficulty adapting content
- Decisions on content made by institution rather than teachers
- Creation of quality programs
- Developing content that meets student needs
- Cultural and social barriers

4 Teacher/Teaching barriers

- Teacher attitudes and reluctance to deal with new technology
- Teacher training - cost and time taken (also management barrier)
- Teacher habits
- Harder to monitor student progress

5 Student barriers

- Student preference for in-class teaching
- Finding time for class, convenience
- Lack of student interest
- Student attitudes towards blended learning
- Student and parental perceptions of online courses
- Existing student habits
- Parental expectations
- Adult students don't like anything to do outside the classroom

6 Technological barriers

- Technology limitations and uncertainties
- Technology commitment
- Too much screen time for students

OPPORTUNITIES

1 Teacher benefits

- Planning time
- Teacher reflection time
- Teacher development
- Tailored training
- Teacher autonomy
- Freedom of curriculum design
- Variety of materials
- Awareness of progression

2 Student benefits

- Immersion setting
- learners practice outside of class
- Independent learning
- Autonomous learners
- Accelerated learning and consolidation
- Motivation
- Quicker student progress
- Engagement with learning
- Lesson review opportunities
- Convenience for students
- Prepares students for academic challenges
- Enriches the learning experience
- Student access to the course

3 School/Institutional benefits

- Increase in school reputation
- Seen as being innovative
- Removes immigration issues
- Teach more students per hour
- Student retention
- Saving money
- Price structure (school charging system)
- Attract wider range of students
- Cost effective business model
- Reduces the need for offline teaching hours

4 Content benefits

- Differentiation of content
- Better learning experience
- Engaging content

5 General benefits

- Education being all about choices. Students can choose which method benefits them most

APPENDIX 4: VARIABLES AND VALUES FOR SPSS QUESTIONNAIRE DATA ENTRY

Q5_age

- 1 20-29
- 2 30-39
- 3 40-49
- 4 50+

Q6_job

- 0 Teacher
- 1 Manager

Q7_location

- 0 English Speaking Country
- 1 Non-English Speaking Country

Q8_timeteaching

- 1 less than 1 year
- 2 1-4 years
- 3 5-9 years
- 4 over 10 years

Q9_student_age_group_EL

- 0 No
- 1 yes

Q9_student_age_group_YL

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q9_student_age_group_teen

- 0 No
- 1 yes

Q9_student_age_group_YAd

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q9_student_age_group_Ad

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q10_tech_experience

- 1 Not confident
- 2 Somewhat confident
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Confident
- 5 Very confident

Q11_teaching_interaction

- 1 Face to face
- 2 Online
- 3 Mix of face to face and online

Q12_student_numbers

- 1 less than 5
- 2 6-10
- 3 11-15
- 4 16-20
- 5 21 or over

Q13_attendance

- 1 once a week
- 2 2-3 times a week
- 3 4-5 times a week
- 4 every day

Q14_class_length

string

Q15_course_organisation_set_syllabus

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q15_course_organisation_syllabus_teacherinput

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q15_course_organisation_Set_textbook

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q15_course_organisation_Textbook_teacherselects

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q15_course_organisation_Courselessonplans_followclosely

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q15_course_organisation_Courselessonplans_suggestions

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q15_course_organisation_Course_specificorder

- 0 No

1 Yes

Q15_course_organisation_Courseorder_teacherdetermined

0 No

1 Yes

Q16_online_access

0 No

1 Yes

Q17_access_before

0 No

1 Yes

Q17_access_during

0 No

1 Yes

Q17_access_after

0 No

1 Yes

Q18_course_editing

string

Q19_student_progress_PTest

0 No

1 Yes

Q19_student_progress_LevelAssess

0 No

1 Yes

Q19_student_progress_Informal

0 No

1 Yes

Q20_fallbehind_excel

string

Q21_BL_definition

0 Inappropriate definition of blended learning

1 Appropriate definition of blended learning

Q22_BL_teaching_experience

0 No

1 Yes

Q23_BL_quality

- 1 Very low quality
- 2 Low quality
- 3 Neutral
- 4 High quality
- 5 Very high quality

Q24_quality_reasons_negative_student

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q24_quality_reasons_positive_student

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q24_quality_reasons_negative_content

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q24_quality_reasons_positive_content

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q24_quality_reasons_negative_teaching

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q24_quality_reasons_positive_teaching

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q24_quality_reasons_negative_tech

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q24_quality_reasons_positive_tech

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q25_BL_elements_students

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q25_BL_elements_teacher

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q25_BL_elements_content

- 0 No

1 Yes

Q25_BL_elements_tech

0 No

1 Yes

Q25_BL_elements_management

0 No

1 Yes

Q26_implementation

1 Very difficult

2 Difficult

3 Neutral

4 Easy

5 Very easy

Q27_barriers_managerial

0 No

1 Yes

Q27_barriers_logistical

0 No

1 Yes

Q27_barriers_content

0 No

1 Yes

Q27_barriers_teacher

0 No

1 Yes

Q27_barriers_student

0 No

1 Yes

Q27_barriers_tech

0 No

1 Yes

Q28_benefits_teacher

0 No

1 Yes

Q28_benefits_student

0 No

1 Yes

Q28_benefits_school

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q28_benefits_content

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

Q28_benefits_general

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

APPENDIX 5: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

RespondentID	Q5_age	Q6_job	Q7_location	Q8_time_teaching	Q9_student_age_group_EI	Q9_student_age_group_YL	Q9_student_age_group_teen	Q9_student_age_group_YAd	Q9_student_age_group_Ad	Q10_tech_experience	Q11_teaching_interaction	Q12_student_numbers	Q13_attendance	Q14_class_length
1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	120.00
2.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	360.00
4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	360.00
5.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	50.00
6.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	60.00
7.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	120.00
8.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	120.00
9.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	80.00
10.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	360.00
11.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	90.00
12.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	110.00
13.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	45.00
14.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	180.00
15.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	110.00
16.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	47.00
17.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	120.00
18.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	240.00
19.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	90.00
20.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	320.00
21.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	150.00
22.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	240.00
23.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	60.00
24.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	50.00
25.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	150.00
26.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	90.00
27.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	50.00
28.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	2.00	180.00
29.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	330.00
30.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	110.00
31.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	180.00
32.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	120.00
33.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	60.00
34.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	60.00
35.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	60.00
36.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	120.00
37.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	50.00
38.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	60.00
39.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	60.00
40.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	60.00
41.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	60.00
42.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	60.00
43.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	60.00
44.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	3.00	40.00
45.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	60.00
46.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	50.00
47.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	60.00
48.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	60.00
49.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	45.00
50.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	60.00
51.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	60.00
52.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	40.00

Q19_student_p ogress_informal	Q20_fallbehind_ excel	Q21_Bl_definitio n	Q22_Bl_teaching experience	Q23_Bl_quality	Q24_quality_reas ons_negative_stu dent	Q24_quality_reas ons_positive_stu dent	Q24_quality_reas ons_negative_co ntent	Q24_quality_reas ons_positive_con tent	Q24_quality_reas ons_negative_tea ching	Q24_quality_reas ons_positive_tea ching	Q24_quality_reas ons_negative_tec h	Q24_quality_reas ons_positive_tec h	Q25_Bl_element s_students	Q25_Bl_element s_teacher
1.00	reflected in grade	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
1.00	students falling be	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
1.00	Student to request	1.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	Leave comments f	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Teaching is adapt	1.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	Receive specific fe	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Examine reasons f	0.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	Determine proble	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	Each student work	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	Do more activities	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	Student who falls	1.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Those falling behi	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	If student falls bef	1.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	They can take sup	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	Given multiple ext	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	Depends on the ty	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	Use electronic ma	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
1.00	Doesn't like movi	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	Students who hav	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	Change class level	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Review what has f	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	They are given rev	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Work one to one	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
0.00	Very weak student	1.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	Given extra work	0.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	Offered extra help	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Working side by si	1.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	Works with stude	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	Discussion with st	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	Students falling be	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
1.00	Students can be m	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Spend more time	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	No immediate cor	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	Work with student	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	May be downgrad	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	Feedback commen	1.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	Give support, sug	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	Student progress f	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	They will upgrade	0.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	A student can upg	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	A student's perfor	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
0.00	They can learn fro	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
0.00	Parents are inform	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	Paired with a stud	1.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	Students can take	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	Student paired wi	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
0.00	Level up test for g	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	Pair with stronger	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	Level tests are av	1.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	Teacher can help	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	Regular feedback	1.00	1.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00

Q25_BI_element_s_content	Q25_BI_element_s_tech	Q25_BI_element_s_management	Q26_implementation	Q27_barriers_managerial	Q27_barriers_logistical	Q27_barriers_content	Q27_barriers_teacher	Q27_barriers_student	Q27_barriers_tech	Q28_benefits_teacher	Q28_benefits_student	Q28_benefits_school	Q28_benefits_content	Q28_benefits_general
0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	1.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
0.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
0.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

APPENDIX 6: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Introduction

1. Provide a brief overview of the project so far, aims and objectives.
2. Does the participant have any questions before we start?
3. Is it okay to start recording the interview session from now?

General questions

1. Can you provide an overview of your school/institution and how teaching is conducted?
2. Most respondents to the survey indicated they were involved in face to face teaching (70%). Has there been any move within your institution to change the way in which courses are taught and delivered (whether this involves blended learning (BL) or not)? Or, is there a move towards change at some point in the future? If so, how was this achieved and what was the reaction?
3. Do you think BL is an appropriate teaching model for an ESL/ELT setting? Why or why not?
4. To what extent do students have control over their learning in your school/institution?

Questions regarding the possibility of introducing blended learning

Definition of Blended Learning

1. All respondents were asked to provide a definition of BL, in terms of their own understanding of the term. 74% gave what I described as an 'appropriate' definition, i.e. they mentioned that there was some sort of amalgamation of traditional classroom teaching with an online component. That was the basic form of the definition. Others mentioned elements of student control over their learning. Given that 26% of respondents either did not know or were unsure as to what BL is, what implications arise from this for the implementation of BL program?

Organisation of course materials:

1. How are courses and materials organised within your school/institution?
2. How much autonomy do you as a teacher have with regard to what is taught and when?
3. 60.5% of respondents to the questionnaire indicated their school had a set syllabus with 35% indicating the course(s) had to be taught in a set order. Do you think there is a link between the level of autonomy a teacher has and the ease of implementing BL in a school?

School/Institution location

1. 72% of respondents lived in non-English speaking countries. There was a correlation between the ease of implementation and the location with implementation being harder in non-English speaking countries. Why do you think that might be?

Confidence with technology

1. 63% of respondents indicated they were either 'confident' or 'very confident' with technology, with 37% being 'not confident', 'somewhat confident' or 'neutral'

as regards confidence using technology. How do you feel about this? Is this surprising/concerning?

2. With most respondents involved with face to face teaching, do you think there are any implications regarding confidence with technology and mode of teaching delivery when it comes to implementing BL?

Student attendance

1. Most respondents indicated that their students came to class either once or 2-3 times a week (63%). Would this have any implications when it comes to implementation of BL?

Barriers to blended learning implementation

1. What would you consider to be the most significant barriers to BL? You can give your top 3 barriers.
2. Why do you think these are particularly significant?
3. What could be done to overcome these?

[There was a strong correlation between ease of implementation and managerial barriers]

Opportunities arising from blended learning implementation

1. What would you consider to be the most significant opportunities BL has to offer? Again, you can give your top 3 opportunities.
2. Why do you think these are particularly significant?
3. Who would benefit most from these opportunities?

Questions regarding the practicality of introducing blended learning

1. Given the barriers and opportunities just discussed, in your opinion, do the barriers outweigh the opportunities or vice versa?
2. Given your answer, faced with these barriers and opportunities, would you think it practical to implement a BL program?

APPENDIX 7A: INTERVIEW INITIAL CODING EXAMPLES FROM NVIVO

Barriers

Internals\\Interview 1 transcript 17042017 - § 3 references coded [2.49% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.94% Coverage

But I'm thinking that maybe on the marketing side and sales side, if they say okay you're supposed to finish all this but you're not finishing by this time then that might be the drawback. But I always justify it as the student's happy, she's learning.

Reference 2 - 0.28% Coverage

one would be the connection. You cannot always have a perfect connection

Internals\\Interview 2 transcript 20042017 - § 11 references coded [12.37% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 1.04% Coverage

Obviously, you have to be extremely motivated to study online, and it's always extremely difficult motivating sort of students in that EFL setting that might not ever use that sort of, might not ever leave the country

Reference 3 - 0.94% Coverage

I think in general they are pretty receptive to change and suggestions although in terms of how planning goes, they're not ... it's pretty typical here in Korea, I guess, to do things very last minute

Reference 4 - 1.19% Coverage

But there's also that language barrier, sometimes, with the native teachers and the administration, so sometimes get a little, sometimes we get told things at the last minute or, you know what I mean, sometimes it's just they leave us out of the loop

Reference 5 - 0.56% Coverage

I feel that they're really connected to the internet and stuff but they're not super interested in learning English

Reference 6 - 0.76% Coverage

Some of them are motivated and interested, but for the most part, you know, they don't check stuff on our learning management system unless I force them to do it

Reference 7 - 1.72% Coverage

I think that that's problematic in implementing blended courses. That is a pretty high number of teachers who don't really understand what blended learning is and that could potentially be problematic for ... English language teaching programs, for publishers, you know. And for teachers themselves, for the students it could be pretty problematic, I feel

Reference 8 - 0.77% Coverage

I know in Korea there's a long history of a certain type of educational practice that is

the teacher as the authority figure and sort of based on the banking model

Reference 9 - 1.76% Coverage

if teachers don't know about it or if they aren't comfortable using the technology or they're not, if there are not training programs set up with their administration or their place of, their work place then a lot of them would probably not be keen to implement that technology in classes, because they're not really getting paid extra so there's not a lot of incentive

Reference 10 - 1.60% Coverage

there's the motivation thing I spoke about earlier and there's the fact that they're busy and they're university students who just came out of this sort of gruelish eight years of just studying non-stop from six in the morning to ten o'clock at night kind of life and they finally have some freedom so the motivation thing is difficult

Reference 11 - 1.42% Coverage

I would say student motivation, and like teacher training, I guess, or teacher support and maybe administration depending on where you are and what the administration practices or the administration preferences were, or university management. Those would probably be the top three barriers

Internals\\Interview 3 transcript 21042017 - § 4 references coded [5.54% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 1.00% Coverage

Some of the other teachers were a bit, they didn't like the idea that you sit there ... and your students can see you, some people were a bit reluctant

Reference 2 - 0.31% Coverage

definitely the technology and the fear of it

Reference 3 - 1.24% Coverage

I think more for teachers, I think some teachers, more traditional teachers might think what's this, it's a waste of time and it's a new-fangled thing. What is this internet?

Internals\\Interview 4 transcript 26042017 - § 9 references coded [9.77% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 2.66% Coverage

it requires a lot of discipline, I think that's the word, discipline and commitment. However, for young learners, for their age, they don't really have that sort of concept of discipline yet in terms of their learning because most of their desire to learn English is mostly driven by parents and without completing their online homework or additional activities online, can be quite challenging for the students to get motivated to do it themselves without the intervention of the parents pushing them or encouraging them to do so.

Reference 2 - 1.54% Coverage

time is something that is very sensitive and they're really busy. Even like a primary school can get really busy as well but if they really have the time to do that and the discipline and habit to do it, I think it can be done. But even for Frontrunner or like

teenagers sometimes they still struggle to complete it.

Reference 3 - 0.56% Coverage

Part of it is because we lack training and knowledge about this set up or approach, and it's still growing I guess

Reference 4 - 0.60% Coverage

Because some schools I guess can't really afford the technology that's needed for it and cost wise can be an issue as well.

Reference 5 - 0.60% Coverage

being isolated, learning in isolation for the online component, especially for the students who are quite dependent.

Reference 7 - 0.55% Coverage

still time I think and discipline to be able to really commit to getting, to complete all this online homework.

Reference 9 - 1.03% Coverage

And for the teachers, I think having the blended learning course is not an option for them. It's usually set by the school and is dependent on whether these facilities are available in the centre or the school.

Confidence in new model

Internals\\Interview 1 transcript 17042017 - § 4 references coded [1.80% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.63% Coverage

when I tried to implement Skype classes for my private classes it's not always easy because people are like no we want to be face to face and want to talk to you and all that

Reference 2 - 0.21% Coverage

They feel they lose something when it's not face to face.

Reference 3 - 0.20% Coverage

they feel more secure learning in the traditional way

Internals\\Interview 2 transcript 20042017 - § 5 references coded [4.19% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 1.15% Coverage

I think there's also some stigma around online education still in Korea, although it's changing, it seems to be changing, I think there are some stereotypes that a lot of people think that it's not as good, learning online is not as, you know

Reference 4 - 0.77% Coverage

I know in Korea there's a long history of a certain type of educational practice that is the teacher as the authority figure and sort of based on the banking model

Internals\\Interview 3 transcript 21042017 - § 3 references coded [10.33% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 3.15% Coverage

I think in the beginning it would have to be quite controlled. Maybe I'm thinking more about the technology side in terms of how new it is ... yes, it would have to be quite controlled at the beginning. And there would be lots of feedback from the students, finding out how they feel, do they feel like they're actually learning. Because maybe students would start doing online courses and think I want to go back to the classroom. Yes, I would say more control.

Reference 2 - 5.94% Coverage

It might be the attitude of the learners, for example you've got a general English class and you get a 50-year-old man coming in. He's already got his expectations, what the class will be like and he's got his history of learning English from school, or whatever, so, maybe, the demographic, maybe the way the students have been brought up. But again, for example if I think about Spain and think about younger students like teenagers they might take to, they might prefer blended learning because they spend quite a lot of time online, they're much more comfortable with computers whereas with older people, older students, they, I think they like coming in because ... things about listening, a lot of the problems with listening even in the classroom, face to face, I think just in terms of the history of learning English, ... how they learned English at school.

Internals\\Interview 4 transcript 26042017 - § 3 references coded [5.04% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 2.26% Coverage

I think that personally, from my opinion, I think that the conventional style of teaching and learning is still important in a way and can't really ... we can't really phase that out because we've learned in so many years that way and it's still good to have that two-way communication, like very natural. Something like very social, the presence is still very important and also, as well, communication doesn't have to come from both the teacher themselves

Reference 2 - 1.31% Coverage

I think that's something that with this online learning, like face to face with the student, mostly, predominantly between a teacher and one student, it takes away the idea that students can socialise with their classmates, or could talk with their classmates.

Reference 3 - 1.47% Coverage

I think it's definitely something beneficial and it's still very new and everyone is still getting used to it and there's a big gap between parents, how they learned before, and how we learn now. So, in a way, some of those parents are still not open to embrace all these changes or new developments.

Definition of Blended Learning

Internals\\Interview 1 transcript 17042017 - § 1 reference coded [1.58% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 1.58% Coverage

it's very important to understand what is expected of you, what you are expected to deliver. So, one thing is if the company sells a product and your understanding's not the same then the student will not be getting value for money, so it has to be all in line. And I think it's also important for the student to see the value that he or she is getting from blended learning as opposed to a traditional type of learning program

Internals\\Interview 2 transcript 20042017 - § 1 reference coded [1.72% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 1.72% Coverage

I think that that's problematic in implementing blended courses. That is a pretty high number of teachers who don't really understand what blended learning is and that could potentially be problematic for ... English language teaching programs, for publishers, you know. And for teachers themselves, for the students it could be pretty problematic, I feel

Internals\\Interview 3 transcript 21042017 - § 2 references coded [3.03% Coverage]

Reference 2 - 2.51% Coverage

if you're a teacher you'll always be in the classroom and you, I think that's one of the good things about teaching is that you do meet your students face to face. So even though I think it's been around for quite a while, I think you might face quite a lot of reluctance from old, I don't mean old teachers, but teachers who would be much more comfortable in a classroom.

Internals\\Interview 4 transcript 26042017 - § 7 references coded [10.21% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 2.45% Coverage

I think so, particularly the Frontrunner [ELT course for 14-17 year olds] one I think because the Frontrunner one has two components from what I understood. It has the face to face with the teacher so that's 50% of the course and you've got like 50% online. And I think it's a really good idea to have it like that because the students can work anywhere, anytime and they can set their goals that are also aligned with what they do or what they will do in the future knowing that many students will travel or take a test

Reference 2 - 1.64% Coverage

So, I think it is blended learning because if I understood from my own definition of what blended learning is, it's a combination of face to face with some online components or even I think like when we do the training now, a lot of the new teachers they may use the iPads to access Athena [an in-house Learning Management System] or access any sites

Reference 3 - 1.26% Coverage

the only thing I think is a bit different is for Small Stars [ELT course for 4-6 year olds], they don't choose the goals, the goals are there. It's pretty much set for them. But the tasks are not individualised for the students. Same for High Flyers [ELT course for 7-10 year olds] it's pretty much generic.

Reference 5 - 1.31% Coverage

I think that's something that with this online learning, like face to face with the student, mostly, predominantly between a teacher and one student, it takes away the idea that students can socialise with their classmates, or could talk with their classmates.

Reference 7 - 1.23% Coverage

it depends on the school you are working at and the environment and your capacity to be able to afford all this equipment in order to support that blended learning. That's mostly online, right? Like using technology, iPads, from what I understood.

Evolution of ELT

Internals\\Interview 1 transcript 17042017 - § 1 reference coded [0.41% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.41% Coverage

I think teaching has to evolve with the times and see what actually becomes more interesting to the learners.

Internals\\Interview 3 transcript 21042017 - § 5 references coded [6.38% Coverage]

Reference 2 - 1.12% Coverage

I mean, personally I think it's a good idea, I think it's the way forward, you kind of have to change and if you can't open another school then what are you going to do

Reference 3 - 1.20% Coverage

I think the way things are going with technology, in a few years blended learning would be I think, it would be a part of something a school could offer. It would become normal.

Reference 4 - 1.16% Coverage

teaching has to change and it has to move forward and if it stays the same it's, I think it's a shame and that's when teachers just kind of stagnate and students get bored.

Reference 5 - 1.20% Coverage

I think you have to offer different ways of learning and it has to be combined some way with technology because that's the way the world is, and it's not going to go backwards.

Internals\\Interview 4 transcript 26042017 - § 1 reference coded [0.81% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.81% Coverage

and it's something that will evolve in the future and maybe later, as we can see now a lot of these online teaching ... schools are really getting more and more popular.

APPENDIX 7B: THEMES EMERGING FROM PATTERN CODING

Initial Code	Pattern code	Emergent theme
Barriers	Student motivation Financial considerations	Student motivation as a negative theme
Confidence in new model	Stigma of online education Preferences towards traditional styles of teaching Student's educational history promoting certain expectations as to how they will learn Cultural sensitivities	Lack of confidence and/or note of caution over new model
Confidence in technology	Fear and reluctance to engage with new technology Hesitance over using new technology as it is not proven	Low confidence with technology – fear, reluctance, hesitance
Definition of blended learning	Basic view of BL Lack of understanding is potential issue Unclear expectations between school and teaching staff	Need for clarity over definition of blended learning.
Evolution of ELT	ELT must evolve alongside technology ELT cannot be left behind More of a necessity than an opportunity	Necessity for ELT to evolve with technology
Opportunities	Student autonomy Customisation and personalisation of learning	Predominantly student focused opportunities
Training & transitioning	Need for training Lack of training and knowledge of BL in certain contexts External training – no focus on BL	Current lack of training and potentially lack of awareness