Blended Learning In A Blended Composition Class: A Case Study In French

Carolyn GASCOIGNE[1], Juliette PARNELL[2]

Department of Foreign Languages

University of Nebraska at Omaha

United States

cgascoigne@unomaha.edu

ABSTRACT

The following pages present a case study examining both faculty and student perspectives of a post-secondary French composition course that is blended in two respects. First, this application may be considered blended because technology is used to mediate portions of instruction. Second, the course is blended in that three formerly distinct classes and levels of instruction are fused into one faculty course assignment. With financial pressures limiting course offerings and forcing technology-mediated solutions at many public universities in the United States, the following study sought to document and describe the effect of a creative course redesign at one institution. Detailed course descriptions, student and faculty surveys, and third-party observations were employed in order gain insight into the impact of the redesign on all parties involved.

Keywords:

INTRODUCTION

HYBRID OR BLENDED LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The number of both hybrid and online courses offered in the United States at the post-secondary level has been increasing steadily over the last decade. Specifically, a series of studies by the Babson Survey Research Group has demonstrated a persistent rise in the number of online courses and the number of students enrolled in online and hybrid courses, culminating in a 2011 survey finding that 6.1 million U.S. students were taking a least one course through this medium. This number represents a 10% increase over the prior year such that an impressive "31% of all higher education students now take at least one course online" (Allen & Seaman, 2011, p. 4). A 2012 follow-up study involving both the Babson Group and *Inside Higher Ed* found that even while the number of on-line courses offered continues to rise, faculty attitudes toward on-line learning are "pessimistic, rather than optimistic" (Allen, Seaman, Lederman, & Jaschik, 2012, p. 2), with professors casting "a skeptical eye on the learning outcomes for online education" (2). The 2012 Babson study (Allen et al.) involved survey responses from 4,564 faculty members representing the full range of institutions of higher learning and included a complete range of faculty and disciplines. When focusing on faculty, the study found that even as of 2012 "professors, overall do not have a positive view of the learning outcomes for online education" (p. 7). Specifically, nearly two thirds of those surveyed (66%) said that they believe learning outcomes for an online course to be either inferior or somewhat inferior to those for a comparable face-to-face course. Even among faculty members who were currently teaching an online or blended course "considerable concern" (p. 8) remained, with 40%-50% of those respondents expressing apprehension over the quality of learning outcomes. When broken down by discipline, a positive attitude toward online learning was highest for faculty members in the applied sciences, and lowest for those in the humanities and the arts. When examined by gender, female faculty members professed being more pessimistic about online learning than did their male counterparts.

In spite of these insights, Allen et al. conclude that "we do not know exactly why faculty members feel as they do about these matters" (2012, p. 11) and suggest the need to study the context of such responses. While the faculty attitudes revealed in the Babson Group study crossed all academic disciplines, many in the foreign language profession appear to acknowledge the potentially facilitative role that technology plays in today's language learning environments. Indeed, ACTFL's 2013 theme, *New Spaces New Realities,* highlights changes in the language learning landscapes:

[N]ot only of schools and classrooms but also in the many virtual spaces that connect learners worldwide. These new spaces and realities provide myriad ways for students to access learning. From the new realities of technology such as Internet resources, mobile learning, online courses, webinars and video gaming to the many opportunities of authentic face-to-face encounters achieved by connecting to the community via service learning and internships, it is evident that language learning is flourishing. (Theisen, 2013, p. 7).

But even if we, as language educators, openly acknowledge the changing landscapes of language learning, relatively few studies have examined how both students and teachers feel about these changes. Instead, much of the research has focused on comparing student learning outcomes.

EARLIER HYBRID APPLICATIONS TO FOREIGN LANGUAGES

According to Karabulut, VeVelle, Li, and Surovov (2012), much of the research devoted to online and blended or hybrid applications to language learning has focused on the general effectiveness of these applications while essentially "ignoring the sociocultural aspects of the learning experience" (p. 344). Accordingly, relatively little research has examined or compared contradictions between teachers' and students' expectations or beliefs about using technology to mediate language learning. Indeed, comparisons of learning outcomes from two student groups, one engaged in online or hybrid instruction and the other in a face-to-face learning environment, have been the objective of many studies, most often focusing on beginning language learners.

Blake, Wilson, Cetto, and Pardo-Ballester (2008) compared the oral proficiency outcomes from three groups of beginning post-secondary Spanish students: distance, face-to-face, and hybrid. In this case, the traditional group met five days per week, the hybrid group met two days per week with seven additional hours of external technologically-mediated practice, and the distance group completed all lessons and practice via technology. After one semester of study, Blake et al. measured students' oral skills using Pearson's Versant for Spanish exam. They found no significant difference in the outcomes between any groups and concluded that "students are not being disadvantaged by taking Spanish in a non-traditional format" (p. 124).

Scida and Saury (2006) also compared outcomes between a hybrid and a face-to-face section of beginning Spanish. In this case, the traditional section met five days per week while the hybrid group met for three hours per week with two additional hours of external web-based practice. After administering an exit survey to students and comparing final course grades, the investigators found that the median grade for students in the hybrid section was higher than that of those in the traditional section and more students from the hybrid section reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the course (p. 523).

Gascoigne and Parnell (2013) looked at two beginning French courses: a hybrid section meeting 120 minutes per week and a face-to-face group meeting 240 minutes per week. Again, the hybrid course was supplemented

by 120 minutes of external online practice. In this case the authors compared scores from chapter exams, compositions, oral participation, the final exam, and overall course grades for each group. In each area there was no significant difference in scores between the two groups, and in the areas of oral participation, final exam, and final course grades, students from the hybrid group outperformed their face-to-face counterparts. Moreover, a comparison of course evaluations scores found that students in the hybrid section rated the course more favorably than did those in the traditional section.

A common finding of the above studies, and others, has been that student learning outcomes from hybrid environments within beginning language courses are not significantly different from those resulting from face-to-face instruction. While much of the research "has focused on how, and whether, technology can support and facilitate language learning, there are fewer studies that look into what language instructors do with technology in their classrooms" (Karabulut, VeVelle, Li, & Surovov, 2012, p. 343) or how teachers and students perceive this use. One notable exception is a detailed case study targeting students of French. In this case, Karabulut, VeVelle, Li, and Surovov (2012) sought to collect extensive data through semester-long student and instructor interviews. Targeting an intermediate level French composition and culture course, the authors provided detailed descriptions of the nature and context of the course: a web-blended format with material presented both online and in class including the use of visual media as content and clickers for interaction, and examined the perceptions of all parties involved.

Data was gathered by means of a three-part student survey focusing on student motivational intensity, student use of technology in English, and student use of technology for learning French. Additionally, there were four semi-structured interviews with each of the six students enrolled in the course, as well as four structured interviews with the instructor. Data analysis revealed a mismatch between the students' and instructor's rationales for using technology. Whereas the instructor viewed technology as a vehicle for learning, students saw it as a time-saving tool and appeared to ignore its role in the development of L2 proficiency. The mismatch also included the fact that the instructor was not aware of the types of technology used by students outside of class, nor was she aware of the problems faced by students when employing the technologies assigned by the instructor. The authors conclude that language instructors must gain an understanding of the types of technologies students are using in their language learning pursuits as well as their rationales for using them.

CASE STUDIES

"In the field of second language education, case studies of children and adults acquiring a second language in nonclassroom settings are prevalent in the literature, although case studies of adults learning a second language within a classroom setting are seldom found in the major journals" (Long, 1986, p. 226). While the observation above was made in the mid-1980s, even a cursory review of more recent publications suggests that it still holds true today. In spite of relative infrequent use, the comprehensive view provided by case studies makes them an ideal vehicle for examining how students function within, as well as how they perceive, the blended language learning environment. As we strive to understand the impact and implications of the ever-increasing number of online and blended language learning applications, the case study can give shape to a "multi-perspectival analysis" (Tellis, 1997, p. 3) that considers the voice of the instructor, the voice of the students, and the interaction between the two.

Because the case study "strives to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a larger context and to provide in-depth understanding of a phenomenon using multiple sources of information" (Merriam, 2002, p. 104), it was considered to be the best tool for examining the hybrid application to language learning described in the pages that follow. Similar to Karabulut et al.'s 2012 case study, the present study employed a case study methodology because a "deep understanding of technology use by individuals, groups, and programs" (Grgurovic, 2011, p. 104) was desired. Indeed, we sought to describe the course as well as the perspectives of all stakeholders: the students at each level of instruction and the instructor. A single case, or holistic, design was selected because ultimately one course assignment represented the unit of analysis, and the case study approach can provide an "intensive description and analysis" of the class in question. This intensive description, often missing in quantitative studies, can be achieved in the case study design by employing multiple sources of evidence, such as interviews, direct observations, and surveys.

PRESENT STUDY

Even within the contemporary educational landscape characterized by increasingly varied learning environments and an ever-evolving stock of technological applications, the course described and examined in this article is unique in that it can be considered blended in two respects. First, it is blended in that some of the face-to-face instruction was replaced by student work done via distance and mediated by technology. Second, this course was blended in terms of the student make-up and the content. Specifically, three post-secondary French composition courses (one at the junior level, another at the senior level, and a third at the graduate level) were taught concurrently under one faculty course assignment. Due to the myriad revisions to the nature of an otherwise traditional course, a case study approach was deemed the best means of capturing the richness of the environment and considering the impact of the changes.

In addition to providing a description of the course in question: a post-secondary hybrid course on French grammar and composition combining three levels of language ability (third-year, fourth-year, and graduate), we sought to examine the perspectives of each of the stakeholders. Specifically, and similar to Karabulut et al. (2012), we examined student motivation to learn French, student technology use in English, student technology use in French, student perceptions of the hybrid nature of the course, as well as instructor and observer impressions.

The Research Questions

Within the confines of a unique multi-level hybrid course in French we sought to first describe in detail the course redesign, and next to examine:

(1) How students at each level of instruction use technology in their L1 (English).

(2) How students at each level of instruction use technology in the target L2 (French).

(3) How the students at each level of instruction perceive the hybrid design of the course.

(4) How the instructor perceived the hybrid redesign of the course.

The Course(s)

Due to a reduction in faculty lines (from four to three), French faculty at the University of Nebraska at Omaha were not able to offer the same number of course options per semester to students. In order to maintain the number of course offerings, a decision was made to use technology to fuel a redesign that ultimately fused two formerly distinct post-secondary courses, French 3040 (French Grammar and Composition) and French 4040 (French Composition and Stylistics), into a single faculty course assignment. To complicate matters further, French 4040 had historically been offered as a split undergraduate-graduate course (with a combined 4000 and 8000 course number) so that graduate students could take the course, complete additional work, and thus receive graduate credit. The course redesign described below therefore effectively fused three courses at three levels of instruction into a single faculty course assignment.

Faculty members at the University of Nebraska at Omaha decided to use technology, specifically a hybrid course redesign, in order to maintain a diverse offering of courses for a somewhat smaller pool of students. In this way we were able to satisfy our students' need for different courses without attracting criticism from administrators seeking ever-increasing returns on our limited faculty resources. The hybrid redesign described below allowed the instructor to capitalize on the common elements of the courses during face-to-face meetings, while also maintaining the individuality of course content at different levels via work done through distance.

The first course, French Grammar and Composition, is a 3000-level or junior-level French course. This course provides students with opportunities for practice in written composition along with a review of relevant grammar. This course has always met face to face for a total of 150 minutes per week. The second course in question, French Composition and Stylistics, is a 4000-level, or senior-level French course that focuses on advanced grammatical principles and provides more extensive practice in composition with attention to stylistics. This course had also traditionally met face to face for 150 minutes per week. The graduate iteration of the course is cross-listed with the 4000-level course and demands additional work and both lengthier and more frequent compositions on the part of the graduate student.

The Redesign

The redesign was primarily applied to the 4000/8000 level courses, as the 3000-level course continued to meet face to face twice per week for a total of 150 minutes. During the in-class meetings of the 3000-level course, the professor would review and expand upon a range of grammar topics initially presented in the first- and second-year courses. Students would then practice using the target structures in class as well as use the structures in short compositions. In the redesign, students in the 4000/8000-level course no longer met face to face twice per week as had taken place in years past. Now, the more advanced students were required to work through a posted review of target structures and complete practice activities on their own as mediated through a course management website (Blackboard). At eight predetermined points throughout the semester, however, the 4000-level students were required to attend the face-to-face meetings along with the 3000-level students. Dates of attendance were selected to correspond to the more difficult topics for which even the advanced students might have lingering questions. The 4000-level students also engaged in more extensive composition practice, which was completed out of class and submitted to the instructor via email. The graduate students did not participate in any grammar review activities and instead engaged in extensive compositions and rewrites—all completed and submitted via distance.

Materials

The research materials for this case study included four student survey instruments: a survey on motivational intensity in language learning (see Appendix A), a survey of technology use in English (see Appendix B), a survey on technology use in French (see Appendix C), and a survey seeking student input on the hybrid course redesign (see Appendix D). The first three instruments were adapted from Karabulut, VeVelle, Li, and Surovov (2012) and each contained eight Likert-scaled questions. The first instrument, the motivational intensity survey, while used in Karabulut et al., was originally adapted from Gardner (1985). The survey seeking student feedback on the hybrid nature of the course was an in-house instrument containing 13 questions to which a five-point Likert response was possible, as well as six open-ended questions: What is your impression of this hybrid language course so far? What do you like about taking this French course in a hybrid context? What do you dislike about taking this French course in a hybrid context? What would you change about it if you could? Have your feelings about French changed over the semester? Your feelings about the course? and, Are your learning goals being met?

Participants

Participants included the instructor, a native-speaker of French with 33 years teaching experience, the observer, a non-native speaker of French with 22 years of French teaching experience, and students in the three strands of the course. The 3000-level course contained eleven students, 10 of which were female. With the exception of one freshman, all students at the 3000-level were either juniors or seniors and ranged from 19-25 years in age. The 4000-level course was comprised of 10 students, eight females and two males. With the exception of one freshman, and one sophomore, all students were seniors, and all within the same age range as above. The graduate section contained three female students under the age of 30.

Procedures

In the twelfth week of a sixteen-week semester, a paper copy of the survey instruments was administered in class to students of both the 3000-level course and students of the 4000-level course. Students took approximately 20 minutes to complete the set of surveys. The surveys were not administered by the instructor. Students in the graduate section of the course completed an on-line version of the surveys. In addition to the surveys, the class was observed on three occasions throughout the semester. The observer, also a professor of French, and co-author of this manuscript, sat silently in the back of the room taking notes on student engagement, interaction with the instructor, and interaction between students.

SURVEY ANALYSIS

In terms of feedback on motivational intensity, students at all levels of instruction appeared to be motivated to learn French. This, however, is not terribly surprising given that the foreign language requirement at this institution concludes at the second-year of language study. Each of the eight motivational intensity questions (Appendix A) had three possible responses, one corresponding to high motivation, one corresponding to moderate motivation, and one indicating a lack of motivation. While motivation was high across all questions and all groups, those with variability across groups are discussed below. In terms of the first question, "I very actively think about what I have learned in my French class," 80% of the third-year students responded "very frequently," as did 70% of the fourth-year students, and 66% of the graduate students. In terms of question 5 "Considering how I study French, I can honestly say that I. . ." 90% of the third-year students responded "really

try to learn French," as did 80% of the 4th-year students, and 100% of the graduate students. Question 8 asked students to describe their participation in class. In this case, 55% of the third-year students indicated that they volunteered answers as much as possible, where as 80% of the fourth-year students and 100% of the graduate students gave this response. It appears that students who had less face-to-face contact claimed to take advantage of this contact to a much greater degree.

The technology use in English survey produced little variation across levels of study. The overwhelming majority of students at all levels of instruction indicated that they "always" or "frequently" use technology in English in activities such as normal communication, work, entertainment, or when searching for information, accessing news, watching videos, reading blogs, listening to music, and shopping online. The only areas in which students admitted to rarely using technology were to post blogs or participate in chat rooms. Technology use in French, on the other hand, appeared to be much less frequent.

In this case, 36% of the third-year students used technology to gain access to French language learning opportunities several times per day, whereas 70% of the fourth-year students and 66% of the graduate students did. When looking up words in French for a paper 100% of the graduate and fourth-year students reported always or frequently using technology whereas 90% of the third-year students did. When searching the Web for information, all students at all levels reported doing so. An unexpected finding was that the less advanced students indicated greater technology use in French than those at the two higher levels for activities such as shopping, communication, reading blogs. For example, 73% of the third-year students used technology to communicate in French while only 40% of the fourth-year students and 33% (or one) of the graduate students did. Similarly, 55% of the third-year students used technology to access French videos, music, and texts, while only 10% of the fourth-year students and 33% (or one) of the graduate students did.

The hybrid course survey (see Appendix D) was administered to the 4000-level and 8000-level students only, as they were the only groups for whom instruction was differentiated. This survey contained 13 Likert-scaled questions, six open-ended questions, and one yes-no question. When asked if they believed the hybrid format presented material in a logical, sequential manner, 10% of the 4000-level students responded "always," 50% said "frequently," and 40% said "sometimes." For the graduate students the responses were one each for always, frequently, and sometimes. When asked if online content was as demanding as content delivered in the face-to-face context, 20% of the undergraduates responded that they strongly agreed, 50% agreed, and 30% were indifferent. For the graduate students, one student strongly agreed and two agreed. When asked if the technology used for assignments was easy to understand all students at both levels either agreed or strongly agreed. When asked if the amount of communication was sufficient for learning 90% of the undergraduates agreed and 10% disagreed, whereas one of the graduates strongly agreed and two agreed. Similar results for both groups were produced when asked if technology-based communication is as effective as face-to-face communication for responding to questions. When asked if the hybrid format of the course met students' need for flexible access to education, all students at both levels either agreed or strongly agreed. When asked if they believed the hybrid course design was just as effective as traditional methods, 10% of the undergraduates strongly agreed, 60% agreed, and 30% were indifferent. Among the graduates, one strongly agreed and two agreed. Question 8 asked if the students preferred hybrid courses to traditional face-to-face courses. In this case, 10% of the undergraduates strongly agreed, 20% agreed, 40% were indifferent, and 30% disagreed. The graduates responded with two agreeing and one indifferent. When asked if they preferred hybrid courses only for specific subjects and levels (rather than in general), 10% of the undergraduates strongly agreed, 60% agreed, and 30% were indifferent. For the graduates, one strongly agreed, one agreed, and one

was indifferent. When asked if students can learn the same amount in a hybrid course, 10% of the undergraduates strongly agreed, 60% agreed, and 30% were indifferent. Two of the graduates agreed and one was indifferent. When asked if the hybrid format allowed them to control the pace of their learning, 90% of the undergraduates agreed and 10% were indifferent. For the graduate students, two agreed and one was indifferent. When asked if they were able to motivate themselves to complete out-of-class assignments, 20% of the undergraduates strongly agreed, 60% agreed, and 20% were indifferent. For the graduate students one strongly agreed and two agreed. When asked if their learning goals were being met, all students at both levels responded affirmatively. When asked about how much contact time students of this hybrid course should have in the future, no one thought that it should meet significantly more often (such as once per week). 30% of the undergraduates and one of the graduates thought the class should meet somewhat more often, such as every other week. 70% of the undergraduates and two of the graduates thought there should be no change.

In terms of the open-ended questions, students at both levels shared mainly positive impressions of the course, such enjoying the format, appreciating the ability to work at their own pace, enjoying the freed-up schedule and resulting flexibility, and appreciating the new and interesting format. When specifically pressed to name aspects that they disliked or that could be improved upon, one student admitted that he/she procrastinates and only recommends hybrid courses for those who are "highly motivated." One student thought that the class should meet more often, such as once per week, while another thought there should be no face-to-face meetings whatsoever. Another student shared that within the hybrid format, directions must be very direct and clear. Still another shared that he/she missed the interaction with and opinions of other students. When asked if their feelings about French and about the course have changed over the semester, students demonstrated the most enthusiasm in their responses, "I still love it and I love the course," "I am now more motivated to learn on my own," " I have good feelings," "I enjoy the language and the course," "steady and positive."

In addition to the student surveys a third-party (another professor of French) completed three class observations. The dates of the observations intentionally fell on days when the hybrid students were required to be present in class. The observer sat in the back of the room. She was concerned with observing the interaction between the face-to-face group and the hybrid students. Specific a priori questions were: Did the students interact well or keep to themselves? Were the hybrid students treated as intruders or did they appear to be welcomed? Did one group dominate the interaction?

The observer noted that while the room was set-up with tables, rather than individual desks, the hybrid students and the face-to-face students sat at separate tables. Indeed, it appeared that the face-to-face students had grown accustomed to a given seating arrangement and the incoming hybrid students, by default, filled the other available spaces. As this was a teacher-fronted class, in that the professor addressed the class as a whole and then solicited student responses to questions, there was little opportunity for student-to-student interaction. Due to this format, opportunities for student participation were evenly shared among both groups of students. Overall, the hybrid students appeared to be welcome in the class with no obvious animosity between the groups, even while sitting at separate tables.

DISCUSSION

One of the main objectives of this case study was to describe in detail a course redesign that sought to maximize faculty resources and increase course offerings by using a hybrid course redesign to effectively combine three levels of French instruction: a third-year grammar and writing, a fourth-year composition and stylistics, and a graduate composition course. In addition to describing the redesign, we sought to examine the sociocultural aspects of the redesign by surveying and observing student and teacher alike. In terms of the first research question, "How do students at each level of instruction use technology in their L1 (English)?" all students at all levels reported "always" or "frequently" using technology in English for activities such as normal communication, work, entertainment, or when searching for information, accessing news, watching videos, reading blogs, listening to music, and shopping online. The only areas in which students admitted to rarely using technology were to post blogs or participate in chat rooms. Given their levels of technology use in English, students involved in the hybrid versions of the course would be familiar with the basic technologies (email, the Blackboard course management site) used to partially mediate instruction.

In terms of the second question "How do students at each level of instruction use technology in the target L2 (French)?" we found relatively less technology use across levels when compared to their use in English. An unanticipated outcome was that the third-year students (the non-hybrid group) professed more technology use in French than either the fourth-year or the graduate students for personal pursuits such as shopping, communication, reading blogs, watching videos, films, reading texts, and listening to music. The more advanced students, however, professed a higher French technology usage for French study opportunities and for editing papers. Because the third-year students had regular face-to-face classroom contact, it is possible that they did not feel the need to seek out additional on-line instruction or pedagogical resources, and instead used their free time to seek out ludic French opportunities on line. The more advanced students, on the other hand, may have felt the need to supplement their limited face-to-face contact by additional on-line learning opportunities, perhaps at the expense of more leisurely online pursuits in French.

As for the third question, "How do students at each level of instruction perceive the hybrid redesign?" all students instructed through the hybrid redesign expressed positive reactions to the course. Although positive overall, a few students offered some suggestions for improvement or caveats. One student, while enjoying the course, intimated that the format may not work well for everyone. This student went on to say that in a hybrid context, students must be responsible and self-motivated. Two other students expressed the need for clear directions and deadlines, while another missed the interaction and opinions of other students. While all students believed that their learning objectives were being met, 30% said that they would nevertheless prefer a traditional face-to-face format.

How did the instructor perceive the hybrid redesign of the course? The instructor of the course completed the same hybrid course survey as the students. In this case, the instructor reported agreeing or strongly agreeing with all statements, with the exception of question #8 "I prefer hybrid courses to traditional face-to-face courses" to which she reported being indifferent. Based on responses to the Likert-type questions, the instructor reported having very positive impressions of the hybrid course, such as finding the on-line content as demanding as face-to-face content, the amount of communication to be sufficient, the technology to be easy to understand, and the hybrid design to be as effective as face-to-face formats. This positive position is similar to that of the majority of the students. When asked about how much contact time this hybrid course should have in the future, the instructor offered that there be no change, as did many of the students. While clearly

falling on the positive side of the spectrum, the instructor's impression of the hybrid nature of the course did not appear to differ dramatically from that of many of the students. It does, however, differ from the negative view of online education held by many faculty members—especially female faculty in the humanities—as found in the 2012 Babson Survey (Allen et al., 2012).

When asked give specific examples of what she liked about teaching this course in a hybrid context, the instructor's responses included more flexibility, increased curricular offerings, and flexibility for students' schedules. When asked about dislikes, responses included less face-to-face interaction with students and reduced speaking opportunities for students. The instructor also shared that organization, deadlines, and clarity of expectations are even more critical in the hybrid context. This insight echoes that of some of the students in this course as well as the finding from earlier investigations (Chenoweth, Ushida, & Murday, 2006; Scida & Saury, 2006). Indeed, hybrid and online students want and need "a much more specific work-plan with specific due dates, both to guide them in their study of the material and help them maintain a certain pace" (Chenoweth et al., 2006, p. 130).

CONCLUSION

While this study did not compare or measure student learning outcomes, as many hybrid-focused studies before it (Blake et al., 2008; Gascoigne & Parnell, 2013; Scida & Saury, 2002) it did apply a case study approach to a hybrid course redesign in order to better understand student and faculty perceptions of the undertaking. The redesign in question was multifaceted: it combined three levels of instruction into a single faculty course assignment while using technology to differentiate instruction for the three student populations. While yielding a rich set of data, one limitation of this study is that the amount and type of data produced is both difficult to summarize succinctly and impossible to extend to other populations.

This particular redesign enrolled a total of 24 students: 11 third-year, 10 fourth-year, and three graduate students. Due to financial limitations at our, and at many other institutions, it is becoming increasingly difficult to justify small course enrollments of 10-11 students. In addition to pressure from administrators, there may also be workload questions from colleagues in multi-language departments who are teaching similar courses to much larger numbers of students. For example, the combined enrollment in this case study barely equals the enrollment in a single section of a similar third- or fourth-year Spanish course at our institution. Barring any unforeseen increases in enrollment in French, creative solutions for maintaining course options must be considered. This case study presents one such option that uses hybrid instruction in order to achieve this goal and also provides insights into student and teacher expectations for, and impressions of, the experience.

REFERENCES

Allen, I.E., & Seaman, J. (2011). Going the distance: Online education in the United States, 2011. *Babson Survey Research Group Report*, p.1-26. The Sloan Consortium. Available: http://sloanconsortium.org/sites/default/files/class-differences.pdf.

Allen, I.E., Seaman, J., Lederman D., & Jaschik, S. (2012). Conflicted: Faculty and online education: *A Joint Project of the Babson Survey Research Group and Inside Higher Ed*, p. 1-24. Available: http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/conflicted-faculty-and-online-education-2012

Blake, R., Wilson, N., Cetto, M., & Pardo-Ballester, C. (2008). Measuring oral proficiency in distance, face-to-face, and blended classrooms. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(3), 114-127.

Chenoweth, N.A., Ushida, E., & Murday K. (2006). Student learning in hybrid French and Spanish courses: An overview of language online. *CALICO Journal,* 24(1) 115-145.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gascoigne, C., & Parnell, J. (2013). Hybrid language study: A Case study in beginning French. *The French Review* 87(2) 129-142.

Grgurovic, M. (2011). Blended learning in an ESL class: A Case study. *CALICO Journal,* 29(1) 100-117.

Karabulut, A., VeVelle, K. Li, J., & Surovov R. (2012) Technology for French learning: A mismatch between expectations and reality. *CALICO Journal,* 29(2) 341-66.

Long, D. (1986). A Case for case studies. *Foreign Language Annals,* 19(3) 225-29.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp. 3-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scida, E., & Saury, R. (2006). Hybrid courses and their impact on student and classroom performance: A case study at the University of Virginia. *CALICO Journal*, 23(3) 517-31.

Tellis, W. (1997). Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report,* 3(2) 1-12.

Theisen, T. (2013). New spaces new realities. *The Language Educator*, 8(1) 7.

APPENDIX A

Survey of Motivational Intensity

Please respond to each of the following questions by circling the letter of the option that best describes your typical opinion or behavior.

1. I actively think about what I have learned in my French class:

a) very frequently.

b) hardly ever.

c) once in a while.

2. If French were not taught in school, I would:

a) pick up French in everyday situations (i.e., read French books and newspapers, try to speak it whenever possible).

b) not bother learning French at all.

c) try to obtain lessons in French somewhere else.

3. When I have a problem understanding something we are learning in French class, I:

a) immediately ask the teacher for help.

b) only seek help just before the exam.

c) just forget about it.

4. When it comes to French homework, I:

a) put some effort into it, but not as much as I could.

b) work very carefully, making sure I understand everything.

c) just skim over it.

5. Considering how I study French, I can honestly say that I:

a) do just enough work to get along.

b) will pass on the basis of sheer luck or intelligence because I do very little work.

c) really try to learn French.

6. If my teacher wanted someone to participate in an extra French activity, I would:

a) definitely not volunteer.

b) definitely volunteer.

c) only do it if the teacher asked me directly.

7. After I get my French assignment back, I:

a) always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes.

b) just throw them in my desk and forget them.

c) look them over, but don't bother correcting mistakes.

8. When I am in French class, I:

a) volunteer answers as much as possible.

b) answer only the easier questions.

c) never say anything.

From Gardner, R. C. (1985). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold.

APPENDIX B

Technology Use in English

Please circle the position on the continuum that best describes your technology use in English.

1. I use the Internet and other computer technology to go about my normal communication, work, and entertainment.

Many times each day	A few times a day	About once a day	At least once a week	Seldom or never

2. If I am writing a paper in English and need help finding or spelling a word, I use the language help in the word processing program or on the Internet.

Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

3. I search on the Web for information that I need when I am writing a paper for class or for my job.

Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

4. I shop for things like books, clothes, music, DVDs and other things on the Internet.

Normally	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

5. I use the Internet to get access to news and other information in English.

Normally	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

6. I use email, instant messenger, or an Internet voice communication tool such as Skype to communicate with friends and relatives.

Normally	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

7. I surf the Web for fun to find interesting blogs to read, images to look at, videos to watch and music to listen to.

For more than an hour every day	Almost everyday	About once a week	Less than once a week	Never

8. I participate in chat rooms and contribute to discussion groups and Wikis on the Web to extend my activities beyond my everyday circle of friends.

For more than an hour every day	Almost everyday	About once a week	Less than once a week	Never

9. I keep a blog to communicate in English with anyone who wants to know what I am doing or what I am writing about.

Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	I don't know what a blog is.

From Karabulut et al. (2012). *CALICO Journal* 29(2), 341-366.

APPENDIX C

Technology Use in French

Please circle the position on the continuum that best describes your technology use in French.

1. I use the Internet and other computer technology to get access to French language learning opportunities by using CD-ROMs, word processing, or the Internet.

Many times each day	A few times a day	About once a day	At least once a week	Seldom or never

2. If I am writing a paper in French and need help finding or spelling a word, I use the language help in the word processing program or on the Internet.

Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

3. I search on the Web for information in French that I need when I am writing a paper for a French class.

Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

4. I shop on French Web sites for things like books, clothes, music, DVDs and other things on the Internet.

Normally	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

5. I use the Internet to get access to news and other information in French.

Normally	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

6. I use email, instant messenger, or an Internet voice communication tool such as Skype to communicate with people in French.

Normally	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

7. I surf the Web for fun to find interesting things to look at in French—i.e., blogs to read, videos to watch and music to listen to.

For more than an hour every day	Almost everyday	About once a week	Less than once a week	Never

8. I participate in chat rooms and contribute to discussion groups and Wikis in <u>French</u> on the Web to extend my opportunities for learning French.

For more than an hour every day	Almost everyday	About once a week	Less than once a week	Never

9. I keep a blog to communicate in <u>French</u> with anyone who wants to know what I am doing or what I am writing about.

Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	I don't know what a blog is.

From Karabulut et al. (2012). *CALICO Journal* 29(2), 341-366.

APPENDIX D

Hybrid Redesign Survey

Please respond to each of the following questions by circling the option that best describes your belief or behavior.

1. Hybrid learning allows for the presentation of course content in a logical, sequential manner such that it facilitates learning.

Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never

2. Online content (including reading, research, review, learning new concepts, and assessment) is as demanding as content delivered in traditional face-to-face courses.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. Technology used for assignments is easy to use and understand.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. The amount of communication and interaction between students and faculty in the hybrid course was sufficient for effective learning.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. Technology-based communication is as effective as face-to-face communication for responding to questions.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6. Hybrid courses meet the need for flexible access to educational opportunities.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

7. I believe using a hybrid course design is just as effective as traditional teaching methods.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. I prefer hybrid courses to traditional face-to-face courses.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

9. I prefer hybrid courses only for specific subjects and/or specific levels of instruction.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

10. Students can learn the same amount in a hybrid course as in a traditional course.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

From Sitter at al.

11. The hybrid format allowed me to control the overall pace of my learning.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

12. I was able to motivate myself to complete the out-of-class assignments.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

13. In the future, how often would you recommend that this class meet in person?

(Please circle one response below)

Significantly more often (e.g., every day)

More often

No change

Less often (e.g., 2-3 times per semester)

Not at all

Short Answer Questions

14. What is your impression of this hybrid language course experience so far?

15. What do you like about taking this French course in a hybrid context?

16. What do you dislike about taking this French course in a hybrid context?

17. What would you change if you could?

18. Have your feelings about French changed over the semester?

19. Have your feelings about the course changed over the semester?

20. Are your learning goals being met? YES / NO