

## Blended Learning: Benefits, Challenges, Preparation Tips and Good-to-Know Theories

*“Blended Learning is a coherent design approach that openly assesses and integrates the strengths of face-to-face and online learning to address worthwhile educational goals”* (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008, pp. x)

At Victoria University, Blended Learning is supported by the suite of tools available in VU Collaborate.

Benefits	Challenges	Preparation Tips	Good-to-Know Theories & Frameworks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables learners to be “together and apart— and to be connected to a community of learners anytime and anywhere, without being time, place or situation bound” (Garrison &amp; Kanuka, 2004, pp 96)</li> <li>• Engages students who were brought up in the digital age and who expect to learn with the latest technologies.</li> <li>• Offers more opportunities for student-student, student-instructor, and student-content interactions. This gives voice to less confident students and promotes success for all types of learners.</li> <li>• Supported by research relating to positive student outcomes i.e. ↑ unit completion rates, ↑ learning achievement, course satisfaction and even ↑ f2f attendance rates.</li> <li>• Advances in multimedia technology mean that some topics (e.g. anatomy) can be better learnt online because students can follow at their own pace and can easily review difficult sections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires a complete redesign of the learning experience with the best of both f2f &amp; online.</li> <li>• Success factors include unit design (e.g. degree and proportion of synchronous/asynchronous interactivity, evidence of reflection, assessment mode), instructor attitudes (e.g. enthusiasm, frequency &amp; depth of feedback), and suitability of technology.</li> <li>• Learners who lack self-regulation (e.g. time-management), motivation, commitment and emotional connection to course mates may require additional instructor intervention for off-campus e-learning.</li> <li>• Instructors and students may be impeded by a lack of familiarity with technology.</li> <li>• Instructors and students with beliefs in authoritative sources of knowledge and transmissionist styles of learning might resist new ways of teaching &amp; learning.</li> <li>• Generally perceived as being more demanding than f2f sessions (more time, effort &amp; work) by students and instructors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read up on Blended Learning.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A good place to start would be from the Recommended Reading listed on the reverse of this page.</li> <li>○ Another good resource is Garrison and Vaughan’s (2004) e-book available via the following link: <a href="http://VU.ebib.com.au/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=819029">http://VU.ebib.com.au/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=819029</a></li> <li>○ Consider how you may use Community of Inquiry framework proposed by Garrison &amp; Vaughan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Look at examples – (e.g. see Garrison &amp; Vaughan, ch. 5) and talk to colleagues about what they’ve been doing</li> <li>• Join the discussions about blended learning               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reflect on your unit and identify areas where VU Collaborate tools can be used, for example, to:</li> <li>➤ Support learners by providing the ability to review content online</li> <li>➤ Encourage more interaction in class and out of class (e.g. Discussions, online chat, Campus Pack Wiki)</li> <li>➤ Promote critical reflection (Campus-Pack Blog/Journal)</li> <li>➤ Communicate with students off campus (E.g. WebEx Virtual Classrooms)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seek the advice of TELDs and get PD</li> </ul>	<p><u>Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)</u> (cited in McLeod [2012]) Consider the use of ZPD in redesigning learning. ZPD is the difference between what a student can learn on his or her own and what a student can learn with the help of significant others. ZPD illustrates how “learning increases through collaborative experiences with both instructors and peers.” (Whiteside, 2015, pp 56)</p> <p><u>SAMR Framework (Puentedura, 2013):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Substitution:</b> Technology replaces existing tasks (E.g. 45 minute on-line lecture)</li> <li>• <b>Augmentation:</b> Technology improves existing tasks</li> <li>• <b>Modification:</b> Technology involves significant redesign of existing tasks</li> <li>• <b>Redefinition:</b> Technology has allowed for the creation of new tasks previously inconceivable.</li> </ul> <p>The SAMR framework argues that it is possible for blending to result in new learning outcomes.</p> <p>The Pedagogy Wheel (Carrington, 2013) Refer to <a href="http://tinyurl.com/posterV4">http://tinyurl.com/posterV4</a> see the connection between learning outcomes, SAMR and Bloom’s Cognitive Domains.</p>

### Recommended Reading

1. Alli, N., Rajan, R., & Ratliff, G. Unlocks. Retrieved on 24 June 2016 from <https://er.educause.edu/~media/files/articles/2016/3/erm1621.pdf>
2. Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 26(1), 87-122.  
<http://0-search.ebscohost.com.library.vu.edu.au/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1040524&site=ehost-live>
3. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. John Wiley & Sons.  
<http://VU.eplib.com.au/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=819029>
4. Means, B., Peters, V., & Zheng, Y. (2014). Lessons from five years of funding DIGITAL COURSEWARE. (Executive Summary). Menlo Park, CA: SRI Education. Retrieved from <http://www.sri.com/sites/default/files/publications/psfullreport.pdf>
5. McLeod, S., (2012) Zone of Proximal Development. Retrieved from <http://www.simplypsychology.org/Zone-of-Proximal-Development.html>

### References

1. Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., & Tamim, R. M. (2014). Detecting bias in meta-analyses of distance education research: big pictures we can rely on. *Distance Education*, 35(3), 271-293.
2. Carrington, A. (2012). The Padagogy Wheel V3. 0: Learning Design starts with graduate attributes, capabilities and motivation.
3. Du, C., & Wu, J. (2014). The Effect of Human Interactions on Student Performance and Satisfaction of Blended Learning. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 18(3), 11.
4. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The internet and higher education*, 7(2), 95-105. Gikandi, J. W., Morrow, D., & Davis, N. E. (2011). Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Computers & education*, 57(4), 2333-2351.
5. López-Pérez, M. V., Pérez-López, M. C., & Rodríguez-Ariza, L. (2011). Blended learning in higher education: Students' perceptions and their relation to outcomes. *Computers & Education*, 56(3), 818-826.
6. Orton-Johnson, K. (2009). 'I've stuck to the path I'm afraid': exploring student non-use of blended learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 40(5), 837-847.
7. Pereira, J. A., Pleguezuelos, E., Meri, A., Molina-Ros, A., Molina-Tomás, M. C., & Masdeu, C. (2007). Effectiveness of using blended learning strategies for teaching and learning human anatomy. *Medical education*, 41(2), 189-195.
8. Puentedura, R. R. (2013). SAMR: Getting to Transformation. Retrieved May, 31.
9. So, H. J., & Brush, T. A. (2008). Student perceptions of collaborative learning, social presence and satisfaction in a blended learning environment: Relationships and critical factors. *Computers & Education*, 51(1), 318-336.
10. Spanjers, I. A., Könings, K. D., Leppink, J., Verstegen, D. M., de Jong, N., Czabanowska, K., & van Merriënboer, J. J. (2015). The promised land of blended learning: Quizzes as a moderator. *Educational Research Review*, 15, 59-74.
11. Tang, C. M., & Chaw, L. Y. (2013). Readiness for Blended Learning: Understanding Attitude of University Students. *International Journal of Cyber Society and Education*, 6(2), 79-100.
12. Shivetts, C. (2011). E-Learning and Blended Learning: The Importance of the Learner. A Research Literature Review. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 10(3), 331.
13. Vignare, K. (2007). Review of literature blended learning: Using ALN to change the classroom—will it work. *Blended learning: Research perspectives*, 37-63
14. Whiteside, A. L. (2015). Introducing the Social Presence Model to explore online and blended learning experiences. *Online Learning Journal*, 19(2). Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R. O. B. E. R. T., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-47.